

NILS ARNE PEDERSEN

A MANICHAEAN HISTORICAL TEXT

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 119 (1997) 193–201

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

A MANICHAEAN HISTORICAL TEXT*

Usually “historical texts” are not found in Gnostic literature, that is, texts dealing with the history and the times of the Gnostics themselves. The Manichees, however, were highly interested in the history of their founder and their church¹. This interest is reflected in numerous fragments of historical texts from Turfan and above all in the Egyptian material, where this type of texts is represented both by the *Cologne Mani Codex (CMC)* and by the Coptic Manichaean texts, which contain a good deal of historical material².

The parts of the seven Coptic Manichaean codices from Medinet Madi which are published in critical editions bear witness to this historical interest. Both the *Kephalaia* and the *Psalm-Book* contain much historical material, and in the *Manichaean Homilies* the text with the title *The Part of the Narrative about the Crucifixion (Man. Hom. 42, 9-85)* describes the death of Mani and the fate of the Manichaean congregation under its two subsequent leaders Sisinnios and Innaios. Also the last text in the *Manichaean Homilies (Man. Hom. 86-96)* contains some historical material. The same seems to be the case for the codex in the Chester Beatty Library entitled *Kephalaia*, like the one in Berlin³.

One of the seven codices seems to have had exclusively historical contents. C. Schmidt described the contents of a few leaves from this codex in “Ein Mani-Fund”⁴. The largest part of the codex was presumably lost during the Second World War, but a few leaves still remain in Berlin⁵ and a single leaf in the Chester Beatty Library in Dublin. This Dublin leaf has been published in facsimile by S. Giversen⁶.

Till now the contents of the codex were known exclusively through Schmidt’s description. Combined with H. H. Schaeder’s philological and historical observations concerning topography and personal names in Schmidt’s description⁷, it has been used in many studies of the history of Manichaeism⁸.

The leaf of which Schmidt gave the most detailed description is the same as the one preserved in the Chester Beatty Library. After making a transcript from the facsimile edition I had opportunity to collate my transcript with the original leaf. Since then, P. Nagel generously reviewed my transcription; he found some additional readings, which have been acknowledged in the notes (here *Nag.*). Finally,

* I wish to express my sincere thanks to Professor Søren Giversen, Professor Peter Nagel, Professor Prods Oktor Skjærø and Dr Ittai Dan Gradel for encouragement and valuable suggestions. I also wish to thank Professor Martin Krause, Dr Wolf-Peter Funk and Professor W. F. Reineke.

¹ The term “history” in this article is only intended to indicate this Manichaean interest in the life of Mani and the progress of his church. I do not intend to say that the Manichees shared any modern concept of “history”, a claim which would certainly be inappropriate in a description of their texts and intentions.

² A fundamental study of the historical literature of the Iranian Manichees is W. Sundermann’s “Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer”, I-II (*AOF* 13, 1986, 40-92, 239-317) and III (*AOF* 14, 1987, 41-107), also essential for the historical literature of the Western Manichees.

³ This codex is now published in facsimile: Giversen, *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library. Facsimile Edition*, I (CO^r XIV), Genève, 1986.

⁴ C. Schmidt and H. J. Polotsky, “Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten”, 27-30 (*SPAW* 1933).

⁵ A. Böhlig, “Die Arbeit an den koptischen Manichaica”, 183-84 (*Mysterion und Wahrheit* (AGSU VI), Leiden, 1968).

⁶ Giversen, *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library. Facsimile Edition*, II (CO^r XV), Genève, 1986, pl. 99-100.

⁷ H. H. Schaeder, “Rezension von Schmidt und Polotsky, Ein Mani-Fund” (*Gn.* 9, Berlin, 1933, 337-62).

⁸ E. g. W. Seston, “Le roi sassanide Narsès, les arabes et le manichéisme”, *Mélanges syriens offerts à Monsieur René Dussaud* I (BAH 30), Paris, 227-34. – Seston, “De l’authenticité et de la date de l’édit de Dioclétien contre les Manichéens”, *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d’histoire anciennes offerts à Alfred Ernout*, Paris, 1940, 345-54. – S. N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*² (WUNT 63), Tübingen, 1992, 101-3, 110.

Giversen learned from W.-P. Funk that Polotsky's original transcription of this leaf did still exist; the transcription is to be found in Berlin in "Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Altägyptisches Wörterbuch" together with other transcriptions some of which are probably from other leaves from P 15997. I have, thanks to W. F. Reineke, obtained access to this transcription. Even though the transcription is imperfect and insufficient, and it is obvious that it never came to be mature for edition, it is of great value because the leaf must have been in a better state of preservation in the thirties. It would not make much sense to publish Polotsky's transcription because there is much text on the leaf which he did not try to transcribe, but his transcription contains valuable supplementary information to an edition of the papyrus. Since my transcript permits a clearer understanding of this important text, it is worth publishing it provisionally. This provisional publication is provided with a translation and notes on the readings and a brief discussion of the contents. In the notes it is always stated whenever a reading is only based on Polotsky's transcription because it is now illegible (here *Pol.*). In some instances a reading is uncertain now, but it was certain in the time of Polotsky; therefore I have chosen to indicate the reading as certain.

According to Schmidt, the contents of the codex was compiled from the accounts of several Manichaean authorities whose names were written at the top edges of the pages⁹. But according to Alexander Böhlig, this information is not correct: It is only possible to see some "kaum lesbare und schwer deutbare Überschriften"¹⁰. On the leaf in the Chester Beatty Library, however, nothing is preserved of such a heading¹¹. Otherwise, the first line is partially preserved, while it is impossible to establish whether the lowest preserved line was also the last line. In its present state the leaf contains 34 lines on the recto (plate 99) and 33 lines on the verso (plate 100). But the verso contained 36 lines in Polotsky's time. The column height is now about 19 cm¹².

Though the lines may not have extended equally far to the right, it seems possible to establish that the column of plate 100 was about 11.4 cm wide, because the last letter in line 19 seems preserved.

A column height of approximately 19 cm with about 33 lines and a width of about 11.4 cm corresponds to the dimensions of the columns in the *Manichaean Homilies*, where H. Ibscher estimated the column height to be about 20 cm and the breadth at about 13 cm with about 33 lines on average¹³.

Transcription of Plate 99

.] [. . . .] . [. . .] . MHN BAPZBIHC . [.
 . .] NNΩMΩETE NTXΩPA NOZEOC AΦA [. .
] . . ΠΩMΩIT ΠΩHPE MΠOYAAAN . [.
 4 .] T XΩPA NTANAZIT . AAOPYBAAAGAN MN [.
 . .] . ΩIACPOY ΠZHY ZΩY MPTMA ETM [MEY
] AYΩI [.] . MΠAΓAΘON ABAA ZN M [.
 . .] [.] . YAN EYHTI ANECBIBOK [.
 8] E . APMENIA MN BITHA WA . . [.
] M ZΩOY KATA TOYCAM :
] NTTEPCIC P EIPHNH AYZΩ [.

⁹ Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 30.

¹⁰ Böhlig, op. cit. 183-84.

¹¹ One of Polotsky's transcriptions in Berlin which is probably from another leaf from P 15997 has at the top edge of the page the framed heading]ΩT and in line 23 the framed heading ΔMMΩC ΠCΔZ:

¹² Since no number from the hand of Hugo Ibscher is preserved on the leaf, the numbers 99-100 from Giversen, op. cit., II, will be used here.

¹³ H. Ibscher in *Manichäische Homilien*. Hrsg. von H. J. Polotsky (Manichäische Handschriften der Sammlung A. Chester Beatty, I). Stuttgart, 1934, XIII. A more detailed description of the leaf from the historical codex can be found in the introduction in Giversen, op. cit. vol. II, VIII-IX.

.....]. ωμ [. . . .
 12]. . . . ΔΠΙΕΡΟ ΜΝ ΝΕ . . [. . . .
]. [. .]. ΜΜΔΩΤΕ ΕΤΜΜΕΥ · ΔΞ . . [. . . .
]. [. .] ΝΕΩΔΤΕ ΞΝ ΤΧΩΡΑ ΝΟΖΕΟС [. . . .
 ΚΑΤΑ] ΜΔ ΜΔ ΔΥΟΥΩΞ ΞΔΤΗΥ ΞΜ ΠΟΥΤΔΩ . . [. .
 16]. ΕΥΜΗΞ ΞΔ ΠΝCΔΥΝΕ ΜΝ ΠΝΝΔΞΤΕ [. . . .
] ω ΜΠΜΔ ΕΤΜΜΕΥ ΞΝΞΙΡΘΑΛΛΑ ΞΜ. [. . . .
]. . . . ΔΔΒΙΗCΟΥ ΠCΔΞ Τ. [. . . .
]. . . [. .]. Ν ΞΙΘΗ ΜΜΔΛΩΠ ΠΩΗΡΕ ΝΑΒΔΧ [. . . .
 20]ΡΟΝΛΔΞΙΝ . . ΜΝ ΔΒΔΚΔΡΙΜ ΔCCEΞΕ ΝΕΜ[Ε
 Β]ΩΚ ΔΝ ΔΞΟΥΝ ΞΙΘΗ ΝΘΑΔΔΜΩΡ ΤΡΡΩ ΔΥ [. . . .
]ωΤ ΝCΩC ΚΑΛΩC ΔΔΒΙΗCΟΥ ΠCΔΞ ΚΑ ΔΒ [. . . .
]ΕΤΜΜΕΥ ΜΝ ΞΝΚΕCΝΗΥ · ΔΥΡ ΟΥΝΔC [. . . .
 24]CΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑ ΜΠΜΔ ΕΤΜΜΕΥ Δ [. . . .
]. ΠCΔΞ ΔΔΥ CΘΗΛ ΠΩΜΩΙΤ . . [. . . .
]. . . ΔΑΧΙΑC ΔΔΒΙΡΑ ΝΤΟΥΡΩC ΔΥC [. . . .
]ΔΥΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑ ΜΠΜΔ ΕΤΜΜΕΥ [. . . .
 28]Ε ΔΠΞΩΒ ΕΙ ΝΔΞΡΝ ΔΜΔΡΩ ΠΡ[ΡΟ
 . ΔΒΔ]ΚΔΡΙΜ · ΞΩCΤΕ ΔΤΕ ΝCΝΗΥ ΒΩΚ [. . . .
]ΟΥΛΑΙCΕ ΝΤCΘΟ · ΔΥΤΕCΡ ΩΒΗΡ ΔΡΑ[Ν
 . . . Δ]ΓΑΘΟΝ ΝΞΗΤC · ΔC† ΤΟΟΤΝ ΤΟΝΩ [. . . .
 32 . . .]ΔΡΑΝ · ΔCΡ ΟΥΝΔC ΜΠΔΤΡΩΝ ΔΡΑ[Ν
 . . .]CΜΔΤ ΔΤΕCΒ[ΟΗ]ΘΕΙΑ ΜΝ ΠΕCΟΥΩ [. . . .
 . . . Ο]ΥΩΝΞ ΔΒΑΛ [. .]. ΩC [. . . .

2 ΝΝΩΜΩΕΤΕ: *Pol.*; everything except ΝΩΜΩ now illegible. – ΝΤΧΩΡΑ: ΝΤ only in *Pol.* – ΝΟΖΕΟС: Because of the vertical stroke of Ρ in line 1, the scribe has made a blank room with the length of a letter between ΟΖΕ and ΟC. – 3 ΜΠΟΥΛΛΑΝ: λ might be Δ, but λ in *Pol.* A small trace of a horizontal stroke after Ν makes it probable that the following letter was Π or Τ. – 4 ΤΧΩΡΑ: Τ only in *Pol.* – 6 End ΞΝ Μ: Strokes above Ν and Μ only in *Pol.* – 7: Π ΔΝΕCΒΙΒΩΚ in *Pol.*; now very difficult to read. – 9: There is a blank room after ΤΟΥCΔΜ: of the length of about 2 letters followed by a very tiny stain of ink which may be trace of a letter. – 10 ΝΤΠΕΡCΙC: Stroke above Ν only in *Pol.* – ΔΥΞΩ: Υ (*Pol.*) now very difficult to read. ΞΩ only in *Pol.* *Pol.* suggests the restoration ΞΩΤΠ. – 13 ΜΜΔΩΤΕ: Μ seems corrected from an original Ν. – The punctuation mark uncertain. – 14 ΤΧΩΡΑ: Ρ written above the line. – 16 ΕΥΜΗΞ: ΕΥΜ (*Pol.*) now very difficult to read. – ΝΔΞΤΕ: Ε only in *Pol.* – 17 ω ΜΠΜΔ only in *Pol.* – ΞΙΡΘΑΛΛΑ: First two letters difficult to read; *Pol.*: Ξ'ΙΡΘΑΛΛΑ. λ might be Δ. – 19 ΝΑΒΔΧ[: Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 28 restored the name as “Abd[jesu]” which, however, is impossible because the fourth letter is partially preserved; it could be Χ, and it is definitely not Ι. – 20]ΡΟΝΛΔΞΙΝ . . ΜΝ ΔΒΔΚΔΡΙΜ: This must be two names. – The two letters after]ΡΟΝΛΔΞΙΝ look like ΕΙ or ΟΙ, but they are very damaged. – 21 end: ΔΥ only in *Pol.* – 22]ωΤ: *Pol.* suggested ΜΟΥ]ωΤ or CΩ]ωΤ. *Nag.* has also suggested ΟΥΩ]ωΤ. – 23 ΕΤΜΜΕΥ: First Ε only in *Pol.* – ΝΔC: Only in *Pol.* – 24]CΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑ: *Pol.* read]ω ΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑ, but an initial C is more likely. – End: Δ only in *Pol.* – 25: The lacuna can be restored as ΔΔΒΙΗCΟΥ] ΠCΔΞ ΔΔΥ etc., ‘the teacher [Abiēsū] sent...’ Before ΠCΔΞ, however, *Pol.* has Ν which may fit the weak traces of ink. – End: Perhaps . . Δ [or, as in *Pol.*, ΠΠC. – 26 ΝΤΟΥΡΩC: Stroke above Ν only in *Pol.* – ΔΥC [: C only in *Pol.* – 30 End ΔΡΑ[Ν: Ρ uncertain, but confirmed by *Pol.* Restoration suggested by *Nag.* – 31: Punctuation mark uncertain. – 32 ΔΡΑ[Ν: This reading (by *Nag.*), seems to be the most likely one; *Pol.* has, however, ΝΕΝΞΝ. – 33]CΜΔΤ: C only in *Pol.* – ΔΤΕCΒ[ΟΗ]ΘΕΙΑ read by *Nag.* and confirmed by *Pol.* – ΠΕCΟΥΩ [: *Pol.*; only C can now be read with some certainty. – 34 Ο]ΥΩΝΞ: Υ (and with it the restoration Ο] only in *Pol.*

Translation of Plate 99

.....Barhbiēs...
 ...the servants of the land (χώρα) of Khūzistan.....
 ..the servant..... the son of
 4 the land (χώρα) of Anajit, Adūrbadagan and ...
but the profit of th[at] place...

-of the good (ἀγαθόν) from...
 ...they are belonging to her ...
 8Armenia and Bithia to...
according to (κατά) their power.
of Persia make peace (εἰρήνη) and they were re[conciled (?)]

 12the river and
those neighbourhoods,
the merchants in the land (χώρα) of Khūzistan...
 every] (κατά) place, and they lived with them in their province...
 16they are full of our knowledge and our faith...
of that place in
the teacher Abiēsū....
before Malōp, the son of Abdkh[...
 20and Abakarim, and he spoke wit[h...
 g]o also in to Queen Thadamōr...
rightly (καλῶς), and the teacher Abiēsū....
 that.....and other brethren, and they made a great...
 24church (ἐκκλησία) of that place...
 the teacher sent the servant Sethel....
Zakhias to Abira of the watch tower, and they...
 ...a church (ἐκκλησία) of that place.....
 28the matter came before Ki[ng] Amarō....
 ...Aba]karim, therefore (ὥστε) the brethren were caused to go.....
a cause of healing, and they caused him to become friends with [us...
 ...g]ood (ἀγαθόν) in him, and he helped us very...
 32 ...for us, and he became a great patron (πάτρων) for [us...
 his p[at]ronage (βοήθεια) and his.....
appear.....

1: ΒΑΡΘΕΛΗΜ seems to be a name. – 2: ΤΧΩΡΑΝΟΖΕΟC (cf. line 14) is Khūzistan (Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 28 A. 10 with reference to Schaefer). – 4 ΤΧΩΡΑΝΤΑΝΑΔΙΤ: According to Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 28 A. 11, the word ΤΑΝΑΔΙΤ is unknown, “vielleicht ‘Provinz’, ‘Distrikt’” (cf. Crum, *Coptic Dictionary*, 422a). Schaefer, however, has offered an explanation: “Und ΤΑΝΑΔΙΤ ... ist, mit dem koptischen Artikel fem. sg. versehen, gr. Ἀνζήτα (Ptol. 5.12), Ἀνζιτηνή, später Χανζίτ, arm. *Hanjit’ Anjit’* (j = dz), syr. ܫܢܝܫܘܢܝܬܐ, ein Gebirgsgau im südlichen Armenien unweit von Amid.” (Schaefer, op. cit., 341 with reference to Th. Nöldeke, “Zwei Völker Vorderasiens” (ZDMG 33, 1879), 163 and H. Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik* I (Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken VI), Leipzig, 1897, 294, 403, 405, 517). – 8 ΔΔΟΥΡΒΑΔΔΓΑΝ “= Azerbaiġan, die heutige Provinz Adarbaigan, das Atropatēnē der Griechen... ΔΔΟΥΡΒΑΔΔΓΑΝ entspricht genau der zu erschließenden, aber nicht belegten mittelpers. Form Ādurbādayān.” (Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 28 A. 11). – 8 ΒΙΘΙΔ: Perhaps the place of that name in Media (Ptol. *Geog.* 6,2,13). – 18 ΔΒΙΗCOY: This person (cf. line 22) is also mentioned in *CMC* 74.6. – ΠCΔΞ: Next to the ἀρχηγός, “teacher” was the highest rank within the hierarchy of the Manichaean Church. – 19 ΜΔΛΩΠ: “Malōp = Ma’lūf aram.-babylon.” (Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 28 A. 6). – 20 ΔΒΔΚΑΡΙΜ (and ΔΒΔ]ΚΑΡΙΜ in line 29): Professor Skjærvø writes in a letter to me (dated 19 October 1993): “Abakarim could be Arabic Abā Karīm (Ābū Karīm).” – 25 CΘΗΧ: “Sethel = Seth” (Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 28 A. 8). This Manichee Sethel has the same name as the son of Adam in Mandaeen and Manichaean tradition. – 26 ΖΑΧΙΑC: This Zakhias may be the same person as the Za... in *CMC* 94 and the Ζαχέας in *CMC* 140.9; the Ζαρούας in the Abjuration Formulas (<Zacharias of Mitylene>, *Seven Chapters* 2,36; *The Long Formula* PG 1,1468B; cf. Lieu, “An Early Byzantine Formula for the Renunciation of Manichaeism” (*JAC* 26, 1983), 176, 179; *The Short Formula* PG 100,1321D); the Ἀκούας in Epiphanius *haer.* 66,1,1; the Mar Zaku in Manichaean Iranian texts (*M* 6 (with the first line preserved in *M* 1, 239), *M* 104: F. C. Andreas and W. B. Henning, “Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan III” (*SPAW* 1934), 865-67, 882), and *M* 6232 R (Henning, “A Pahlavi Poem” (*BSOAS* 13, 1950), 645); the Zakū in an-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (G. Flügel, *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften*, Leipzig, 1862, 104); there may, however, have been two different persons with this name, a disciple and a teacher (cf. C. Römer, *Manis frühe Missionsreisen nach der Kölner Manibigraphie* (Pap. Col. XXIV), Opladen, 1994,

119-21 with references to earlier literature). Incidentally, one of Polotsky's transcriptions in Berlin which is probably from another leaf from P 15997 mentions a ΖΑΧΙΑΣ ΠΩΗΡΕ ΝΖΑ. [. – ΑΒΙΡΑ: "Abira = Abiram aram." (Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 28 A. 9). – 28 ΑΜΑΡΩ: "Amrô = Amru" (ibid., 28 A. 5); Schaefer, op. cit., 340-41: "Αμάρω" is transcribed "aus עמרר oder vielmehr, nach manichäischer und mittelpersischer Orthographie: עמרר" (cf. ibid., 345).

Transcription of Plate 100

[. .] ΝCΑΖΗΤΥ ΔΥΒΩΚ ΩΔ ΑΜΑΡΩ ΠΡΡΟ Π[. . .]
 [.] Ω ΖΝ ΤΓΝΩΜΗ ΝCΑΠΩΡΗC ΠΜΙ . Ω .[. ΕΥ]
 [ΓΕ]ΝΗC ΜΠΕΡCΗC ΝΕΤ . . . ΝΝΒΟΗΘΟC . .[.]
 4 [.] ΖΑΡΑΥ ΔΥΤΕΟΥΟ ΔΡΑΥ ΝΝΖΙCΕ ΜΝ Ν .[.]
 ΔΥΔΖΙΟΥ ΜΜΑΥ ΔΕΥΔCΖΕΙ ΜΠΡΡΟ ΝΝΠ[ΕΡCΗC]
 ΔΥΔΙ ΖΜΑΤ ΔΔΩΝ ΔΑΜΑΡΩ ΠΡΡΟ CΖΕΙ Ζ[ΝΕΠΙC]
 ΤΟΛΛΥΕ ΝΝΑΡCΑΦ ΠΡΡΟ ΜΝ C[Δ]ΠΩΡΗ[C . .]
 8 ΜΝ ΝΕΥΓΕΝΗC ΕΤΝΔΩΩΟΥ . .[.]
 ΜΟC ΕΝ ΠΕ ΔΖΑ ΤΟΟΤΝ CΑ ΠΕΤΔΕ[.]
 [.] . . ΤΝΝΔΩΤΕ ΝΤΚ . . .[.]
 ΠΡΡΟ ΔJΝΝΑΙΟC ΒΩΚ ΔΖΟΥΝ .[.]
 12 ΝΑΡCΑΦ ΠΡΡΟ · ΔCΑΠΩΡΗC ΠΜΙ[. ΝΕΥ]
 [ΓΕ]ΝΗC ΕΤΝΔΩΩΟΥ ΕΤΒΗΤΝ Ε[. .] .[. . . .]
 [.] ΜΠΡΡΟ ΔΕ ΠΕΤΡ ΩΕΥ ΠΕ ΔΤΚΔΙ . Δ .[. . . Δ]
 ΜΑΡΩ ΠΡΡΟ · ΕΥΔΙ ΖΜΑΤ ΝΤΟΟΤΚ ΖΔΔΩ[Ν ΔΝΔΡ]
 16 CΑΦ ΠΡΡΟ ΚΕΛΕΥΕ ΕΤΒΗΤΝ CΑΖ .[.] .[. . . ΕΝ]
 [Τ]ΟΛΛΥΕ ΔΩΡΠ ΔΡΑΥ · ΔΠΥ . . .[.]
 [Δ]ΜΑΡΩ ΠΡΡΟ ΜΝ CΑΠΩΡΗC ΠΜΙ[.]
 [.] . Κ ΔΡΑΝ ΝΤΖΕ ΩΔ ΠΖΟΟΥΕ ΕΤΑΝΔ[ΡCΑΦ Π]Ρ
 20 ΡΟ ΜΟΥ ΔΖΩΡΜΗΖΔ ΠΡΡΟ ΠΥΩΗΡΕ ΔΙ [ΕΡΗ]
 ΠΕ ΔΥΡ ΔΔΔΕ ΔCΑΠΩΡΗC ΠΜΙ . ΩΝ . . .
 [.] ΜΝ ΠΜΑΓΟΥCΑΙΟC ΜΝ ΝΑΠΥΔΟΓΜΔ[. . .]
 ΒΕ ΜΜΑΝ ΜΠΟΥΡΡΟ ΝΖΟΥΟ ΔΕ Ν . .[. . . . Τ]
 24 ΜΝΤΔΔΔΕ ΜΝ ΠΜΑCΤΕ ΕΤΖΝ ΠΕ .[. . . .]
 [.] CΑΠΩΡΗC ΠΖΥΠΔΡΧΟC ΕΠΕΔ . . .[. . .]
 [. .] ΠΝΝΔΩΤΕ ΜΝ ΠΝΝΔC ΜΠΔΤ[ΡΩΝ . . .]
 [. . .] ΗΤΝ ΔΤΟΥΔΙΩΓΕ ΜΜΑΝ Ν . .[. . . .]
 28 [. .] ΝΖΙCΕ ΔΡΑΝ · ΔΥCΑΡ ΝΕΥΕΥΝΟΥ[ΧΟC]
 ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑ ΜΝ ΝΩΜΩΕΤΕ ΝΤCΕΤΕ .[. . . .]
 ΤΟΝΩ · ΔΥΝΕΖCΕ ΟΥΝΔC ΝΚΙΝΔΥΝΟ[C . . .]
 ΖΙCΕ ΜΝ ΟΥΝΔC ΝΔΙΩΓΜΟC ΔJΝΝΔΙ[ΟC]
 32 [. . .] ΤΙΟΝ ΜΠΟΥΔJΩ ΕΤΜΜΕΥ ΔΥΒΩ[Κ]
 [. . . .] . ΔΥCΕΠCΩ[Π]Υ ΔΕΥΔΔ[Ι] ΖΜΔ[Τ]
 36]ΔΖΙΟΥ[
] . . [

1 ΑΜΑΡΩ: M only in *Pol.* – Π[: *Pol.* has ΠΜ? [. – 3 ΝΕΤ: ΕΤ only in *Pol.* – 4 ΝΝΖΙCΕ: *Pol.*; only ΖΙ now clearly legible. – 5 CΖΕΙ: *Pol.*; now illegible. *Pol.* has added a note: "Spuren schwach aber wahrscheinlich." – 6 ΔΥΔΙ: *Pol.* has Ν²ΥΔΙ. – ΑΜΑΡΩ: P only in *Pol.* – CΖΕΙ Ζ[only in *Pol.*; now illegible. – 6-7: Restoration Ζ[ΝΕΠΙC]ΤΟΛΛΥΕ from *Pol.* – 9 ΠΕΤΔΕ[: Last ε only in *Pol.* – 10 ΤΝΝΔΩΤΕ: *Nag.* has suggested ΠΕΤΝΝΔΩΤΕ. The letters before ΤΝΝΔΩΤΕ are only ambiguous traces of ink. – ΝΤΚ: ΤΚ from *Pol.*; now almost illegible. – 11 ΠΡΡΟ: *Pol.*; only ο now legible. – 12 ΝΑΡCΑΦ: ΝΔ only in *Pol.* – Punctuation mark uncertain. – 14 ΔΤΚΔΙ: ΚΔΙ from *Pol.*; now very deteriorated. – 16-17: ΕΝ][Τ]ΟΛΛΥΕ may as well be ΕΠΙCΤΟΛΛΥΕ (cf. lines 6-7); ΕΝΤΟΛΛΥΕ has been preferred here because of ΚΕΛΕΥΕ in line 16. – 19 ΝΔ[ΡCΑΦ Π]Ρ: *Pol.* read ΝΔΡCΑΦ ΠΡ but added

“Kaum lesbar.” – 20 beginning ϩΟ: ϩ only in *Pol.* – 20-21 ΔΙ [ϪΡΗ]ΠΙΕ: Ι only in *Pol.* The restoration is based on the phrase used in *Man. Hom.* 42, 15-16 about the accession of the King Hormizd I to the throne (ΔϪΤΩΚ ΔΡΕΤϪ Ι [ΝΔΙ] ΞΟΡΜΗϪΔΔΠΡΡΟ ΔϪΔΙ ϪΡΗΠΙΕ ΔΠΕϪΜΔ) (secondarily, I see that *Pol.* suggested the same restoration). Compared to line 19, there would still be space for one or two letters more in line 20, but the two lines may not have reached equally far to the right. – 22 ΔΟΓΜΔ: Based on *Pol.*; ΜΔ now lost. – 23: ΒΕ in *Pol.* – 24: A possible restoration of the lacuna at the end of the line is ΠΕ[Ϫ]ϪΗΤ. – 27]ΗΤḲ: *Nag.* suggested ΕΤΒ]ΗΤḲ. – 28 ΕΥΝΟΥ[ΧΟϪ]: Restoration suggested by *Nag.* – 30 ΤΟΝΩ: ΤΟ only in *Pol.* – 31 ΞΙϪΕ: ΞΙϪ only in *Pol.* – 32]ΤΙΟΝ: There does not seem to be space enough in the lines 31-32 for a restoration such as ΔΙΝΝΔΙΟϪ ΕΩΚ ΔΠΠΑΔΔΤΙΟΝ, but line 32 may have reached further to the right, because the right margin often fluctuates in these manuscripts. *Pol.* has ΤΩΝ, but this reading is wrong, as it can be seen from the papyrus, though not from the facsimile. – 33 ϪΕΠϪΩ[Π]Ϫ ΞΕϪΔΞ: *Pol.*; first Ϫ now illegible and first Ξ almost illegible; both letters also suggested by *Nag.* – 34: Nothing of this line is now preserved, but its existence seems indicated in *Pol.* – 35 ΔΞΙΟΥ: Only in *Pol.*; the line not preserved any more. – 36: Nothing of this line now preserved, but its existence indicated in *Pol.*

Translation of Plate 100.

- headlong (?), and he went to King Amarō
 .. in the thought (γνώμη) of Sapōres, the
 [nob]le (εὐγενής) Persians (Πέρσης) ... the assistants (βοηθός) ...
 4 .. for him, and he told to him about the sufferings and the ...
 and he thought him worthy (ἀξιοῦν) so that he will write to the King of the P[ersians
 (Πέρσης),]
- and he obtained favour for us, and King Amarō wrote
 [let]ters (ἐπιστολή) to King Narses and S[a]pōre[s ...]
 8 and the many nobles (εὐγενής)
 ... in order to despair of him who will
 protector
 king, and Innaios went in
 12 King Narses, and Sapōres, the...[..... the]
 many [nob]les (εὐγενής) because of us
 ... the king ... that which is useful in order that you receive
 King [A]marō as he obtained your favour for [us, and]
 16 King [Nar]ses ordered (κελεύειν) concerning us
 [comma]nds (ἐντολή) (?)... stumble against them, and his
 King [A]marō and Sapōres, the
 ... for us in this way until the day when [Ki]ng
 20 Na[r]ses died and King Hormizd his son received [the]
 [cr]own, and he was at enmity with Sapōres, the
 .. and the Magian (μαγουσαίος) and those who belong to his sect (δόγμα) ...
 ... us ... their king. And (δέ), in particular, ...[..... the]
 24 enmity and the hatred which is in his (?) heart (?)
 .. the hyparch (ὑπαρχος) Sapōres
 .. our protector and our great pat[ron] (πάτρων) ...]
 ... concerning (?) us that they persecute (διώκειν) us
 28 ... the sufferings to us, and he spread his eunu[chs] (εὐνοῦχος)]
 at every (κατά) place, and the servants of the fire....
 very, and they raised a great dange[r] (κίνδυνος) ...]
 suffering and a great persecution (διωγμός), and Innai[os] went (?) to (?) the (?)]
 32 pala[ce] (παλάτιον) (?) at that time, and he wen[t]
, and he beseeche[d] him in order to obta[in] favou[r]

..... think worthy (ᾠξιοῦν)
 36

1 ΝCΛΞHTϣ: For the possible translation ‘headlong’ cf. *A Manichaean Psalm-Book*, Part II. Ed. by C. R. C. Allberry (Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Library, II), Stuttgart, 1938, 81, 26. Another possibility is ‘unexpectedly’, the sense of the CΛΞHTϣ̄ in *Psalm-Book* I, pl. 248, 12 (Giversen, *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library. Facsimile Edition*, III (CO^r XVI), Genève, 1988), suggested by Nag. (“unversehens”). Nag. also refers to ΝCΞHTϣ̄ in *The Tripartite Tractate*, NHC I,5 p. 64.33-34. – 7 ΝΔPCΔϕ, Narses (also in lines 12, 15-16, 19): “Narsaph ist die nordiran. Form des Namens (in den Turfantexten 𐎧𐎠𐎫𐎠 als Gottesname)” (Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 29 A. 1). Cf. further the more exhaustive remarks about the form of the names ΝΔPCΔϕ and ΞΩPMHZΔ (pl. 100, line 20) in Schaefer, op. cit., 344 A. 1. – 11 ἸΝΝΔΙΟC (cf. line 31): Also mentioned in *CMC* 74.7; *Man Hom.* 83, 21; *Psalm-Book* II, 34, 11; the Abjuration Formulas (<Zacharias of Mitylene>, *Seven Chapters* 2,37; *The Long Formula* PG 1,1468B; cf. Lieu, op. cit., 178, 179); perhaps also mry ‘y(n)[in *M* 3401 (Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts* (Berliner Turfantexte XI), Berlin, 1981, 143 with A. 1). Innaios is, however, *not* the same person as hnyy (Ḥannī) who is sent to India by Mani in *M* 4574 (Sundermann, “Zur frühen missionarischen Wirksamkeit Manis” (*AOH* 24, 1971, 79-125), 83; Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*, 57) as Lieu, op. cit., 196 writes: Cf. Sundermann, “Zur frühen missionarischen Wirksamkeit Manis”, 93. – 14: The conjunction ΞE cannot be translated with certainty; it may be translated as “that”, or as “because”, or it may indicate indirect speech or a quotation. – 28 EYNOY[XOC]: Concerning these eunuchs that seem to be mentioned, Skjærvø writes in his letter: “note the Sasanian office of *šābestān* ‘master of the harem’ corresponding to Greek εὐνοῦχος in *ŠKZ* (i. e. *Šābuhr KZ* (*Ka ba-i Zardušt*) (*Šābuhr* I’s inscription)) (Mid. Pers. line 34, Parth. line 28, Greek line 67)” (Cf. A. Maricq, “Res Gestae Divi Saporis” in *Classica et Orientalia* (IFAB, Publication hors série 11), Paris, 1965, 73).

Following are some remarks on the contents of the text. The description of Schmidt presupposes that plate 99 preceded plate 100¹⁴. I think this assumption is correct: At the bottom of plate 99 it is described how King Amarō became the patron of the Manichees, and on plate 100 he is acting as such.

The text mentions a queen, some kings and other persons. On the basis of the royal names it should be possible to fix chronologically the events referred to in the text.

On plate 99, line 21, Queen Thadamōr is mentioned. According to Schaefer, this expression is a syriacism. Aramaic תדמור is Palmyra, and Schaefer compares the spelling ΘΛΔΔΜΩΡ with the spelling Θαδᾶμορα which is found in Josephus, *ant.* 8,154. Consequently, ΘΛΔΔΜΩΡ ΤΡΡΩ renders the Syriac מלכת תדמור, “Queen of Tadmor-Palmyra”, and this queen should be none other than the famous Queen Zenobia of Palmyra¹⁵.

A Queen Taḏī, wife of a Caesar, is mentioned in two Manichaean Sogdian texts (18223 and *K* 16). W. Sundermann, who edited these texts, suggested that Taḏī might be “eine hypokoristische Verstümmelung” of the name of Queen Thadamōr, so that the Caesar could be Septimius Odaenathus of Palmyra¹⁶. This hypothesis presupposes that in some way the name of Zenobia’s city has been transferred to the Queen herself, not only in the Coptic but also in the Middle Iranian texts¹⁷.

If the hypothesis that Queen Thadamōr is Zenobia is accepted, then the event mentioned in our text may have happened after the death of Odaenathus, otherwise we would expect the text to mention a

¹⁴ Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 28-29.

¹⁵ Schaefer, op. cit., 344.

¹⁶ Sundermann, “Iranische Lebensbeschreibungen Manis” (*Acta Orientalia* 37, Copenhagen, 1974), 137; Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*, 41-45, 123. Cf. Sundermann, “Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer”, I, 61 A. 64 concerning the possibility of a letter from Mani to Zenobia.

18223 and 18222 form the fragment of one sheet; 18223 tells about the healing of a certain Nafšā who is the sister of Queen Taḏī, wife of the Caesar; in this connection Mār Addā, Manichaean missionary in the Roman Empire, is also mentioned. In *K* 16, Nafšā is speaking to her sister Taḏī. Finally, the Manichaean Middle Persian text *M* 2 /R/I/28/ mentions that Nafšā was converted to Manichaeism by Addā (this text is edited in Andreas and Henning, “Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan II” (*SPAW* 1933), 301-2).

¹⁷ The complex of problems involved the use of ΘΛΔΔΜΩΡ as a personal name in our text was already observed by Polotsky as it can be seen from his note: “Thadmōr (= Palmyra) kommt als Frauennamen auf einer palmyrenischen Inschrift vor (Mitteilung von Geheimrat Moritz). Die Königin Zenobia von Palmyra war eine Zeitgenossin des Mani” (Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit. 28 A. 4).

King of Palmyra. Therefore, it is most likely that the event occurred between 267 and 272, when Zenobia ruled Palmyra herself on behalf of her minor son Vaballathus.

On plate 100, the death of King Narses of Persia and the accession of his son Hormizd II in the year 302 is mentioned in line 19-20. The text on plate 99 is badly preserved, but if we nevertheless tentatively assume that plates 99-100 describe a progressive chain of events, then the narrative of the text begins no later than the year 272 and covers the period until the year 302 at the earliest, that is, a period of no less than 30 years. If the reference to Queen Zenobia refers to the time before the death of Odaenathus, the period will be even longer.

It is worth noticing that it was in this very period that both Mani and Sisinnios suffered martyrdom, events which are not mentioned on the present leaf. But according to Schmidt's description of the contents of the historical codex the death of Mani was mentioned on other leaves¹⁸. On one leaf the ἄρχηγός Sisinnios was mentioned¹⁹. Presumably this means that the purpose of the narrative on plate 99 only was to recount a few events in the same period.

At the bottom of plate 99 is a description of how King Amarō became the patron of the Manichees. Perhaps he became their patron because of a miraculous healing performed by a Manichee; "a cause of healing" is mentioned in line 30. Miraculous healings are in no way unknown in Manichaean texts²⁰.

In the inscription of Paikuli where King Narses relates the circumstances leading to his accession to the throne, two persons called Amru are mentioned. The first "Amru King of the Lahmids" must be the same as 'Amr ibn 'Adī, the Arab King of Hira, who is known from Arab tradition, while the identity of the second Amru is disputed²¹. Schaefer identified Amarō in our text with King 'Amr ibn 'Adī²².

On plate 100, ΣΑΠΩΡΗC ΠΞΥΠΑΡΧΟC is mentioned in line 25. This ΣΑΠΩΡΗC was also identified by Schaefer with a person mentioned in the inscription of Paikuli. According to this inscription, a prominent faction of Iranian noblemen did not accept the new King, the young Bahram III, and they offered the crown to his great-uncle Narses. The first of this group of noblemen who is mentioned in the inscription is "Šābuhr the Hargbed". In the Sassanian state, the hargbed held the highest rank after the King, he belonged to the Sassanian clan himself, and had the privilege to crown the king. Schaefer identified this Hargbed with ΣΑΠΩΡΗC ΠΞΥΠΑΡΧΟC²³.

In his description of the text Schmidt only mentioned this ΣΑΠΩΡΗC ΠΞΥΠΑΡΧΟC²⁴. But the text mentions also a ΣΑΠΩΡΗC with a different title (plate 100, line 2, 18, 21; presumably, ΣΑΠΩΡΗC in line 7

¹⁸ Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 28. Some of Polotsky's transcriptions in Berlin which are probably from other leaves from P 15997 seem to refer to Mani's last days.

¹⁹ Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 25, 29. One of Polotsky's transcriptions in Berlin which is probably from another leaf from P 15997 mentions CΙCΙΝΝΙΟC [ΠΑΡΧ]ΗΓΟC.

²⁰ Cf. Sundermann, "Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer", III, 43-44.

²¹ H. Humbach and P. O. Skjærvø, *The Sassanian Inscription of Paikuli*, Wiesbaden, 1983, Part 3.1, 71; Part 3.2, 120, 126 with further references. The title of this second 'mrw 'pgrn'n is not preserved; Humbach and Skjærvø, op. cit., Part 3.1, 71 restore the lacuna with "[MLKA?]" and translate "Amru [King of] the Abgars (?)".

²² Schaefer, op. cit., 345.

²³ Schaefer, op. cit., 345. Humbach and Skjærvø, op. cit., Part 3.1, 44; Part 3.2, 39, 44. Concerning the hargbed cf. E. Herzfeld, *Paikuli I* (Forschungen zur islamischen Kunst III), Berlin, 1924, 192-94.

In his letter, Skjærvø discusses the identity of both ΣΑΠΩΡΗC ΠΞΥΠΑΡΧΟC and the μαγουσαίος mentioned on plate 100, line 22. He points out that it is uncertain whether this μαγουσαίος could be the well-known Kerdīr who was already ēhrbed, that is teacher of religion, in 260 (ŠKZ; Mid. Pers. line 34, Parth. line 28: Kerdīr ēhrbed, Greek line 66: Καρτεϊρ μάγου (cf. Maricq, op. cit., 73)) and still held that office in 293 (he is mentioned in the inscription of Paikuli; cf. Humbach and Skjærvø, op. cit., Part 3.1, 41-42; Part 3.2, 45): He must have been very old in 302. To some degree, the same consideration holds for Šābuhr the hargbed whom we may assume was also somewhat advanced in age in 293. Both persons or one or the other in our text may be someone else. But Skjærvø also points to the possibility that the "references are to Kerdīr and Šābuhr the hargbed - or one or the other -, but refer to the past."

²⁴ Schmidt and Polotsky, op. cit., 28.

is the same person); even though some letters of this title are preserved, I have not been able to restore the word. It is of course possible that the two persons are one and the same in spite of the different titles.

It is natural to compare the narrative, the sequence of which is more or less comprehensible on plate 100, with the one in *The Part of the Narrative about the Crucifixion* in the *Manichaean Homilies*. According to the *Homilies*, Innaios became ἀρχηγός of the Manichaean congregation after King Bahram II's execution of Sisinnios, the previous ἀρχηγός (*Man. Hom.* 83.21-22). The King called off the persecution when Innaios had cured him of a dangerous disease (*Man. Hom.* 83.28-85.10). On plate 100 of our text, Innaios plays an important role in making King Narses call off a persecution of the Manichees. Based on Schmidt's description of the contents of the historical leaf, W. Seston suspected a discrepancy between the two narratives, but after all he remarked: "On ne pourra tenter de concilier les deux versions que quand le "livre historique" aura été tout entier publié"²⁵.

The two narratives could be in agreement if we assume that the suspension of the persecutions mentioned in the *Manichaean Homilies* had been succeeded by a new persecution under Narses, which the King called off later on.

The references to historical persons mentioned in the Paikuli-Inscription lends some credibility to our narrative. But it should finally be mentioned that both the story in the *Homilies* and the story on the historical leaf contain motifs belonging to the genre of legend. In the *Homilies* there is the miraculous healing of King Bahram II. On the historical leaf, plate 99, line 30 speaks about "a cause of healing"; this may also relate to a miraculous event. But these legendary features cannot in themselves determine whether the stories are fabricated: A historical core might very well have been enriched or stylized with such motifs²⁶.

Aarhus

Nils Arne Pedersen

²⁵ Seston, "Le roi sassanide Narsès, les arabes et le manichéisme", 228-30; quotation on p. 229.

²⁶ Cf. Sundermann, "Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer" III, 41-42.