

12 Mass and elite in late antique religion

The case of Manichaeism

Nicholas Baker-Brian

The elect and hearers in Manichaeism

At a time when the rulers of the Roman and Sasanian empires were rarefying their imperial identities by presenting themselves as cosmically ordained elites,¹ one of the curious features of the late antique period was the maintenance of cohesive relations between mass and elite groups beyond the spheres of empire and government. During the fourth century AD a religious sub-group embedded within both Persian and Roman societies, namely the followers of the Mesopotamian prophet Mani,² upheld a functional socio-economic order whereby its 'elite' – so defined here in light of their performance and indeed avoidance of certain occupations³ – co-existed alongside its 'mass' of members in a way which innately influenced its identity and practices. However, unlike the balance between these two groups achieved by Athenian citizens in the fifth century BC, which was 'predicated on the assumption that all citizens were of equal political worth and that no citizen had an innate right to political privilege, regardless of his special attributes or attainments', the co-existence of members in the Manichaean community was founded on the active encouragement of an imbalance based on the perceived suitability of individuals for roles within the community. This nevertheless resulted in an association whereby the community's asymmetry expedited rather than impeded the attainment of its primary objectives.

This chapter discusses a number of historical and sociological issues arising from the configuration of institutional relations between members in Mani's community, as presented in a range of sources from the late third and fourth centuries AD: a community which comprised a primary division of two classes, an 'elite' referred to as the Elect, and a 'mass', the catechumenate or Hearers.⁴ It should be noted that in this chapter, 'community' will be employed to refer to Manichaeism as an ecclesial institution of the late antique period, 'capable of promoting its aims and enforcing its rules' (BeDuhn 2000: 30). However, we should also keep in mind that there was likely on occasion diversity of communal practice across the Manichaean *communities* of Late Antiquity.⁵ The analysis in this chapter begins by examining a number of Manichaean literary sources which tackle various issues pertaining to Hearer–Elect relations. The controversies raised by these sources indicate that issues arose between the grades, and that considerable

thought was given to managing tensions between the Elect and Hearers in a way which not only resolved issues – in the case of the Manichaean kephalaic literature by presenting solutions in the form of lessons for its audience – but also provided opportunities via the same lessons for reinforcing normative values about the roles of these grades within the Manichaean community. Therefore in the literature, the Elect’s primacy as ‘spiritual oligarchs’ was routinely reinforced, yet always accompanied by the message outlining their responsibilities to Hearers as the basis for their position of privilege in the community. Likewise, Hearers were reminded continuously of their commitments to the Elect – largely, their donative role in the community – but conveyed in a manner which indicated that they were the *patrons* (see the letter from the Kellis archive, P. Kell. Copt. 31.17) of the Elect: this is a neat inversion of late Roman social relations, whereby a hugely affluent minority patronised a burgeoning ‘mass’ in the shape of the Roman ‘middle class’ (see the preamble in Mayer 2012: 1–21). The chapter will then move from these literary-theological sources to an analysis of the letters (characterised as ‘documentary texts’ by their editors) composed – for the most part – by Manichaeans from Kellis, the Roman-period settlement in the Dakhleh Oasis of Egypt (dating from various points in the fourth century)⁶. While these epistolographic sources offer insight into Manichaean relations ‘on the ground’ (so to speak), thereby seeming to offer a point of documentary contrast to literature like *The Kephalaia of the Teacher*, they are to a certain extent no less contrived than the theological texts in the sense that the responses of the Kellis correspondents to relational affairs adhered – albeit unconsciously – to the prescribed norms and values of Manichaean social relations. On this issue, a comparison of literary texts with documentary material is justified so long as due caution is exercised in areas where there is considerable ambiguity of expression, which is particularly evident in the epistolographic sources. Due regard is paid along the way to Josiah Ober’s path-breaking study of mass and elite from 1989 on Athenian society in the fifth century BC, not from the point of adopting his conclusions – which would be ridiculous given the entirely different historical circumstances underpinning the coalescence of a religious sub-group in a society overseen by a monarchical-imperial regime – but rather from the point of utilising Ober’s ideas about the dialectical role of mass and elite in defining social relations between competing groups.

The communal structures for Manichaeans in the Roman world in particular are notoriously ill-defined in the extant sources.⁷ Nonetheless it is apparent from the documentary evidence discovered in Kellis that the Manichaean community there had domestic foundations, in that the Elect, who were first and foremost grovagues, were attended to by a network of catechumens who lived lives of routine domestication, which involved the running of skilled businesses, such as textile production and other similar livelihoods (see BeDuhn 2008: 259–74). To add nuance at this point: the Elect were not strictly ‘wandering, begging monks’ (to borrow the title of Daniel Caner’s study of early Christian ascetics) in the sense of being wholly isolated from the communities which supported them. Instead, as seen from the perspective of the Kellis archive, the Elect were

accompanied by members of the catechumenate serving as a 'professionalised' laity. Members of both classes enjoyed a relationship fostered by an 'institutional intimacy' whereby both assisted each other in the realisation of their respective roles and ambitions as followers of Mani and his teachings. These introductory observations aside, a number of Manichaean sources beyond Kellis indicate that this bicameral division existed within a larger, institutional structure: beneath its Principal (the *archēgos* as Mani's successor) resided 12 Teachers, 72 Bishops, and 360 Presbyters.⁸ For many years, this hierarchy was considered by scholars to replicate the structure of the Christian *ecclesia* which Manichaeans had supposedly appropriated, although which now looks to have derived instead from the religion's cosmological teachings and its narrative concerning the structure of the divine firmament.⁹

The division of the Manichaean community into Elect and Hearers derives from the story which Manichaeans told themselves about the world. This comprised an ancient cosmology¹⁰ in which a universal soul – referred to as the 'Living Soul' – had become imprisoned in the world of matter.¹¹ Two supernatural kingdoms, the Land of Light and the Kingdom of Darkness, had engaged in a cosmic conflict of epic proportions during which quantities of Light had become imprisoned in the Dark Kingdom: a terrible fate for the fragments of divine soul, which grew worse with their confinement in the created order. It was thus the appointed task of all Manichaeans to aid the release of dispersed souls, which formed part of the collective Living Soul, from the world around them. The details of how Light is recovered and released are couched largely in allusive language across Manichaean literature. However, it is clear that the Elect were charged with the considerable responsibility of being the primary facilitators for leading the release of souls, their suitability for this task arising from their training and lifestyle which was determined by a code of practice – 'The Commandments of Righteousness' – which prescribed the ways in which the Elect could remain pure in physical and emotional terms.¹² As noted above with what might be called the 'soft' definition of the elite specified by Josiah Ober, which he considered 'less specifically linked to political power' (Ober 1989: 11), the Elect comprised the community's elite on the basis of their qualification to perform the religion's principal duty. As a result of who they were and what they had achieved, the Elect were frequently lauded in superlative terms: 'They are gods as they stand firm in the image of the gods. The divinity that is planted in them came to them from the heights and dwelt in them. They have done the will of the greatness' (*The Kephalaia of the Teacher* 88. 219.34–220.3).

Thus, since the Elect were the grade in most intimate contact with the divine, they were required to become divine themselves – or as close as was possible in a contaminated world. As an ancient faith, Manichaeism stood in a long tradition of religions and philosophical movements whereby soteriological aims were closely linked to dietetic practices (as explored by BeDuhn 1992: 109–34). The Elect became intimate with souls during a ritual meal performed on a daily basis, at which the Manichaean elite purified Light contained in the food during the stages of its digestion. Metabolic control and the alimentary processes in the bodies of

Elect led to the release of the Light, which returned heavenward to the planetary bodies responsible for its collection (see BeDuhn 2000: 209–33). Thus, the hazards involved in effecting the release of souls from matter – the toxicity of the immediate environment both to the Living Soul itself and those interacting with it – was considered so great that only the Elect class could safely and effectively initiate and complete the redemptive task of liberating the Living Self.

The Hearers' contribution to this gargantuan task was to arrange the provision of alms for the Elect. Alms could take many forms, for example, food, clothing, medicines, and shelter. Foremost among them, however, was the food offered for the Elect's sacred meal. The almsgiving role for Manichaean Hearers arose in one sense out of logistical necessity as a result of the Elect being gyrovagues, but it was also determined by the ethical requirement that the Elect avoid harvesting food, which according to Manichaean theology was imbued with life and was liable to affliction during its collection and preparation. The Hearers took on the stain – the sin – of administering alms in order to safeguard the exclusive efficacy of the Elect and their interaction with the alms during the ritual meal. The conduct of Hearers was likewise governed by 'Commandments of Righteousness' (see *Chapter 80* of the *Kephalaia*; see below, § 3), and among their most sacred duties lay the fulfilment of their charitable obligations. *Chapter 87* of the late third- to early fourth-century Coptic work, the *Kephalaia of the Teacher* – a heuristic commentary conveyed as a dialogic exchange based on Mani's oral teaching¹³ – comprises a lesson given by Mani to his congregation on why almsgiving (Copt. *mñtinae*) is more efficacious in the case of his church than in 'every [other] sect'. According to the chapter, the success of Mani's church in what it does with the alms it receives lies in the presence of the Elect. The other sects receive alms for God from their catechumenate, but they become afflicted because they are not able to proceed any further: 'There is no rest nor open door that they come out by and find an opportunity to go to the God in whose name they were given'. By contrast is the destiny of alms in the 'holy church' of Mani.

[W]hen these alms reach the holy church, they shall be redeemed through it and purified and rest therein, They shall come from it and go to the God of truth in whose name they were given. Thus it is this holy church itself that is the place of rest for all those alms that shall rest therein; and it becomes a doorway for them and a conveyance to that land of rest. Also, the holy church has no place of rest in this entire world except for through the catechumens who listen to it, as [. . .] only with the catechumens who give it rest. For its honour is with the catechumens, through whom it shall be passed on. (*Keph.* 87.217.13–25)

While the final 'rest' granted to the alms is dependent on the Elect, the chapter advertises the importance of the Hearers in this process: without the catechumenate, the holy church would be like the other sects, failing to give rest to the alms they receive (a neat variant on the *sine qua non* advanced for the Elect).

The assembly of the catechumens is like this good earth that shall receive the good seed [see Matthew 13.8]. See how large is the assembly of the catechumens! For it is like good earth, since it also shall receive to it the holy church. It shall provide for it, and give it rest from all its deeds and sufferings. It shall become a place of rest for it, since the church rest in it everywhere. The place wherein there are no catechumens does not have the holy church resting there. (*Keph.* 87.218.1–10)

It would not be too amiss to suggest a degree of tension in the philosophy underlying the relations between the Hearers and the Elect is apparent in the mollifying tones of this lesson. The chapter stands arguably as an apology for the role of the catechumenate. The importance of the Hearers' role is announced in unequivocal terms: the catechumenate are 'the place of rest for the holy church'.¹⁴ Conjecture abounds with regard to the social factors underlying this lesson: what is clear, however, is that the relationship between Hearers and the Elect was a matter of ongoing debate in late antique Manichaean literature. The following section will explore evidence of tensions between the elite and the mass in Manichaeism, and will also consider the role played by Manichaean literature in resolving controversies surrounding Elect–Hearer relations.

Assuaging Elect–Hearer tensions in Manichaean literature

Before we investigate the question of tension between the two grades in the Manichaean church, it is worthwhile thinking a little more about the ideological nature of Manichaean texts in light of Josiah Ober's introductory discussion in his *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens* of the sources relevant to his own study. By drawing Ober's definitions and categories into dialogue with late antique Manichaean sources, we can propose a number of important and useful distinctions in the broader study of 'mass and elite' in both the classical and the post-classical worlds (Ober 1989: 43–52). Manichaean literary texts share similar concerns with other 'elite sources', broadly defined as written by and for elite audiences: being rhetorical and didactic in character, the desire to communicate the ideology of the elite underlies their composition. Manichaean literature, however, was not meant just for its elite readers in the form of the Elect. Hearers were also central to its composition and reception, a claim which can be justified on the basis of the ideological concerns which the texts themselves sought to impart. A prominent concern evident in a number of Manichaean literary texts was the assuaging of tensions between the two grades. Such tensions arose no doubt because of internal disagreements between individuals, some precipitated by issues which remain for the most part unknowable;¹⁵ some, however, will have reflected the development of Mani's teachings during its consolidation into an 'institution' with established networks of adherents across the ancient Mediterranean and west Asia. The *Kephalaia of the Teacher* testifies to the types of discussions which occupied the Manichaean church in the immediate period after Mani's death (d. ca. 276) as it sought the most appropriate ways to live

according to his teachings. However, other tensions also developed in light of external judgements about the religion, many of which formed part of a broader Christian discourse surrounding ascetic activities and almsgiving in the third and fourth centuries. Late antique Manichaeans were especially exposed to judgements criticising their ascetic philosophy and practice, which arose from these debates. Rather than concealing their identities, which appears to have been the case only towards the end of the fourth century, Manichaeans lived very much ‘in the world’. Their visibility thus made them susceptible to hostile criticisms in part determined by a shift in Christian discourse towards a uniform Christian identity. As the evidence from Kellis indicates, Manichaeans in the village along with those engaged in church business further afield, maintained relationships with a variety of other communities and businesses out of the need to support their religious duties, in addition to fulfilling their ‘secular’ obligations. Manichaeans were evidently aware of criticisms about their practices, and were not shy in offering robust arguments in defence of them.

The relationship between the Elect and Hearers within Manichaeism was thus so central to how the Manichaean community functioned that their association was the subject of considerable discussion in a variety of Manichaean literary sources. While these sources testify to the balance struck by Elect and Hearers as a working co-operative engaged in ‘soul work’ (tasks performed in service of the soul’s liberation) (see BeDuhn 2000: 25–68), the same texts also convey some of the tensions which underlay relations between the two grades: compare, therefore, the antithesis identified by Ober between two parties displaying seemingly irreconcilable ambitions (see summary discussion in Ober 1989: 304–14). As Manichaean sources indicate, the alignment of Hearers’ ambitions with the objectives of the Elect meant that areas of tension between the two parties lay elsewhere. Thus, in light of the rigid hierarchy of the Manichaean community in which all efforts were concentrated in a pyramidal fashion on the activities of the Elect, anxieties and related concerns about the conduct of this elite feature prominently in Manichaean literature. Indeed, by drawing attention to potential areas of internal discord between Elect and Hearers, together with highlighting some of the anxieties besetting the vocations of the two grades, these same sources were intended to assuage such stresses (ibid.: 305–6). *The Kephalaiia of the Teacher* fits the description of a work which handled vicariously the concerns and complaints about and between the two grades. It is replete with didactic material of an ideological type, in which scenarios (real and imagined, it is to be suspected) are raised about the conduct of Hearers and the Elect and their attitudes towards the normative teachings and practices of the religion. Under the cover of a dialogic structure of debate between Mani and his disciples, the *Kephalaiia* was able to present resolutions to tensions between the Hearers and the Elect which in fact emphasised the religion’s prevailing ideologies (see Cameron 2014: 7–21). Since the *Kephalaiia* is a lengthy and complex work, I draw attention here to only two examples: the first, an account of an individual Elect’s anxiety about the nature of his own vocation (*Chapter 81*), and the second a complaint from a Hearer about the behaviour of one of the Elect in his company (*Chapter 88*).

Chapter 81 of the *Kephalaia* comprises a remarkable exchange between Mani and one of his leading disciples, identified only as the *archēgos* (*Keph.* 81.193.33), namely the leader of the church immediately below Mani, a role which was to acquire the status akin to a ‘papal’ figure in the period after Mani’s death.¹⁶ The chapter raises what we may imagine was a fundamental anxiety for both the Elect and Hearers about the nature of their obligations to the religion: namely, the predisposition of human beings to act sinfully, and the implications of this predisposition for the ‘religious’ actions of Mani’s followers. The *archēgos*, as a member of the Elect himself, begins by describing the salvational benefits of fasting in terms of the number of angels engendered by the practice – *angelos* being an ambiguous term to interpret in this context, but most certainly referring in some way to the light saved by the Elect – produced by the Elect during their daily fasts and on the ‘three Lord’s days’, on which occasion the Hearers also ‘engender them’ (*Keph.* 81.193.31). In spite of the efficacy of Manichaean practices, however, the *archēgos* has also witnessed sinful behaviour among other Manichaeans (likely among the Elect), and possibly also sinned himself, and is thereby requesting exemption from fasting and other duties in order to avoid committing further sins; the details at this point in the text are sparse, since the work is damaged at this point and beyond reasonable reconstruction (i.e. *Keph.* 81.194.14–25). Ideas of sin in Manichaeism were closely associated with the treatment of the ‘Cross of Light’ (see *Keph.* 88.220.25), the expression given by Manichaeans to the divine light ‘crucified’ in the world of matter. As a result of the omnipresence of Living Soul in all matter, it was an understandable concern for Manichaeans that any form of interaction with the world could be deemed sinful should harm be done to the divine light trapped therein. In all likelihood, therefore, the query from the *archēgos* reflected the attraction of a ‘quietist’ response for many Manichaeans to Mani’s cosmogonic theology; the *Kephalaia* contains a number of chapters in which Mani defends the practices of the church, specifically its donative tradition of alms as food for the Elect, in terms of their correct use in service of the religion in, for example, *Chapter 85*, and *Chapter 93*. Mani’s response is thus critical of the *archēgos*’ suggestion that he ‘withdraw to prayer’ (*Keph.* 81.194.28), and his reply is rhetorical: ‘Now, if you can ask exemption (Copt. *pareti*) from this matter and this divine work, are there also others like you to decline it? Then indeed, all this sort of benefit and every divine work: whoever will do it?’ (*Keph.* 81.195.25–28). Rather than seek exemption, Mani counsels ‘that greater is the glory and the victory and the good of the one who preaches, building the church; than that of the brother who turns his heart inward and keeps himself to himself, and edifies only himself’ (*Keph.* 81.196.7–10). One of the concerns of the *Kephalaia* in particular seems to have been, therefore, to outline ‘normative Manichaean discourse’ (BeDuhn 2000: 220), and persuade Manichaeans of that discourse’s internal coherence when translated into a set of ritual practices. However, tensions could arise in other areas, especially in relation to the type of conduct which the two grades were led to expect of one another. *Chapter 88* offers one such example of the sort of counsel offered when the behaviour of the Elect fell short of what was demanded

by the catechumenate; here the discussion is focused around a Hearer's anxiety about displays of ire (Gk. *cholē*) by the Elect:

A catechumen stood before my master, the apostle [i.e. Mani]. He says to him: If when I see a righteous one being angry and resentful as he quarrels with his friend, turning his anger on him and uttering ugly words, not giving in to him; and that moment when I see them arguing with each other [. . .] it is obvious that they are not righteous, [. . .] and it is obvious that they are not established in the truth of [. . .] condemn them. Directly I shall find fault, saying: If these are righteous, why are they angry? For what reason do they quarrel with each other? Why would one abuse another, as if they had nothing in the universe on which they stand firm? (*Keph.* 88.219.4–16)

In reply, Mani chastised the Hearer for failing to recognise that the Elect comprise both good and evil impulses – like all people – and that the conflict between them ('the mystery of the two essences') means that even the Elect on occasions show anger as a result of being 'established in a body that is not their own' (*Keph.* 88.220.21–22). The lesson continues. The Elect are engaged in a continuous battle to promote within themselves that which is righteous and just: like a tree which if tended in one way can provide aromatic oils and spices and by contrast if handled in another can produce smoke and ash, the Elect have been nurtured by the Manichaean community in order to bring forth from themselves salubrious benefits (*Keph.* 88.219.20–33). The Hearer is then instructed about his own sinful habits, and the extent to which the Elect not only tolerate the nefarious behaviour of the catechumenate but also perform 'all these charities', i.e. soul work, for the catechumenate: 'You spend your lifetime in eating and drinking, in lusting after women, gold and silver. Your hands are always free to beat the Cross of Light. Behold, you are stuck in all these sins. The saints [Elect] watch you as you commit them. Nevertheless, they neither mock nor hate you' (*Keph.* 88.220.24–27). *Chapter 88* of the *Kephalaia* thereby reasserted the ideological reasons for the division between Elect and Hearers: the privileged position accorded to the Elect arose from their restraint from sinful behaviour but also from their compassion towards the Hearers who, being unable to resist 'beat[ing] the Cross of Light', are thus required to accept their ancillary position to the Elect.

An association between the internal discussions concerning the conduct of the Manichaean Elect, and the external criticisms brought to bear on Manichaeism's rationales and practices by its opponents, is therefore apparent. In this regard, the debate about the roles and responsibilities of those committed to the teachings of Mani was reflected in the broader controversies concerned with defining ascetic propriety which occurred across the late antique period. Central to the emergent ascetic cultures of Late Antiquity (specifically, between the third and the fifth centuries AD) were the controversies about the sorts of practices deemed suitable, and indeed desirable, for Christian ascetics to undertake. Much of the discussion concerned the role of work, specifically the performance of manual labour, and the extent to which this was regarded as an essential element in the routines of

ascetics of all varieties.¹⁷ As Daniel Caner has demonstrated, while specific practices acquired negative connotations for a number of reasons, the prevailing social customs of late Roman society both consciously and unconsciously influenced the reception of certain ascetic habits (Caner 2002: 16–49, specifically the comments at 16–17). Judgements on this matter were certainly complex, as Caner has demonstrated in relation to Augustine’s treatise, *de opere monachorum* (*On the Work of Monks*, composed ca. 400), by highlighting Augustine’s protection of social convention governing the distribution of occupations.¹⁸ Attempts both to define and assign tasks for monks and ascetics thereby resided in the interstice between the categories of class and culture in Late Antiquity. While leisured retirement (*otium*) from the duties of work was regarded as a requirement for those undertaking philosophical enquiry,¹⁹ a subtle distinction was applied to the leisure of those whose pursuits were questioned by the church authorities, for example in the inactivity of heretical ascetics which, from a heresiological point of view, included Manichaeans. Thus, their (alleged) avoidance of *labor* became a species of idleness. More pointed concerns, however, determined the response of church leaders to the alms-raising activities (for example, begging) of ‘extreme ascetics’.²⁰ The ecclesial model of the Manichaean community, and in particular the way in which its charitable activities were embedded in the model itself, was viewed with considerable suspicion by ecclesiastical authorities. Manichaean practices also lent themselves easily to parody: indeed, the misrepresentation of Manichaean ascetic habits was instrumental in defining more regimented standards for organised monastic labour towards the end of the fourth century (Brown 2012: 214–15). By the time that Epiphanius, the celebrated heresiologist and Bishop of Salamis (d. 403), composed the entry on the Manichaeans in his *Panarion*, (‘Medicine-Chest’, i.e. for the treatment of maladies caused by heresies) Mani’s followers had come to be characterised in the following manner:

But their other absurdities, such as their so-called ‘elect’. They have been ‘chosen,’ all right – by the devil for condemnation, in fulfilment of the words of scripture, ‘and his choice meats’ (Habakkuk 1.16). For they are drones who sit around and ‘work not, but are busybodies’ (2 Thessalonians 3.11) ‘knowing neither what they say nor whereof they affirm’ (1 Timothy 1.17). The holy apostle [Paul] denounces them because of his prophetic knowledge that certain idle, stubbornly evil persons will be making their rounds, not in obedience to God’s teaching but because the devil has driven them insane. For in contempt for these idlers’ occupation he says, ‘Let the non-worker not eat!’ (2 Thessalonians 3.10). Manichaeans instruct their catechumens to feed these people generously; they offer their elect all the necessities of life, so that whoever gives sustenance to elect souls will appear pious, if you please!²¹

Manichaean literature, however, had always been reasonably explicit about the ‘work’ undertaken by both the Elect and Hearers. The fasting of the Elect, during which angels were ‘engendered’, is referred to as ‘work’ (Copt. *hōb*), even ‘divine work’ by Mani in *Chapter 81* of the *Kephalaia*. A continuity of

ideological expression therefore appears to distinguish Manichaean attitudes on this matter. In the context of controversy over work in the final quarter of the fourth century, the Manichaeans of North Africa contributed their own answer to the debate in the form of the apologetical work known as the *Tebessa Codex*. A treatise-cum-letter (the addressee is referred to by the epistolary term ‘dearly beloved’: for example, col. 24.14), the work is a parchment codex discovered in Tebessa – ancient Theveste – in Algeria, a region renowned during the late antique period as an omphalos for North African Manichaeans. It has been dated in broad terms to the late fourth or early fifth century. The product of a Latin-speaking Manichaean, whose identity is unknown, its author was a literate figure, possibly one of the high-profile Manichaeans from the end of the fourth century, and likely an Elect.²² The work offers an interpretation of the nature of relations between the two grades of adherents. Although very fragmentary in places, sufficient of the work survives in order to reconstruct its apologetic orientation,²³ a quality determined by its explanatory presentation of relations between the grades and their different types of *labor* in service of the Manichaean community. The *Codex* supplies highly important descriptions from inside the religion of how the grades characterised themselves in relation to one another. Thus, the Elect are variously referred to as ‘strangers and aliens on earth’ (col. 4. 3–5), as belonging to ‘the superior level’ (col. 8. 9–11), ‘disciples’ who are ‘both poor in resources and few in number and along a narrow road they walk and for the strait path they have been selected’ (col. 9. 5–9); while the Hearers are said to be ‘those possessing riches [. . .] since having been placed in the world also by him [Mani?] still lower than the level of the Perfect [i.e. the Elect] as possessing riches’ (16. 1–11), but who nevertheless use their wealth to help the Elect, ‘and receiving them within their own houses and residences, furnished whatever they had that was needed for use’ (col. 17. 9–15). Both grades, however, are deemed ‘disciples’ (col. 20. 16–17), and while the Elect as the ‘Perfect’ (col. 21. 6) will have ‘citizenship in heaven’ (col. 21. 10–11), the Hearers are nevertheless also ‘imbued with the same knowledge along with the Perfect’ (col. 21. 14–16), and ‘indeed to the heights must be lifted up on account of their assistance [of the Elect]’ (col. 1. 14–18), in pointed contrast to the fate of the Gentiles (i.e. non-Manichaeans; col. 1. 13–14). The language regarding the benefits which accrued to the Hearers as a result of their relationship with the Elect is deliberately allusive (‘the Elect share with the Hearers from their own heavenly treasure’ (col. 5. 12–15)), but would nevertheless have been readily understood by all tiers of the religion as referring to the accrual of the spiritual benefits to the entire community – the salvation of the individual, and the community of which he/she is a part – as a result of the labours of the Elect and the Hearers.

Defining ‘work’ in the Manichaean sense of the term was a principal concern for the author of the *Tebessa Codex*. Efforts at defining labour in the *Codex* are presented in biblical language whereby citations and allusions from the *logoi* of both Jesus and Paul are utilised to prescribe the value of ascetic activity, in a manner not too dissimilar from the use of (albeit judgemental) biblical proof-texts

marshalled by Epiphanius in his hostile portrayal of Manichaean ascetics.²⁴ The *Tebessa Codex* offers a bewildering pastiche of quotations from Pauline texts, the full significance of which is nevertheless diminished as a result of the *Codex*'s relatively poor condition. Certain key arguments, however, remain apparent. For instance, the two grades of the Manichaean church are justified as a typological realisation of the two sisters, Mary and Martha (Lk. 10.38–42)²⁵: the Elect, in imitation of Mary, have 'chosen the best portion', although the Hearers, like Martha, 'performed the duty and service of the house' (col. 8. 7–15), and are to be equally valued by all. The apologetic defence of the Elect and their efforts as a form of spiritual labour occupied a considerable part of the text. 'Good works' (*bona opera*), following the expression of the pastoral epistle, Titus 3. 8, comprise a variety of forms including, 'service' (*militia*; see 1 Corinthians 9.7) and 'ministry' (*ministerium*; see 2 Corinthians 8. 19) and several times (*aliquotiens*) 'labour' (*labor*; see 1 Thessalonians 2.9). Should the Elect authorship of the *Codex* be a valid assertion, the Hearer addressee is called upon to acknowledge (*noscatitis*) 'those who labour among you' in a citation from 1 Thessalonians 5. 12–13 (col. 40. 10–19), and called on to supply 'a stipend for the saints' (see 1. Corinthians 9–17; col. 45. 4–5). While the rationale for the *Codex* was evidently to assert the Manichaean position in the broader debate about ascetic labour and the culture of almsgiving, and is thus most appropriately read as an apology for the lifestyles of the Manichaean Elect, it is also the case that its injunctions were applicable to the Hearers too. It thereby defends and promotes the value of the catechumenate's efforts in the service of the religion.

Elect–Hearer relations as evidenced in the Kellis archive

To move from Manichaean literary texts which mediated the ideologies of the religion to adherents, to the documentary texts from Kellis which provide insights into the quotidian lives of Romano-Egyptian Manichaeans, is to witness a quite different, albeit a not wholly alien, perspective on relations between Hearers and the Elect. The documentary texts found in the village composed in both Greek and Coptic are precisely that in that they document, sometimes in unconnected ways, matters of seeming routine. They reveal a faith based around local networks where the exchange of letters was essential for its day-to-day survival. The letters are characterised by an intimacy and robustness of relations built around family ties and long-standing business associations. Their importance lies primarily in demonstrating the role played by kinship relations in shaping the practice of Manichaeism in Kellis and its environs. They also reveal a less idealised image of relations between members of the catechumenate, and relations between Hearers and the Elect, than is found in didactic works such as the *Tebessa Codex*. In comparative terms, the letters reveal more about the daily lives of Hearers than they do about the trials of the Elect: although, even in this latter case they do provide some unique and compelling insights.

For all correspondents represented in the archive, the hub of activities was Kellis (Bagnall 1997: 11–15). Correspondents wrote either from Kellis or sent

letters to the village from elsewhere in Egypt (elsewhere in the Oasis, or the Nile Valley).²⁶ A domestic-familial foundation based around the support offered to the religion's adherents from a devout family of Manichaeans is evident in a large number of letters (P. Kell. Copt. 19–29; and likely also P. Kell. Copt. 23; 27–28; 52). The Coptic component of the archive is predominantly epistolographic, the most common being letters which blend personal issues (for example, enquiries after addressees' health, see Baker-Brian, forthcoming 2016) and commercial affairs (for example, relating to the provision of and payment for essential items such as food, clothing and medicines). However, attempts to classify the letters in bold, thematic terms can prove problematic. A significant number of the letters (although by no means all) have a clear religious purpose (i.e. in the service of the Manichaean religion, for example, P. Kell. Copt. 32), while in others the religious orientation is diminished or subdued (for example, P. Kell. Copt. 36, 'and the others who give rest to you' (36.14)); there are certain letters in which a concern with 'Manichaean' matters is little or non-existent, yet we know that either their author and/or the addressee is a Manichaean or an associate of Manichaeans, such as is the case with P. Kell. Copt. 43, a letter from a woman named Tehat (see below) to her son Psenpsais. For the purpose of this chapter, therefore, we will consider only a limited number of the letters edited in two volumes by Iain Gardner, Anthony Alcock and Wolf-Peter Funk, where the religious matters are assured, and where the letters shed light directly on the operations of the religion from the perspective of Elect–Hearer relations.

Requests for and the acknowledgement of food, clothing and medicines received are prominent concerns in very many of the letters. In a number of cases, we would be correct in thinking that the context for such requests was charitable and related to the alms culture of Manichaeism. In this regard, the appearance of the term *agape* in the collection is important. As the editors have noted in the first volume of Coptic documentary texts, the use of the term *agape* on six occasions in the letters would seem to have a 'concrete meaning extending from the act of charity to a particular liturgical purpose' (Gardner *et al.* 1999: 70–71; see also Alcock 2000: 208–9). A number of letters in the group written by a certain Horion (P. Kell. Copt. 15–18) – a devout Manichaean with connections to other persons in the Kellis letters (see Gardner *et al.* 1999: 26) – refer to the preparation and performance of the *agape*, for example, 'also, the other *agon*²⁷ of oil that I received from Sabes [with the] *holokottinos*, I left it (with them). For we take in much oil for the *agape*, in that we are many, and they consume much oil.' Synecdoche most likely governed the use of the term *agape* in the Kellis archive, in the sense that it was used interchangeably to refer to both the alms (as food), and the daily sacred meal for which the Hearers supplied the alms.²⁸ The most pronounced indication in the corpus of the absolute importance of almsgiving for the religion, and its centrality as *the* practice which defined relations between the Elect and Hearers is found in the letter, P. Kell. Copt. 31. Its editors have characterised the text 'as a kind of 'circular letter' sent or taken around the Manichaean communities', in which the author – who identifies himself as 'your father (Copt: *iōt*) who is in Egypt' and on the basis of the letter's content is almost certainly one of the

Elect – writes to a group of female Hearers, ‘the members of the holy church, the daughters of the Light Mind’. The writer continues:

Before everything: I greet you warmly, and your children together, each by their name. I am praying to God every hour that he will guard you for a long time, free from anything evil of the wicked world: You being for us helpers, and worthy *patrons*,²⁹ and firm unbending pillars; while we ourselves rely upon you. (P. Kell. Copt. 31. 10–18)

The idealisation of almsgiving as a sacred exchange of resources between the laity and the Elect is thus a feature of its frequent representation across a range of Manichaean sources. However, the Kellis archive on occasions records the other side of this story. In one of the recently published letters, P. Kellis Copt. 58, an unnamed writer raises a possible misunderstanding with an unnamed addressee arising from the provision of a cowl (Copt. *kleft*) ‘to the brothers’, that is, the Elect.³⁰ The concerns of this letter are reflected in P. Kell. Copt. 18, a letter from Orion (= Horion) to Tehat, most directly the commissioning of a cowl: the editors indicate that both letters share the same hand and find spot, and in the case therefore of P. Kellis Copt. 58, it is ‘fairly certain that the author is again Orion and the recipient may well be Tehat’ (Gardner *et al.* 2014: 20). P. Kellis Copt. 58 appears to indicate that Orion commissioned the manufacture of the cowl from Tehat, who we know from earlier letters and business accounts (i.e. P. Kell. Copt. 44–50) was involved in a tailoring business, on the understanding that the garment be supplied as a donation for one of the Elect. Instead, Orion had been sent what amounted to an invoice for the item: ‘You [sc. Tehat] wrote: “If you like it keep it, or else 1300 talents.” So I wrote to you that day that I had given it to the brothers. Do you have no news (P. Kellis Copt. 58.1–6)?’ Reading between the lines, and filling in the gaps underlying the etiquette of gift exchange among the laity of the Manichaean community associated with Kellis, we can surmise that Orion, a devout Manichaean, did not expect to be charged for the cowl since he had already indicated its status as a charitable donation for the Elect to Tehat. He believed that Tehat, as a fellow Manichaean, would understand the principle behind this sacred transaction and produce the cowl free of charge as her contribution to the complex series of stages which lay behind almsgiving in the Manichaean church. In this case, therefore, a fissure had opened in the delicate structure governing the ideological consent of almsgiving in Manichaeism. While this instance was likely explainable due to simple misunderstanding or lapse of memory, other instances in the Kellis archive reveal that the transaction of letters and gifts between adherents – in particular the organisation involved between Hearers in the provision of alms – was a complex and frequently haphazard business.

The finest example of a ‘breakdown in communications’ between Hearers is to be found in P. Kell. Copt. 20, from Makarios to Maria. However, before we proceed to analyse its contents, some background is offered first on these figures because of their importance in the documentary archive as a whole. The domestic foundation for Manichaean activity in Kellis and beyond is one of the truly

remarkable insights provided by the documentary material unearthed during the early 1990s. Therefore, it is surprising that no dedicated study of the domestic-familial character of late antique Manichaeism exists: the epistolographic material in particular lends itself very appropriately to the composition of a social history of Manichaeism in Egypt (and more broadly in Late Antiquity). A case study of the familial networks which underpinned Manichaean activities in fourth-century Egypt would inevitably utilise the corpus of letters exchanged between Makarios and his family, which the editors date to the middle-period (around the 350s) of the fourth century (Gardner *et al.* 1999: 8–11), but would also necessarily include the letters exchanged between the family and associates of Pamour³¹ which date slightly later than the Makarios archive; although in the case of Pamour and his associates, the presence of Manichaean elements is ‘rarely so overt’ (Gardner *et al.* 2014: 41). Makarios is the author of a number of letters addressed to members of his immediate family, including to his ‘sister’ Maria – who was in all likelihood his wife (see Dickey 2004: 131–76), and to Maria’s son Matthaïos, whose brother, Piene, is also a key member of the family and the Manichaean community through his connection to the figure known as the Teacher (see below).³² All members of this immediate circle are evidently devout Manichaeans. Their kinship and religious relationships appear intertwined as evidenced in a selection of letters, one example being the deeply devout letter from Matthaïos to Maria (P. Kell. Copt. 25), in which Matthaïos addresses his mother with the distinctive ‘Manichaean’ greeting formula drawn from 1 Thessalonians 5.23 (‘you being healthy in your body, joyful in heart and rejoicing in soul and spirit’: lines 16–19).³³ Makarios writes frequently to Maria in Kellis on family business (P. Kell. Copt. 20; P. Kell. Copt. 22; P. Kell. Copt. 24),³⁴ and is also the author of a devout letter to Matthaïos (P. Kell. Copt. 19). In the majority of these missives, Makarios’ care for his family is inseparable from his service to the religion since his young charges, Matthaïos and Piene, are faithfully engaged in fulfilling their religious duties. The case of Piene is of considerable interest: he appears in the archive as a young disciple in training whose socialisation within the religion is documented on a number of occasions, including in P. Kell. Copt. 20 where he is said to be accompanying the Teacher – a senior Manichaean Elect – on his travels. The same text also records that the Teacher is instructing Piene in Latin (Copt: *mnrōmaïos*), presumably one would think in order to take on a missionary role in the future. In the case of this text, Makarios complains about Maria’s epistolographic silence. The nub of the issue in this case (as in a number of other examples) being that essential items – some destined most likely as alms for the Elect – appear to have been forgotten about:

When Piene came to me, he said: ‘I have met Philammon and Pamour of Tjkoou’. You did not send (any) letter by way of them, although they are not strangers. The other things that you spoke about, saying: ‘I will send them by way of Pamour’; and even the garment for Mathaïos, you did not send it! Now indeed, if you have fixed it, then send it to him; for he needs it. Also the cushion; and the book about which I sent to you, saying: ‘Send it to me’; you have

neither sent it nor said why you have not sent it! Now indeed, do not neglect to send (a message) to us about your health, so that we can leave our house. (P. Kell. Copt. 20. 28–39) (Gardner *et al.* 1999: 168–9)

This is not a happy letter. In the previous lines, Makarios notes Maria's neglect and alerts her to the current situation regarding Maria's children in the context of their involvement in the foundation of what is presumably an emergent ecclesial-ascetic grouping (hence, 'their body is set up'):

You, yourself, Maria: I am very much amazed how you too have left off and stopped remembering us at all! If you do so because my children have been taken from me, I have no power in this matter beyond [...] requests, until Mathaios is placed near to me. And Piene: The great Teacher (Copt. *sah*) let him travel with him, so that he might learn Latin. He teaches him well. Their body is set up, and they are good (and) worthwhile. (P. Kell. Copt. 20.18–27) (Gardner *et al.* 1999: 168)

As noted above, P. Kell. Copt. 20 also introduces the figure of the Teacher to the archive. As this letter, together with P. Kell. Copt. 24 and P. Kell. Copt. 25 indicates, the Teacher serves as Piene's mentor. The Teacher is clearly a figure of considerable authority within Manichaean circles and very likely a member of the Elect: he may indeed have been the 'western' or Egyptian representative among the 12 Teachers (with the central focus remaining in west Asia), the senior level of Manichaeans directly beneath the *archēgos*, the figure-head of the church, as outlined above (although in reality we know little or nothing about the distribution of the 12) (see discussion by Gardner 2006: 317–23). The letters in the Makarios archive indicate that the Teacher travelled around the Nile Valley, visiting Alexandria (for example, P. Kell. Copt. 29) and always it seems accompanied by an entourage (including Piene). His work most likely involved administering pastoral care to Manichaean communities in the region together with performing broader evangelical duties. Among the newly published letters from 2014, there is a letter by The Teacher (P. Kellis Copt. 61) framed in the distinctive 'Manichaean' style in imitation of Mani's own epistolary practices (see Gardner 2006). However, the editors of the second volume of the documentary texts where the letter appears indicate: 'It is unknown whether this new letter is written by the same person referred to [among the Makarios letters], as it might well be from a different time-frame' (Gardner *et al.* 2014: 29).

A pertinent feature raised by the presence of the Teacher in the Kellis archive concerns the identities and roles of the Elect within the community. The Teacher is known only by his title, which raises a potential instance of the deliberate erasure of an individual's name for reasons determined by the religion (for example, the adoption of a 'Manichaean' name post-conversion, or the award of a title, rank or role), or as a result of external causes such as persecution. It is noted by the editors of the second volume of the documentary texts that the letters collected there are less explicit about their Manichaean faith, a tendency which they

ascribe to numerous possible causes, including the ‘need for greater circumspection’ in light of Manichaeism’s troubled fortunes during the mid-to-late fourth century.³⁵ The seeming anonymity of the Teacher may be read in this historical context, or even in the broader context of a tradition of literary anonymity which can be evidenced in Manichaean texts from Late Antiquity.³⁶ Nevertheless, the possibility of a titular or even an anonymous tendency for the identification of senior Manichaeans offers an interesting contrast to the habit of elite individuals to promote rather than downplay their visibility as privileged members of a community, as an aspect of how the elite exercise power and authority within society (see Ober 1989: 13–15).

A visible member of the Elect in the archive may be identified in the figure of Lysimachos. He is referred to as Apa Lysimachos in a number of letters (P. Kell. Copt. 21.10; 24.41; 29.17), an honorific form of address equating to ‘Father’. He appears active in the Nile Valley, and is recorded as having visited Antinoou (P. Kell. Copt. 21; see P. Kellis Copt. 82). Lysimachos stands as a central figure in the wider network of individuals and families associated with Kellis: he has very close ties to Makarios and his family and associates (esp. Piene, for example, P. Kell. Copt. 29), and also to Philammon (see Gardner *et al.* 1999: 38–9), who is mentioned by Makarios (P. Kell. Copt. 19, ‘my brother Philammon’), and who writes also to Theognostos (see Gardner *et al.* 2014: 118–19) and Hor (see Gardner *et al.* 1999: 26), both of whom are themselves recipients of letters from Lysimachos (P. Kell. Copt. 30 to Hor; P. Kell. I. Gk. 67 to Theognostos). In P. Kell. I. Gk. 67, Lysimachos to Theognostos, the author requests a ‘well-proportioned and nicely executed ten-page notebook for your brother Ision. For he has become a user of Greek and a Syriac reader’ (following the suggested reading of Iain Gardner³⁷), which is a further indication of the Elect’s role in overseeing the provision of education and educational resources within the Manichaean community.

The role played by both the Elect and Hearers in the processes whereby individuals ‘became Manichaeans’, for example through the education and training which the Elect provided and the Hearers reinforced (for example, P. Kell. Copt. 20. 25–6; see P. Kell. Copt. 15–20), raises a further important consideration. Frequently neglected in discussions of the Kellis archive, and in Manichaean studies more broadly, is the place of children within the religion. The young lives of Matthaïos and Piene – whose ages we have no indication of, but whom Makarios refers to as ‘children’ (Copt. *šēre*) – certainly require greater scrutiny than they have been accorded up to this point. While consanguinity likely linked Makarios with the boys, he also on occasions utilises what are likely to have been ‘Manichaean’ forms of address when writing to them, for example in the case of P. Kell. Copt. 19 where Matthaïos is referred to as ‘[t]he child of righteousness’. However, to conclude this section, I wish to draw attention to an additional feature of the relationship between Hearers and the Elect which has been known about for some time, but which may be further illuminated by the evidence from the Kellis archive. *Chapter 80* of *The Kephalaiā of the Teacher* which expounds the ‘Commandments of Righteousness’ describes the

‘second work’ of Hearers (in contrast to fasting, prayer and almsgiving which constituted the ‘first work’) as:

A person will give a child to the church for the (sake of) righteousness, or his relative [or member] of the household; or he can rescue someone beset by trouble; or buy a slave, and give him for righteousness. Accordingly, every good he might do, namely this one whom he gave as a gift for righteousness; that catechumen [. . .] will share with them (*Keph.* 80. 193. 5–11).

While the documentary archive indicates that the family was the principal way in which individuals were socialised to become Manichaeans (so to speak), the texts from Kellis also point to other ways. For example, one of the many charitable obligations of Hearers was ‘to rescue’ individuals facing extreme hardship. Among the newly edited volume of documentary material, P. Kellis Copt. 73 from Pegosh to Pshai relates the affairs of a young man whose sister has died, leaving him with two orphaned nieces. The uncle of the girls had been in contact with Pegosh, indicating his wish that Pegosh become a guardian for one of the orphans, although the consent of the elder of their household is indicated as required since the uncle himself is still reasonably young. The description of the situation is somewhat allusive, as noted by the editors. However, the letter contains the line: ‘Because he [sc. the uncle] wants to do it head-over-heels [i.e. enthusiastically] so that you will perform the service of the church, and this is a hard burden at the judgement’ (P. Kellis Copt. 73. 16–18) (see comments by Gardner *et al.* 2014: 87). The ‘service’ in this instance could very likely be in line with the substance of the ‘second work’ noted above from *Chapter 80* of the *Kephalaia*. Indeed, attention to the needs of orphans seems to have been a distinctive feature of almsgiving among the Manichaeans associated with Kellis (see P. Kell. Copt. 43) (Franzmann 2013). But, as a result of the ambiguities of expression which characterise this letter (and very many of the personal letters associated with Kellis), caution must be exercised before proposing so neat an association between the injunctions of the theological literature and the ‘realities’ of Manichaean life presented by the documentary material. Indeed, the responsible reconciliation of the data supplied by the documentary material from Kellis with Manichaean literary-theological texts remains a relatively unexplored area of investigation, which would likely prove to be an important and fruitful area of future research in Manichaean studies.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have explored only a handful of the complex issues surrounding relations between the Elect and Hearers in late antique Manichaeism. The second modern definition of ‘the elite’ offered by Josiah Ober’s path-breaking study provided a definition which could be profitably applied to the Manichaean Elect: our analysis has reinforced the normative understanding of the Elect’s status as having been founded on their suitability to perform specific duties within the religion,

but also on their avoidance of others. The chapter has highlighted, however, the limits of transplanting aspects of Ober's analysis to the world of the Manichaeans of Late Antiquity. Instances of tension between the Elect and Hearers are to be found in very different areas than in other groups and communities comprising a mass and elite. The Manichaean community was a relatively closed and cohesive social group existing within the confines of a larger society, to which it nevertheless maintained real and substantial attachments (see Brown 2012: 159; see Baker-Brian, forthcoming 2016). Like other historic sub-groups, the Manichaeans displayed their own 'sub-culture' which necessarily inverted the prevailing values and cultural forms of wider society.³⁸ Therefore, Manichaean Hearers revered their Elect because of their endurance of poverty and hardship: their status as the elite was based on their commitment to the 'Commandments of Righteousness' which counselled practices that were essentially antithetical to the customary habits of other elites in Late Roman society. Thus, their 'elite' reputation derived from their ability to become 'strangers and aliens on earth' (*quia peregrini et alienigenae mundo sint*: col. 4.3–5), in the evocative description of the *Tebessa Codex*. Both grades nevertheless recognised – in the words of Ober – the 'importance of being elitist' (Ober 1989: 324–7), the Hearers in their single-minded diligence in providing alms, and the Elect in the way that they articulated their religious vocation. It is likely most accurate to describe the Manichaean community of late antiquity as headed by a coterie of 'spiritual oligarchs'. However, in light of the letters and other documentary sources from fourth-century Egypt, it seems to be the case that the Elect rarely – if ever – took their Hearers for granted. The Elect never ceased to recognise the Hearers as their *patrons* (see P. Kell. Copt. 1.17), a situation which arguably represented one of the most significant modifications of mass and elite relations in the entire post-classical period.

Notes

- 1 Concerning the presentation of the cosmic origins of monarchical power in Late Antiquity, see the comparative study by Canepa (2009: 188–223). On the presentation of the later Roman emperors as divine monarchs and the Roman aristocracy as a concomitant elite, see Weisweiler (2015: 17–41).
- 2 On Manichaeism in Late Antiquity, see Lieu (1992); Gardner and Lieu (2004: 1–45); Baker-Brian (2011).
- 3 Thereby adopting one of the definitions of 'the elite' privileged by Ober (1989: 11).
- 4 For the terms used to denote the two classes across Manichaean literature, see Tardieu (1981: 78; English transl. by DeBevoise 2008: 62).
- 5 A heresiological description concerning schismatic Manichaean activity is supplied by Augustine, *de haeresibus* 46.10 in Gardner and Lieu (2004: 144–5).
- 6 An overview of Kellis in the fourth century can be found in Bagnall (1997: 11–15).
- 7 A possible sign of a Manichaean monastic foundation in late antique Egypt (close to Kellis) looks to be attested in Bagnall (1997), lines 320 and 513 in the designation, 'Top(os) Mani' ('the place (of) Mani'), relating to the *topos* owing olives and dates. For some useful commentary, see Goehring (1999: 174–6). In addition there is the following reference in P. Kell. Copt. 11.6, 'He has gone to the monastery (Copt. *thenete*) to be with father Pebok', in Gardner *et al.* (1999: 132): both references may refer to the same foundation, see Gardner *et al.* (1999: 130). For an expanded discussion,

- see Gardner (2000: 247–57). For an insightful survey of the Manichaean presence in Egypt during Late Antiquity, see Dubois (2003: 279–306, esp. 295–6). Also, the summary in Baker-Brian (2011: 130–31).
- 8 See Allberry (1938: 44. 8). Also, Augustine, *de haeresibus* 46. 16: English translation in Gardner and Lieu (2004: 190).
 - 9 On the correlation between the structural numerology of the Manichaean church and the organisation of the Manichaean cosmos, see now Leurini (2009: 169–77). See also the debate about the hierarchy between Mani and the Persian sage, Goundesh, in the Chester Beatty *Kephalaia*, K337, discussed by BeDuhn (2015: 52–74, esp. 69–70).
 - 10 On the Jewish-Christian (biblical) origins of Manichaean cosmology, see Hutter (1992).
 - 11 A variant account of Mani's cosmology can be found in the remnants of Mani's letter to Paticius preserved in the response of Augustine to the Latin translation of the letter, namely his *Contra epistulam Manichaei quam vocant fundamenti*: see the English translation by Teske (2006: 234–67). The 'Letter of the Foundation' may be the same as the 'The Long Epistle to Fatiq', attested in the list of titles of Mani's letters in al-Nadīm's *Fihrist*, about which see now Reeves (2011: 116). For an edition of the *epistula fundamenti*, see Stein (2002).
 - 12 See *The Kephalaia of the Teacher* 80. 192.3–193.22, trans. Gardner (1995: 201–2). For the standard edition of the work, see Polotsky and Böhlig (1940). All translations from the *Kephalaia* are taken from Gardner.
 - 13 The definition of the *Kephalaia* offered by Pettipiece (2009: 7), is worth quoting in full: '[The *Kephalaia*] should not be seen as a record of the *ipsissima verba* of Mani himself, nor should it be viewed as a *summa* of Manichaean theology. Instead, it can be more accurately described as representing the emergence or evolution of a scholastic, interpretive tradition, ostensibly rooted in an authoritative oral tradition analogous to those which led to the compilation of the Jewish Talmudic and Islamic Hadith traditions.'
 - 14 *The Kephalaia of the Teacher* 87. 218. 29–30.
 - 15 Beyond the evident tensions underlying the lessons of the *Kephalaia*, one 'historical' disagreement between Manichaeans over the reception of Mani's teaching has been preserved, in suitably jaundiced fashion, by Augustine in his *de moribus manichaeorum* 20. 74. The infamous case of Constantius the Hearer (not named by Augustine in this text, but in his later work, *Contra Faustum* 5. 5) and his efforts to provide a domestic nucleus for the Elect of Rome, ended badly as a result not only of the quarrelsome natures of the Elect, but also because (according to Augustine) 'when the rule of life from the letter of Mani was proposed, many found it intolerable and left'. For the English translation of the *de moribus manichaeorum*, see Teske (2006: 69–103, esp. at 102–3). See also BeDuhn (2013: 83–5). On Augustine's *de moribus manichaeorum*, see Baker-Brian (2013: 31–53).
 - 16 On the *archēgos*, see Lieu (1992: 110). Also, Glassé (2009: 129–44).
 - 17 For the revision of scholarly ideas about the forms of ascetic living in Late Antiquity, see the summary in Clark (1999: 33–8).
 - 18 See Augustine, *de opere monachorum* 25. 33.
 - 19 Concerning philosophical definitions of *otium*, see esp. Trapp (2007: 220–21). For a fourth-century perspective, see Matthews (1975: 1–12).
 - 20 For a discussion see Brown (2012: 208–23).
 - 21 Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66. 53.1–4. English translation, Williams (1994: 270–71).
 - 22 See the English translation with extensive commentary by BeDuhn and Hamilton (1997: 33–87). See the important edition and German translation by Stein (2006), who argues convincingly for rearrangement of the *Codex*'s pages.
 - 23 The apologetic nature of the *Tebessa Codex* is discussed by BeDuhn and Hamilton (1997: 35–6).
 - 24 See Baker-Brian (2009: 82–137). See recently, Doerfler (2014: 79–111).
 - 25 A familiar biblical typology in Manichaean literature, e.g. the *Cologne Mani Codex* 92.15.

- 26 See Gardner *et al.* (1999: 11–14). All translations are taken from this volume.
- 27 A measure of some sort: see Gardner *et al.* (1999: 64).
- 28 See the summary of the meaning of *agape* in Franzmann (2013: 37–49, esp. at 41).
- 29 See the note on the appearance of *patron* in P. Kell. Copt. 31 in Gardner *et al.* (1999: 212 n. 17) (‘Perhaps one might here translate: “benefactor”’).
- 30 Gardner *et al.* (2014: 30–33). All translations are taken for this volume.
- 31 I.e. Pamour III according to the genealogical stemma in Worp (1995: 50–51).
- 32 See the prosopography in Gardner *et al.* (1999: 19–50). Matthaïos is identified here as either the son or nephew of Makarios.
- 33 See Gardner *et al.* (2000: 118–24). For the likelihood that the trichotomy was employed by Mani himself, Sundermann (2009: 259–77, notably at 272).
- 34 For an examination of Maria’s role in the Manichaean community of Kellis, see Moss (2012: 502–13, esp. at 510–11).
- 35 See Gardner and Lieu (2004: 145–9), for a selection of the legislation against Manichaeans in the later Roman empire. For commentary, see Beskow (1988: 1–11). For a contextual reading of the legislation, see Humfress (2007: 244–55) and also, BeDuhn (2010: 136–44).
- 36 See the discussion in Baker-Brian (2009: 145–77). Also, Gardner (2006). For the religious significance of Mani’s name, see Tubach and Zakeri (2001: 272–86).
- 37 For the attribution of this letter to Lysimachos and the debate surrounding line 21, see Gardner (2007: 223–8). See Worp (1995: 178–9).
- 38 I have adapted the definition of sub-culture in the essay by Gordon (1997: 46–9).