

Not to Hide a Light Under a Bushel:
Manichaean Missionary Practices in the Roman West

By

Kenneth Lai



Religious Roots of Europe

University of Helsinki

19 October 2017

UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Faculty Theology		
Writer Kenneth Wenchen Lai		
Title of thesis Not to Hide a Light Under a Bushel: Manichaeian Missionary Practices in the Roman West		
Discipline Religious Roots of Europe (RRE)		
Type of thesis Master's	Month and year October 2017	Number of pages 112
Abstract <p>The details of the mission of Manichaeism—a religion that rose out of a Jewish-Christian milieu in Roman Babylonia in the 3rd century CE—emerge from both polemical sources and genuine Manichaeian sources, the latter of which have been greatly expanded in the past century with a number of discoveries. This thesis presents a comparative study that critically evaluates the sources for and identifies the practices of the Manichaeian mission in the Roman West between the 3rd century CE, when the religion was founded, and the 6th century CE, when the religion was persecuted off the face of the Western Roman Empire.</p> <p>By comparing the corpus of Augustine (who was himself a Manichaeian for 9 years) and Manichaeian sources, the thesis identifies a total of eight Manichaeian practices that can be tied to the Roman West: (1) the undertaking of polemical treatises and doctrinal debates; (2) the command of a broad range of languages; (3) exegesis of the New Testament to unearth Manichaeian beliefs; (4) the comparison of Old and New Testament passages (= disputations) to demonstrate the falseness of the Old Testament, which no true Christian should believe in; (5) missions in the guise of merchant trade; (6) the appeal to similarities with the disciples of Jesus; (7) sensationalist appeals to the appearances of poverty and association with women; and (8) the donation of children by lay Manichaeians to become missionaries. Among those identified here, practices (6)–(8) seem to be unique contributions to the field; chapter 3 furthermore reconstructs the theological underpinning of practice (8). Previous scholarship has not focused specifically on a critical examination of the Manichaeian mission.</p> <p>In using a comparative method, this thesis compares attestation of Manichaeian missionary practices <i>internally</i> (i.e., within, for instance, Augustine's corpus to see if he is consistent in his attestation of the same practice) and <i>externally</i> (i.e., to see if polemical reports match up with genuine Manichaeian reports). When making external comparisons, if attestation is found in Augustine but not in Manichaeian sources, it is surmised that the practice is likely a heresiological invention; if in Manichaeian but not in Augustinian sources, then perhaps a missionary practice that was not used or else simply not attested in the Roman West. The standard is generally, at any rate, to seek attestation in both sources and thus to verify that the practice was indeed used and witnessed in the Roman West.</p> <p>Finally, the appendices present the first English translation of a recently discovered sermon by Augustine (<i>Serm.</i> 350F) and two tables compiling Manichaeian disputations.</p>		
Keywords Manichaeism, mission, conversion, heresiology, Augustine, children		
Place of storage Helsinki University Library, Library of the Central Campus, Theology		
Other information		

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	4
1.1. Manichaeism: A Brief Description	4
1.2. History of Research.....	6
1.3. Methodological Considerations: <i>Act. Arch.</i> as an Example.....	9
2. Manichaean Missionary Tactics in the Roman West: Augustine and Manichaean Sources	14
2.1. Mani's Missionary Statement and Its Sources.....	14
2.2. Evaluating Augustine and other Hesiologists as Historical Sources for Manichaeism....	17
2.3. Manichaean Missionary Tactics	27
2.3.1. Treatises and Public Debates	28
2.3.2. Command of Languages	33
2.3.3. Manichaean New Testament Exegesis	35
2.3.4. Disputations: Old vs. New Testament Contradictions.....	39
2.3.4.1. <i>Sermo</i> 350F: An Example of Augustine's Appropriation of Manichaean Disputations	43
2.3.4.2. Marcion's Influence on Manichaean Disputations?	48
2.3.5. Likeness to Disciples and the Example of Thomas	51
2.3.6. Sensationalism: Poverty and Association with Women	56
2.3.7. Ambulatory Lifestyle.....	62
2.3.8. Use of Visual and Auditory Media.....	63
2.4. Conclusions.....	64
3. Child Donations as Missionary Trainees	67
3.1. Scholarly Background and the Finds of Kellis	67
3.2 Evaluating the Evidence of Child Donations and the Training of the Elect.....	69
4. The Light in the East: Conclusions.....	78
Appendix A. Translation of <i>Serm.</i> 350F (= <i>Serm.</i> Erfurt 4).....	80
Appendix B. Manichaean Disputations in Augustine, Arranged by Source.....	87
Appendix C. Manichaean Disputations, Arranged by Theme	94
Bibliography	96

1. Introduction

The following chapter introduces the religion of Manichaeism (1.1) and discusses the history of research (1.2) related to the missionary practices of the religion, especially in the Roman West, which is the geographical focus of this thesis. The last section (1.3) reflects on the methodological practices of this study, which is comparative in nature, using one text written against Manichaeans in particular, the *Acta Archelai* (hereafter *Act. Arch.*), as a case study for how the comparative study of the Manichaean religion has changed over time given new discoveries in the history of the study of Manichaeism. The thesis itself proposes and responds to the research question of what can be historically verified about the Manichaean missionary practices in the Roman West, studying eight general practices that can be compared in Augustinian and genuine Manichaean sources. Additionally, the thesis further gives a study of one missionary practice relating to the donation of children to the upper echelons of the Manichaean church in order to become missionaries.

1.1. Manichaeism: A Brief Description

Manichaeism was a religion founded by Mani (216–274/6) in the 3rd century CE. A Babylonian native, Mani believed himself to be the Paraclete foretold in the Gospel of John.¹ Thus, despite the common pejorative that his was a Persian religion,² Mani claimed to profess

I am greatly indebted to my adviser, Antti Marjanen, for his immense patience and immeasurable skill in guiding me through the arduous journey that was the production of this thesis. I am also grateful for regular advice by Ivan Miroshnikov, as well as helpful suggestions by Ismo Dunderberg, Victor Ghica, Gábor Kósa, Georgy Obatnin, and Nils Arne Pedersen.

¹John 14:16; see, e.g., CMC 17.4–5; 46.2–3; 63.[21–22]; 70.[20–21]. The abbreviations used for the Manichaean texts are as follows: CMC = *Cologne Mani Codex*; *Ps.Bk. II* = *Psalm Book II*; *Keph.* = *Kephalaia*; *Hom.* = *Homilies*; *CT* = *Codex Tebessa*; references to the Turfan texts (i.e., those beginning with M [= Manichaica], So [= Sogdica], U [= Uigurica], T [= Toyoq] and followed by a number) can be looked up in Boyce 1960. For the languages used in these texts, I abbreviate Middle Persian (MP), Parthian (Pa), and Sogdian (So). Note also that references to *Keph.* sometimes refer to the entire chapters using Roman numerals and at other times to page and line numbers using Arabic numerals; in the latter case, the pages cited refer to those of the original codex rather than the pages of the modern book, the latter of which only Funk includes in his editions of the text. Papyrological references follow the forms used in the database hosted on <http://papyri.info>. Other abbreviations follow the method outlined in the SBL style guide. For all ancient sources herein, if no translation is referred to, the translation is my own.

²See, e.g., Hegemonius, *Act. Arch.* 40.5 (text: Beeson 1906, 59): *Persa barbare* (“You barbarian Persian”); Titus of Bostra, *Manich.* 1.1 (text: Lagarde 1859, 1): ὁ δὲ Μάνης, ἐκ βαρβάρων [ῶν] καὶ τῆς μανίας αὐτῆς ἐπώνυμος (“Mani, being so named because of the insanity of barbarians”); Aug., *Faust.* 28.4 (text: Zycha 1891, 741): *et credat nescio cui ex transverso de Perside post ducentos vel amplius annos venienti, et suadenti ut illi potius quid Christus dixerit feceritque credatu* (“And I know none who would prefer to believe some Persian, who comes out of the blue two hundred or more years later and tries to persuade people to believe him instead about what Christ said and did”);

the true Christianity.³ The Christian nature of his religion is particularly evident in Manichaean missions to the Roman West, where Christianity was by then already about to come to a head with Constantine’s conversion in 312. Besides Mani’s wide-reaching vision of the Manichaean mission, which imagined a pan-lingual religion with a global following,⁴ one of the most striking characteristics of Manichaeism included the division of its adherents into two distinct classes: that of the auditors (also known as the hearers or the catechumenate), who were the lay believers, and the Elect, for whom the auditors worked to provide food and housing and who themselves assumed the offices of the Manichaean church.⁵

Furthermore, the Manichaeans believed that the Elect, by consuming food, into which was mixed particles of light, were capable of returning the light that was trapped in this world skyward to the Father of Lights, the celestial principle where resided the Father of Lights, the highest deity in the Manichaean belief system and with whom all light was consubstantial.⁶ It is

Ramsey 2007, 397 (translation, slightly altered). On the topos of branding heresiarchs as barbarians, see, e.g., Pedersen 2004, 167n20; cf. S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 121–25, on the association of Manichaeism with Persia; polemical etymologies for Mani’s name like that attested here is a common feature of heresiological works, for which see Tubach and Zakeri 2001.

³The texts originating from the Roman West attest to the fact that Manichaeans made use of the autonym “Christian” (Lat. *christianus*; Copt. *ⲭⲣⲏⲥⲧⲓⲁⲛⲟⲥ*): *Secund.* 1.3; *Felic.* 1.19–20; 2.12; *Faust.* 9.1; 31.2; *Hom.* 72:9; *Keph.* [258.29]—for a discussion, particularly of the passages in *Faust.*, see Pedersen 2013, 181–92. In comparison, Central Asian sources, though they do not evidence Zoroastrianism as an autonym, seem to borrow Zoroastrian terms in order to explain Manichaeism to its local audience—see, for instance, the discussion in MacKenzie 1979, 503n13, 525, on the use of *pryšm’r* (MP, “reckoning”) in T III 260 (= M 7980–84) and *drw’xyz* (MP, “arising whole”; MacKenzie 1980, 304) in *Šābuhragān* 67: MacKenzie 1979, 506 (text), 507 (translation). Likewise, in the Far East, Manichaeans were accused of preaching false Buddhism (佛教, *fójiào*), a notion that perhaps comes from the use of the word Buddha (佛, *fó*) to translate the notion of God in general and certain Manichaean deities in particular, as in the Sun God (日光佛, *riguāngfó*, “Buddha of sunlight”) and the Mother of Light (電光佛, *diànguāngfó*, “Buddha of Lightning”), as well as other Manichaean notions, for which see Bryder 1985, 4–10, 75–123. The Chinese translation for the Christian God, on the other hand, used the Chinese principle of deity (天, *tiān*, “sky”; 神, *shén*, “deity; spirit”), words that referred to ruling (帝, *dì*, “emperor”; 主, *zhǔ*, “master”) or immortality (仙, *xiān*, “immortal [literally, a person who has become a mountain]”), or some combination of those concepts. Considering the fact that Manichaean self-identification seems to have shifted depending on the dominant religions of the region, it seems safe to surmise that the Manichaean autonym of “Christian” was simply part of their missionary rhetoric in the Roman Empire.

⁴*Keph.* CLI; M 5794 + M 5761; S. N. C. Lieu 2006. See the discussion in section 2.1 below. Mani even speaks of *speaks* in *Keph.* 189.1–4 of his disciples surpassing the four great kingdoms of the world: Babylonia and Persia (ⲡⲕⲁⲗ ⲛⲧⲪⲁ[ⲪⲮ]ⲗⲔⲔⲛ ⲙⲏ ⲧⲁⲧⲡⲉⲣⲥⲓ), Rome (ⲧⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟ ⲛⲏⲣⲟⲩⲙⲁⲓⲟⲥ), Ethiopia (ⲓⲧⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟ ⲛⲏⲣⲟⲩⲙⲁⲓⲟⲥ), and China (ⲧⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟ ⲛⲏⲣⲟⲩⲙⲁⲓⲟⲥ); Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 189 (text). Mani’s missionary ambitions would indeed turn Manichaeism into a veritable world religion of its time; see further S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 86–90.

⁵BeDuhn 2000, 25–33. On the offices of the church, which consisted (in descending order) of the head of the church, the teachers, the bishops, and the householders and presbyters, see Leurini 2013, 159–220.

⁶Previously, it has been thought that Manichaeism was a dualistic religion in which good and evil were co-existing and pre-existent forces of equal strength, represented respectively by the Kingdom of Light and the Kingdom of Darkness as well as that Manichaeism was not a truly monotheistic religion. These notions have both been challenged, however, particularly in light of the discovery of CMC, for which see the review in Scibona 2001;

this class to which belong, for instance, the figures of Faustus, Fortunatus, Adimantus, and Felix, with whom Augustine debates in some of his works.⁷ By working symbiotically, the auditors and the Elect would progressively return the light that was trapped in the matter of the world to the Kingdom of Light and, by doing such a work, achieve their own redemption and the return of their own souls to the Kingdom of Light.

Like their contemporary Christians, Manichaeans also believed that the end of times, what they referred to as the Great War,⁸ was imminent. Premonitions of its onset included the persecution of the Manichaean church, the torture of its adherents, and the destruction of their scriptures.⁹ In the end, however, the Manichaean church would prevail, and the entire world, converted to Manichaean faith, would work collectively to liberate the light from the world.¹⁰ Central to the Manichaean faith was thus the notion of dispersing the Manichaean faith across the world, the mission that is given a historical study in this thesis.

1.2. History of Research

This section looks at the scholarship history on the Manichaean mission. That the Manichaeans must have employed a successful mission is itself evident from their incredible success in dispersing their religion across three continents within the first couple of centuries of its birth.¹¹ It is remarkable, then, that so little research has been done to determine the historically verifiably facts surrounding the Manichaean mission.

Scholarship on the subject is relatively sparse considering the profound ramifications of this research question on our understanding of late antique religions. The most common scholarly trend has been to rely on philological methods to answer to this question—that is, to

Bermejo-Rubio 2009, 222–27. It now seems that the notion of Manichaean good–evil dualism with equal force on either side emerged primarily from Augustine’s preoccupation with the origin of evil; Brown 2000, 35–42. Manichaean texts, on the hand, speak about the power of Light over Darkness (i.e., “radical dualism”), the former of which was diminished according to the Manichaean cosmogonic myth, because of its quality of consubstantiality, when light became mixed with matter (= Darkness). Although the substance of the Father of Lights is mixed into the matter of the world, he remains a single entity; it is in this way that Manichaeism maintains monotheistic beliefs. On the cosogonic myth of light mixed into matter and the versions told by Augustine, see further the discussion in section 2.2.

⁷*Faust.; Fort.; Adim.; Felic.; Conf.* 5.6.10–7.13; *Retract.* 1.16, 22; 2.7–8.

⁸See, e.g., *Hom.* 8.8: πῖλας μπόλεμο[c]; Pedersen 2006, 8 (text).

⁹*Hom.* 8.8–21.30.

¹⁰*Hom.* 29.2–31.18; cf. Heuser and Klimkeit 1998, 83–84; Pedersen 1996, 172–200, 222–57.

¹¹Samuel Lieu offers a thorough overview of both eastward and westward spread of Manichaeism in his indispensable monograph S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 90–120, 219–42; see now as well his address at the 2013 Symposium of the International Association of Manichaean Studies, S. N. C. Lieu 2017.

focus on the study of translation as a form of religious propagation.¹² This should come as no surprise, as the study of Manichaeism covers a wide breadth of languages: Coptic, Syriac, Greek, Latin, Middle Persian, Sogdian, Parthian, Bactrian, Uyghur, Khotanese, Classical Chinese, Arabic, and still others.¹³ Thus, to study Manichaeism already presupposes a philological mindset. As a result, scholars of Manichaeism are perhaps not entirely inculpable of privileging linguistic considerations in their approach to the study of the Manichaean mission. This is not, of course, to understate the linguistic capabilities of the Manichaeans; Augustine, for instance, notes that the Latin Manichaean texts were “well written in Latin,”¹⁴ though these texts, at least the canonical writings of Mani, would have had to have been transmitted from their original Syriac through a Greek/Coptic intermediary into Latin.¹⁵

While the linguistic aspect of translation fulfilled the very fundamental basics of communication, the ingenuity of the Manichaean mission reached well beyond the philological acumen of its adherents. Beyond this question of language, however, scholarship has generally taken a piecemeal strategy to studying the Manichaean mission, mixing and matching from the following approaches:

1. Reconstruction of Manichaean missions based on Mani’s early missions (including the tactic of prioritizing the conversion of political leaders)¹⁶
2. Missionary tactics through visual media¹⁷
3. Proselytization through trade-routes and as merchants¹⁸
4. Analyzing the public debates¹⁹

¹²For instance, see Peter Bryder’s published dissertation, Bryder 1985 (on Manichaean adaptations to a Chinese audience), S. N. C. Lieu 1987 (Lieu’s problematization of transformation *versus* translation in his review of Bryder 1985), and Bryder’s subsequent response to Lieu’s criticism in Bryder 1992, wherein Bryder concludes that the transmission, translation, and transformation of Manichaeism from place to place and culture to culture are essentially three simultaneous processes. For other examples of the approach to the Manichaean mission by examining the process of translation to Zoroastrian, Buddhist, and Uyghur-speaking audiences, see also Colditz 2005; Takao 2000; Tongerloo 1984. On translation, transmission, and transformation of Manichaeism in the Roman West, which evidences at least Latin, Coptic, Greek, and Syriac texts, see the discussion in section 2.3.2 below.

¹³New dialects and languages are still being classified from the mammoth Turfan archive. For a recent overview of some important linguistic discoveries to emerge from the Turfan Manichaica, see Zimmer 2004.

¹⁴*Conf.*, 5.6.11: *suae sectae si qua volumina latine atque composite conscripta erant* (“some volumes fairly well written in Latin for his own sect”); Verheijen 1981, 62 (text); Rotelle 2008, 121 (translation).

¹⁵The seven canonical writings of Mani were his *Treasury of Life*, *Gospel*, *Pragmateia*, *Book of Mysteries*, *Book of the Giants*, *Epistles*, and *Psalms and Prayers*. On the Syriac origins of the canonical texts of the Manichaeans, see S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 8; Tardieu 1981, 64–67. These writings are further discussed in sections 2.2 and 2.3.1–2.

¹⁶Koenen 1983; Römer 1994; Kósa 2013, 320–22..

¹⁷Panaino 2004; Gulácsi 2015; Heuser and Klimkeit 1998, 270–90, the last of which is an updated version in English of Klimkeit 1982a.

¹⁸Brown 1969, 92–103; S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 97–106.

¹⁹Brown 1969, 100; Tardieu 1982; Lim 1992; Van den Berg 2010; Lim 1995, 70–71.

5. Sensationalist strategies with pale-faced proselytizers²⁰
6. The role of women (possibly as door-to-door solicitors)²¹
7. Cultural/linguistic adaptation of theology and missionary approaches²²

Although some scholars have attempted to undertake a general approach to Manichaeian missionary practices, the process has generally favored one of the above angles.²³ Others, like Julien Ries, have misleadingly adduced missionary principles based on dogmas found in certain Manichaeian texts²⁴ but without corroborating these with other similar sources.

Of the scholars who have broached the general topic of Manichaeian missionary practices, Werner Sundermann²⁵ offers the fairest synthesis of scholarly research, though his discussion of missionary techniques relies in particular on approaches 1 and 4, above, while Peter Bryder²⁶ and Gábor Kósa,²⁷ who, following their area of expertise, focus on the movement of Manichaeism from Iran into China, cover only approaches 1 and 6, above. What has been lacking thus far in Manichaeian scholarship is a dedicated effort to analyze the Manichaeian mission as such.²⁸ This gap in scholarship is thus the starting point of my master's thesis, in an effort to parse through the sources for a critical understanding of Manichaeian missionary practices by combining and expanding on the approaches discussed above. This is an especially relevant topic now given the new Manichaeian material recently published from Ismant el-Kharab (Roman Kellis), located ca.

²⁰Brown 1969, 101; S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 185–86.

²¹Scopello 2001; Scopello 2005a; Scopello 2005b, 295–315; Coyle 2009a; Kristionat 2013, 132–63; cf. Burrus 1991 for a discussion gender politics in the Patristic sources generally and on Manichaeian women as an example.

²²Sundermann 1996; Gasparro 2000; Kósa 2011, 155–56; Colditz 2005; Takao 2000; Tongerloo 1984; Bryder 1985; S. N. C. Lieu 1987; Bryder 1992.

²³Sundermann 1986b; Sundermann 1986c; Sundermann 1987; S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 86–120; Bryder 1994; Sundermann 2009.

²⁴Ries 1977, 99–102. Ries describes in this article “les tres justices” (i.e., commandments) of Manichaeian believers based on the use of the seemingly obscure use of the word *δικαιοσύνη* in *Keph.* LXXX, and which Ries sees as a direct response to *Keph.* 14.9–10, wherein the Paraclete (i.e., Mani) enigmatically announces its intention to speak about “justice.” Such a method is strikingly arbitrary in its attempt to reconstruct Manichaeian doctrine based on the *Kephalaia* alone. In Ries's defense, some important data, such as the use of *δικαιοσύνη* as a *technicus termini* for the Elect, do not emerge until after the discoveries at Ismant el-Kharab (Roman Kellis) in the 1990s; see, for instance, Bermejo-Rubio 2013, 233–34, wherein Bermejo-Rubio demonstrates this link through a convincing set of parallels in the Manichaeian corpus, prompted by the use of the term in a prayer found at Kellis. This finding is discussed further in chapter 3 below. It should be noted that Ries's scholarship is otherwise generally excellent and Ries 1957 and Ries 1959 remain classical studies on Manichaeism.

²⁵Sundermann 2009.

²⁶Bryder 1994, 54.

²⁷Kósa 2013, 303.

²⁸Bryder 1985, 150, even laments the fact that no monograph has yet appeared that would otherwise serve as a useful touchstone for any researcher on Manichaeism for the purposes of better understanding the Manichaeian mission.

250 km due west of modern-day Luxor.²⁹ Already, the data from the Kellis archive have attested to a new dialect in Coptic,³⁰ re-dated and revised to a Manichaean identity what was previously regarded as the earliest existing Christian letter,³¹ furnished a veritable archive of Manichaean letters,³² verified the existence of a central Manichaean prayer alongside Arabic, Parthian, and Middle Persian parallels, further contributed to the research on the historicity of *Act. Arch.*,³³ and continues to be one of the most important discovery in the history of Manichaean studies since that of the Manichaean codices at Medinat Madi.³⁴ The findings from Kellis as a whole have thus offered greater historical precision in the field of Manichaean research.

1.3. Methodological Considerations: *Act. Arch.* as an Example

In this section, I explore the comparative method of study in Manichaean research by discussing how certain key discoveries of texts related to Manichaeism have led to dramatic changes in how Manichaeism can be critically approached from a historical perspective. The key example for comparison is the *Act Arch.*, a polemical work by Hegemonius whose fictional polemical elements and factual data on Manichaeism have been interpreted with varying degrees of historicity depending on the genuine Manichaean data available at the time of study. The work has been scrutinized as a historical source with fascinating results that continue to revivify discussion in the field.³⁵ The productiveness of the comparative study of *Act. Arch.* justifies my

²⁹The documentary and literary findings have been published in the Dakhleh Oasis Project series: Worp 1995 (I); Gardner and Choat 1996 (II); Worp and Rijksbaron 1997 (III); Bagnall 1997 (IV); Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999 (V); Worp 2004 (VI); Gardner and Choat 2007 (VII); Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 2014 (VIII).

³⁰Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 84–95; cf. the review of this book in Shisa-Halevy 2002.

³¹Gardner, Nobbs, and Choat 2000, 10.

³²Gardner 2013.

³³P.KellisGk. 98; M 194; M 790; M 7352; M 8050; M 8531; as well as the relevant passage in the *Fihrist* of Ibn an-Nadīm, for which see Flügel 1862, 64–65 (text), 96–97 (translation); see further the discussion in de Blois 2005; Gardner 2011a; Bermejo-Rubio 2013. This discovery is discussed alongside Augustine’s knowledge of the same prayers in section 2.2 below.

³⁴For a full history, see Robinson 1992; cf. Gardner and Lieu 1996, 148–54. That these texts originate from Medinat Madi is reported by the peddler of the codices at Cairo, Maurice Nahman, who claims to have discovered these codices in a wooden chest at the ruins of an old house in Medinat Madi. Gardner and Lieu, 1996, 149, speculatively suggest that the fact that these codices, whose dialect has been identified as Lycopolitan, was discovered in the Fayyum might indicate the storage of the texts by “missionaries of religious refugees” fleeing persecution. The long-anticipated radiocarbon dating of these codices, the result of which are published in BeDuhn and Hodgins 2017, now indicate that these codices were produced between the late 300s and the early 400s CE.

³⁵See, e.g., S. N. C. Lieu 1994a. The recent discoveries in Kellis in the late 20th century have afforded a renewed take on the *Act. Arch.* by comparing letter-writing conventions in Manichaeism, for which see Gardner 2007.

own use of comparative methods in this thesis. Finally, I conclude this section with an outline of the contents of my thesis.

Research on Manichaeism has long been stalled by the limitation that, up until the 20th century, Western researchers of Manichaeism have had to rely for the historical data surrounding Manichaeism on the anti-Manichaean writings of largely patristic sources, most notably Epiphanius's *Panarion*,³⁶ Hegemonius's *Act. Arch.*,³⁷ and Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings.³⁸ Beginning with Pierre Bayle (1647–1706), however, and strengthened by the more critical scholarship of Isaac de Beausobre (1659–1738), studies of Manichaeism began to strip off the theological imperative to demonize a religion that was, already by the end of the 6th century CE, all but effaced off the European continent³⁹ and was able to approach the heresiological data of the patristic sources from a more deliberate, historical-critical perspective, additionally seeking out non-Western sources in the hopes of widening the scope of comparative research.⁴⁰ These studies quickly peaked, however, given the limitations of the available sources, until such watershed discoveries as the writings of Ibn an-Nadīm in the late 19th century,⁴¹ the recovery of Manichaean texts from Turfan (from which expeditions have sprung a wealth of Iranian texts that have even constituted an entire field of its own, the *Turfanforschung*⁴²) and

³⁶The editions by Karl Holl have been updated and revised in Holl, Collatz, and Bergermann 2013 (I); Holl and Dummer 1980 (II); Holl and Dummer 1985 (III). An English translation of *Pan.* based on Holl's editions has recently been made available in F. Williams 2009 (I); F. Williams 2013 (II & III).

³⁷Beeson 1906. An English translation has recently been made in Vermes 2001. Additionally, Epiphanius, *Pan.* 66.6.1–11, 7.5, 25.2–31.5, preserve large amounts of *Act. Arch.* in Greek. See further BeDuhn and Mirecki 2007, 8–9, for a review of scholarship on *Pan.*, as well as the various Greek and Coptic fragments that comprise the text.

³⁸For a discussion of Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings and my evaluation of them as historical sources on Manichaeism, see section 2.2 below. On this early period of research in Manichaean studies, see Nyberg 1935.

³⁹S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 7, 215. Nevertheless, church leaders and intellectuals kept the term Manichaean alive as a polemic to be lodged against the teachings of the Paulicians, Bogomils, Paterenes, and Cathars. Manichaeans would even come to be seen as the spiritual progenitors of the Protestants during the Reformation; Bossuet, d'Auberive, and Caron 1816, 19:119. Even the Renaissance mathematician, physicist, and theologian Blaise Pascal would famously declare that “les Manichéens étaient les Luthériens de leur temps, comme les Luthériens sont les Manichéens du nôtre” (Pascal 1963, 4:340).

⁴⁰Non-Manichaean perspectives from works with less polemical concerns than the Patristic sources, such as the *Kitāb al-āthār al-bāqiyah 'an al-qurūn al-khāliyah* of al-Bīrūnī, were essential comparative material for research on Manichaeism between the mid 17th and late 19th century; for a useful survey of Arabic and Syriac works that have been useful for Manichaean studies, see, e.g., Reeves 1996, 7–15, 21–28.

⁴¹Flügel 1862; Flügel 1871; Bayard 1970. This 10th-century text details with remarkable accuracy, given how late the text is in the history of Manichaeism, Manichaean practices and belief that have found parallels, e.g., in the Manichaean daily prayers, attestation of which occur in the Turfan and Kellis archives; see de Blois 2005; Gardner 2011a; Bermejo-Rubio 2013.

⁴²See Sundermann 2000; Sundermann 2004, the latter of which additionally offers detailed information about each expedition, listed by country.

Dūnhuáng (敦煌市) in the early 20th century,⁴³ the discovery of a Latin codex on Manichaean church order in Tebessa, Algeria, in 1918,⁴⁴ of the Medinat Madi texts in 1929,⁴⁵ and of the miniature codex detailing the life of Mani supposedly discovered in Upper Egypt (conserved in Cologne) in 1970,⁴⁶ and, most recently, the excavations at Roman Kellis from the late twentieth century.⁴⁷

By the beginning of the 20th century, a new generation of scholars, fueled by the Göttingen *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, began to parse the newly discovered sources for the roots of Manichaeism. This movement, in turn, would be abruptly halted in the 1940s by harsh criticism from the newly hatched school of the phenomenology of religion, a school of thought that would anticipate another stumbling block for research in Manichaean studies: the postmodern challenge to historical criticism.⁴⁸ In the wake of postmodernism, research on Manichaeism would be reborn again in a new light of historical critique that would more rigorously challenge the subjectivity of the researcher, the impotence of the single researcher daunted with a religion that spanned numerous continents and languages, and the fathomless chasm separating *res gestae* from *historia rerum gestarum*.

For a concrete example of the research history in Manichaean studies, I turn to the comparative study of *Act. Arch.* While Pierre Bayle, writing in the 17th century, was among the last of the scholars of Manichaeism to accept *Act. Arch.* as a completely reliable historical source on Manichaeism,⁴⁹ Beausobre's scholarship marked the beginning of the historical-critical study of Manichaeism with the publication of his *Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme* (1734/1739).⁵⁰ In these works, Beausobre rightly noted that the story told in *Act. Arch.*, which centers around a dogmatic debate between Mani and Archelaus, the bishop of the Roman Mesopotamian city of Carchar,⁵¹ was full of mistakes and contortions made evident by a

⁴³For an overview of this material, see S. N. C. Lieu 1998a, 1–54.

⁴⁴Omont 1918; BeDuhn and Harrison 1997; Stein 1998.

⁴⁵Robinson 1992; cf. Gardner and Lieu 1996, 148–54. The provenance of these texts, like that of the CMC, remains a mystery.

⁴⁶Koenen and Henrichs 1970; Henrichs and Koenen 1975; Henrichs and Koenen 1978; Henrichs and Koenen 1981; Henrichs and Koenen 1982; Koenen and Römer 1988. On the dubiety surrounding the provenance of this text (= CMC), see, e.g., Henrichs 1979, 379.

⁴⁷For an overview of the finds, see Hope 1999 as well as the discussion below in chapter 3.

⁴⁸Ort 1967, 1–19, though now outdated, provides an excellent summary of research up to that time, before the dramatic entrance of postmodern thought onto the scholarly stage.

⁴⁹Stausberg 2000.

⁵⁰Beausobre 1734; Beausobre 1739; cf. Stroumsa 2000.

⁵¹*Act. Arch.* 15.1–43.2; cf. BeDuhn and Mirecki 2007, 9–14.

comparative study of the reported doctrines of Manichaeism and geographical details surrounding the life of Mani. Beausobre thus argued that no such meeting could ever have taken place.⁵² He was also acute enough to surmise, based on a comparative study of Persian sources on Mani's exile to Turkestan that *Act. Arch.* would have had to have been written around 330 CE,⁵³ and elsewhere concludes that the otherwise unknown figure of Hegemonius was author of *Act. Arch.*, an attribution that remains accepted today.⁵⁴ Beausobre was wrong, however, to discount the entirety of *Act. Arch.* as a historical source, though his keen linguistic readings and his comparative study of patristic sources with non-Western sources would thereafter become a scholastic norm in the study of Manichaeism.⁵⁵

Following Beausobre's critical study of *Act. Arch.*, the text would remain a work regarded as nothing more than a Christian fiction until the end of the twentieth century.⁵⁶ Even after the discoveries in Medinat Madi and Turfan in the early 1900s, only rough facts could be comparatively rescued from *Act. Arch.*: the names of the disciples of Mani's mission to the Roman Empire and of some of the canonical writings of Mani, Mani's self-designation as the Paraclete, and his succession by his disciple Sisinnius—even these facts, however, are laced with errors and misdirection.⁵⁷ Following the discoveries at Kellis, however, Iain Gardner⁵⁸ has pointed out remarkable similarities between the epistolary conventions in the documentary letters recovered from Kellis and those evidenced in the letter written by Mani to Marcellus in *Act. Arch.*,⁵⁹ the letter in which Mani attempts to convert Marcellus and that then results in the debate between Mani and Archelaus and the same letter traditionally regarded as fictitious since Beausobre's criticism of the larger work.⁶⁰ Gardner's study points convincingly to an astonishing level of authenticity in Hegemonius's work that demonstrates that Hegemonius must have had

⁵²Beausobre 1734, 1:108–9, 144–54.

⁵³Beausobre 1734, 1:167–80; cf. S. N. C. Lieu 1994a, 136, who suggests a date between 330 and 348 CE.

⁵⁴Beausobre 1734, 1:132; cf. Tardieu 1986. This identification was drawn from Photius, *Bibl.* 85, for which see note 136 below.

⁵⁵Ries 1957, 1:475.

⁵⁶See, e.g., the discussion in Ries 1959, 2:395–98.

⁵⁷Ort 1967, 36–37, 177–79. Even after reviewing these comparisons, Ort concludes that “the author of the *Acta Archelai* is of no importance at all for our studies. A careful examination of the data of his book brings to light a number of unreliable passages” (179). Both the world and western mission of Manichaeism is discussed in section 2.3.1.

⁵⁸Gardner 2007; cf. Gardner, Nobbs, and Choat 2000; Gardner 2006; Gardner 2013, where Gardner further elaborates on Manichaean epistolary conventions.

⁵⁹*Act. Arch.* 5.1–13.4.

⁶⁰See, e.g., Vermes 2001, 40n13.

access to some genuine letters by Manichaeans, perhaps even the canonical letters of Mani himself, on which he would have modeled Mani's letter in *Act. Arch.*⁶¹ Similarly, comparative studies of the text of *Act. Arch.* 44–45 with Augustine's *Adim.* and Marcion's *Antitheses* seem to have convincingly demonstrated a connection between Addā, the likely source of the passage in Hegemonius, and Marcion, a 2nd-century early Christian known especially for his controversial canonization of the New Testament and his rejection of the Old Testament God.⁶² The discoveries of Manichaean texts since Beausobre's time thus demonstrate that the comparative study of the available data greatly determines the historicity of even texts like *Act. Arch.* that have deemed for centuries to be works of fiction.

It is thus with this critical-comparative methodology that, in this thesis, I evaluate as source materials texts that evidence Manichaean missionary practices in the Roman West. In chapter 2, I compare the evidence in Augustine's extensive corpus on Manichaeism, the breadth and depth of which allows both a comparison with other (both Manichaean and non-Manichaean) sources, as well as within Augustine's own corpus, to evaluate how consistent Augustine is in his evidence of various Manichaean missionary practices. In all, I discuss 6 general practices that can be securely tied to the Roman West: 1) the composition of polemical treatises and the striking of public doctrinal debates; 2) a thorough and broad command of languages; 3) exegesis of the New Testament to demonstrate Manichaean ideas; 4) the presentation of contradictions between the Old and New Testament; 5) the comparisons between Manichaeans and the disciples of Jesus as well as the use of certain popular apocryphal Christian texts; and 6) sensationalist appeals to poverty and the association with women. A seventh practice seems to be evidenced in the use of trade routes for missionary purposes. In chapter 3, I elaborate on a further practice that seems to be attested in Roman Egypt—the donation of children to become missionaries. I draw for this practice on comparative material from Augustine, Kellis, the Medinat Madi texts, the Cologne Mani Codex, Codex Tebessa (from Algeria), and the Turfan archive. In each chapter, I strive to establish a critical-comparative study of the material to verify that Manichaean sources attest to the practice generally and local sources, most of which are polemical in nature, attest to the same practice in Roman West.

⁶¹Gardner 2007. The evidence suggests that Manichaean letter writing conventions were developed in imitations of those in Mani's canonical *Epistles*.

⁶²BeDuhn 2007, 136–42; Pedersen 2004, 177–254. For a discussion of Marcion's influence on the Manichaean practice of comparing Old and New Testament contradictions, see further section 2.3.4.2 below.

2. Manichaean Missionary Tactics in the Roman West: Augustine and Manichaean Sources

The following chapter provides a comparison between Augustine and Manichaean sources. Beginning with the missionary statement as given by the Manichaeans themselves, I discuss the attested sources, some philological considerations, and then provide a summary of general precepts of the Manichaean mission that can be extracted from this statement. I then turn to heresiological sources, focusing specifically on Augustine, for the Manichaean mission in the Roman West, evaluating these texts as historical sources. Finally, comparing Augustine with Manichaean sources, I evaluate eight general Manichaean practices that emerge from either Augustinian or Manichaean sources (or both) for their historicity. In the conclusion to this chapter, I also provide a table that compares how these eight general practices line up with the general missionary statement provided in the Manichaean Coptic and Middle Persian sources as well as how reliably each practice can be tied to the Roman West based on their sources of corroboration.

2.1. *Mani's Missionary Statement and Its Sources*

Among early Christians and Jews, the Manichaean discourse appealed to theological gaps in the cosmogonic narrative, the logical inconsistencies of scripture, and the moody vicissitudes of a fickle God.⁶³ Perhaps most importantly, Manichaeism seems, especially for Augustine, to have provided a theodic solution for evil with its dualist cosmology—thus, evil was not the creation of an omnipotent God but rather a co-existent, pre-cosmic enemy.⁶⁴ The focus of

⁶³S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 152–68, 187–90

⁶⁴The notion of Manichaean dualism as the conception of good and evil as co-existing, pre-cosmic, and equal forces has been a commonly held understanding for as long as polemical treatises have existed on Manichaeism. With the discovery of the Cologne Mani Codex in 1969 (see CMC 66.4–12 especially), however, the notions of monotheism and dualism in Manichaeism have begun to undergo revision; see Scibona 2001. It seems that this traditional understanding of Manichaean dualism may have come from Augustine's description of Manichaeism as a way of justifying his entering the Manichaean religion, because they explained that good and evil were pre-existent, equal forces, a problem with which Augustine struggled throughout his episcopal career as a Christian to resolve in the biblical scriptures; see, for instance, Brown 2000, 35–42. Scholars have generally been cautious of the veracity of this claim, e.g., in his *Conf.*, as one of the primary reasons why Augustine became a Manichaean—see, e.g., BeDuhn 2010, 1:31–41; cf. S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 175–77. The consensus now is generally that the question of theodicy must have played some role in Augustine's decision to join ranks with Manichaeans, but presumably the description of good and evil as equal forces is perhaps an Augustinian invention. Furthermore, for reasons why Augustine became a Manichaean, one should not discount those related to the aesthetics of the religion, sensationalist appeals, the appeal of astrology, philosophical discourses, proselytizing strategies, social pressure, genuine belief on the part of Augustine, provincialism, and so on.

priority of the texts or their common source,⁷⁵ nor can we be certain at what point in time these “advantages” were gathered,⁷⁶ it is at least a fact that polemical writers rebuke, report, or at least mention these claims in a way that can be verified by the historian by comparing polemical claims with authentic Manichaean sources. Antonio Panaino even goes so far as to speculate that Manichaean provocations, directed specifically as they are against the scripture, language, and logic of nascent religious systems, even compelled Zoroastrians to re-edit, re-transcribe, and canonize the Avesta with a new script and draw up a commentary (i.e., the Zend), while Christian writers like Augustine were pushed to hone their exegetical skills, particularly in harmonizing Old and New Testament passages and developing a systematic approach to Christology.⁷⁷ This argument (i.e., that Manichaeans were chiefly responsible for certain key developments in Zoroastrianism and Christianity) is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to prove but seems highly plausible given the historical evidence and seems particularly convincing from the vantage point of social identity theory.⁷⁸

2.2. *Evaluating Augustine and other Hesiologists as Historical Sources for Manichaeism*

Counter-arguments, mainly the polemical writings of Christian apologists, against Manichaean criticisms of scripture, logic, morals, and provincialism have supplied an immense, albeit very confusing and hardly impartial, data set. On the other hand, none of the Manichaean polemical writings against these apologists survive today in their entirety.⁷⁹ Due to the lack of

⁷⁵Lieu (2006, 526) speculates that the *Šābuhragān* may even have been the common source behind the text of these two missionary statements.

⁷⁶Given the discussion in note 71 above, it is more than likely that it would at least have been after Mani’s death, putting the *terminus a quo* at 274/6 CE. With the radiocarbon dating of the Medinat Madi texts, reported in BeDuhn and Hodgins 2017, the *terminus post quem* for *Keph.* can be safely established in the late 300 and early 400s. This date range at least suggests that at least the Coptic Manichaean mission statement should have been relevant during the time of Augustine (354–430 CE), whose works are examined here in relation to the Manichaean mission statement.

⁷⁷Panaino 2004, 251. On OT vs. NT contradictions in Augustine, see the discussion in section 2.3.4 below.

⁷⁸See, for instance, Thomassen 2004, 248–50, where the focus is on “centralizing” and “decentralizing” forces of discourse; King 2008, 32–36, where similar such forces are termed the “call to unity” of heresiologists, a process simultaneous with their “production of division.” King’s focus, unlike that of Thomassen, is on the one-sided production of discursivity by the dominant “call to unity.”

⁷⁹For lists of relevant polemical sources, see Mayer 1974, 2:76–86; Coyle 1978, 13–16; S. N. C. Lieu 1988; S. N. C. Lieu 1994b, 197–202. Although no one to my knowledge has attempted to improve upon Lieu’s lists, some important additions to Lieu’s overall list should include Oxyrynchus fragments 4965 and 2603 and P. Harr. 107, which Iain Gardner has convincingly shown evidence Manichaean concepts and epistolary conventions, aided by the documentary texts recently discovered at Kellis (Gardner 2013, 294–309). In a private correspondence (18 August 2016), Lieu admitted to me that, though he had earlier signaled the beginning of a new research effort in an

comparative data, direct quotation of Manichaeans by the polemical writer is often treated here, as in the field at large, as authentic even if selectively quoted and carefully represented for partisan counter-argument. It is rather the content of what is claimed about Manichaeans that are challenged—for instance, whether or not, as Augustine claims, Manichaean sectarianism existed in the Roman West, which will be discussed below. Consequently, the relative lack of authentic data on Manichaean rebuttals to their Christian competitors has proven highly problematic for research on Manichaeism, due to the resulting task of having to parse genuine Manichaean discourse from polemical additions.⁸⁰

It is, nevertheless, a useful exercise, since historical data on missionary activity can be graded by plausibility based on an internal comparison within the polemic (e.g., how does the author polemicize other non-Christians? Is there any reason to doubt their quotations of their Manichaean opponent as genuine? Is the author consistent in their report of a given datum?) and an external comparison with other Manichaean or polemical writings (e.g., what, if any, genuine Manichaean texts and/or practices can be related to the polemical text? Are accusations made in these texts genuine or simply repetitions from other sources?). If external comparisons yield attestation in both polemical and Manichaean sources, then it is very likely that the missionary practice attested was in fact used in the geographical area. Likewise, if attestation occurs only in the Manichaean source, the practice was perhaps not used in the area, or, if attestation is only in the polemical source, then perhaps it is not to be trusted. As for internal comparison, the more a polemicist has written on Manichaean missionary practices, the easier it will be to provide a rigorous comparison with his consistency on any given practice. Through this comparative approach, I hope to provide a more critical study of Manichaean missionary practices in the Roman West.

One drawback of this approach is that it necessarily relies for historical information on polemical texts that participated in the many persecutions of the Manichaeans. Such texts, often Christian heresiologies and anti-Manichaean decrees, give valuable insight into geographical variation in the Manichaean mission but results in certain unresolvable problems: first, the data

electronic age to collect the sources for Manichaean expansion in the Roman Empire, he had long since given up on this particular project; S. N. C. Lieu 1994c.

⁸⁰At least since Beausobre introduced the criticism of the historicity of such polemical works in his *Histoire*, vols. III–V; on Beausobre and, more generally, on how research on Manichaeism changed drastically with key discoveries of texts related to Manichaeism, see the discussion in section 1.3 above.

from these texts must be rescued from their ideological webs of discourse, an imperfect process that necessarily depends on the amount of available indisputably Manichaean data in a given time and place as well as historical-critical methods of study; second, these texts are mostly written in either a Christian or Roman legal context, with the result that we can only extract specific information about the Manichaean missionary approach to Christian officials or generally from a Roman legal perspective. Consequently, we can know, in a critical way, precious little about how Manichaeans approached everyday (lay) Christians, Romans, Jews, Mithraists, worshippers of Isis, and any number of demographics in the Roman West toward whom Manichaean missionaries might have developed specific missionary practices,⁸¹ as no account of the Manichaean mission by such ordinary folk survives.

It should be noted that, while previous scholarship has touched on the matter of how Manichaean writers have (falsely or accurately) portrayed Christian scripture and their methods of exegesis,⁸² these scholars have *not* focused on the particular problem of reconstructing the missionary/polemical strategy underlying such writings and arguments.⁸³ Doing so will contribute to a larger understanding of features of the Manichaean mission in the Roman West as well as better inform the extent to which heresiologies reacted to Manichaean missionary polemics.

The single wealthiest source for Manichaeism in the Roman West is Augustine, who was himself a Manichaean for nine or ten years.⁸⁴ Augustine even wrote twelve works explicitly against Manichaeism.⁸⁵ Such was the amount of ink spilled by him against Manichaeans that John Kevin Coyle memorably describes “a desire to prove himself non-Manichean . . . behind

⁸¹On the religious diversity of the Roman Empire, see, e.g., Beard, North, and Price 1998, 1:245–312. Most likely, no historically verifiable data can be secured on the matter of whether Manichaeans in the Roman West developed other programs of conversion unrelated to specific religious allegiances, nor would we know what such programs would have looked like.

⁸²See, for instance, Pedersen 2004, 206–54 (on the Manichaean criticism of the Creator God in the OT); Van den Berg 2010, 194–99 (on Adimantus’s argumentative approach to OT and NT passages); Baker-Brian 2009, 125–34 (on the Adimantus’s selective approach to OT and NT passages).

⁸³In the examples presented above, for instance, only a few pages are dedicated to the consideration of the missionary tactics of effects of such writings: Pedersen 2004, 186–99 (on the missionary tactics of Titus of Bostra himself); Van den Berg 2010, 178 (on the audience of Adimantus’s *Disputationes*); Baker-Brian 2009, 186–89 (on the Manichaean focus on scriptural contradictions).

⁸⁴*Conf.* 3.9.20; 4.1.1; 5.6.10. Pierre Courcelle thought that Augustine rounded this figure down to nine years from the otherwise numerologically significant ten years “à réduire le plus possible le laps de temps pendant lequel il fut disciple de Mani, lors même qu’il se reproche d’avoir été tel longtemps, trop longtemps”; Courcelle 1968, 78; cf. Brown 2000, 35–49; BeDuhn 2013a.

⁸⁵*Adim., Duab., Faust., Fel., Fort., Fund., Gen. Man., Mor. eccl. Manich., Nat. bon., Secund., Util. cred., Ver. rel.*

virtually everything he wrote.”⁸⁶ Augustine is thus a central source for Manichaeism that can be internally compared—that is, whatever he claims about a given Manichaean practice can be verified against his reports of the same practice in his other writings. Nevertheless, one central issue concerning Augustinian studies is the question of *how much* Augustine actually knew about Manichaeism.

Two camps seem to dominate Manichaean studies on this matter. On one side, scholars like Coyle err on the side of caution, arguing that, while Augustine reports some genuine Manichaean beliefs, he is clearly not familiar with every aspect about the religion and is often even confused about the most basic of Manichaean tenets.⁸⁷ Others, most prominently Johannes Van Oort, argue that Augustine came to know Manichaeism intimately over his years both as a Manichaean and as an apostate, proof of which knowledge has incrementally emerged from the comparative data gleaned in the Manichaean findings of the past century and a half.⁸⁸ My own approach is to recognize the experience of Augustine with Manichaeism as limited by his time spent as an auditor.⁸⁹ While he may not have been directly exposed to Manichaean texts, or indeed certain Manichaean practices,⁹⁰ Augustine reveals much information about Manichaeism that can be comparatively verified against the Manichaean evidence;⁹¹ other times, Augustine seems, for rhetorical purposes, to consciously paint a skewed version of Manichaean beliefs, about which he elsewhere demonstrates excellent knowledge. His depiction of the cosmogonic myth of how light came to be mixed with darkness, for instance, is sometimes quoted directly

⁸⁶Coyle 2009b, 40.

⁸⁷See, for instance, Coyle 2001; Coyle 2003; Ratzinger 1967; cf. Van Lindt 1992, 224n4; Kósa 2011, 115

⁸⁸Maher 1979; Van Oort 1996; Van Oort 2006, 711–16; Van Oort 2008; Van Oort 2010; Van Oort 2012; Van Oort 2015a.

⁸⁹For a similarly cautious approach, cf. Kaatz 2005.

⁹⁰His knowledge of, e.g., the Manichaean daily prayers seems to be rather limited in *Haer.* 46.18; *Epist.* 236.2; *Fort.* 1–3; *Mor. Manich.* 15.36. Cf. P.KellisGk. 98; M 194; M 790; M 7352; M 8050; M 8531; as well as the relevant passage in the *Fihrist* of Ibn an-Nadīm, for which see Flügel 1862, 64–65, 96–97. For the connection between the Manichaean texts, which has been the result of an exciting recent development in the study of the Manichaean prayer ritual, see de Blois 2005; Gardner 2011a; Bermejo-Rubio 2013. While it would be strange for Augustine not to be familiar with a prayer that would have been performed some three, four, or seven times a day, it is possible that Augustine is simply not forthcoming about his knowledge and experience of this practice in his writings—likewise, this would mean that his representations of Manichaean cosmology and cosmogony, both of which are summarized in the text of the prayer, are not accurate reflections of his knowledge of the religion (it would be unimaginable to think that Augustine never questioned his fellow Manichaeans about the figures featured in the prayer over his period of nine years as a Manichaean auditor). Alternatively, the prayer might have looked dramatically different in the Roman Empire outside the secluded city of Kellis, or perhaps the prayer had not yet been established as far north into the Roman Empire as Carthage, where Augustine first fell into Manichaeism.

⁹¹See, e.g., *Conf.* 3.12.21; cf. P.KellisCopt. 25.42–48. On this comparison, see chapter 3, below.

from Manichaean books, sometimes accurately described, and sometimes purposefully skewed to serve a rhetorical point.⁹²

It is nevertheless important to note that what Augustine learned as an *auditor* may have been severely limited by the medium of religious instruction.⁹³ He notes, for instance, that “only those who are your Elect can be fully informed about your way of life. You know, however, that I was not one of your Elect but a Hearer.”⁹⁴ Elsewhere, Augustine reveals that, while Mani’s letter had been “read out” (*lecta est*) to him and his fellow auditors, he had “not yet heard” (*nondum audieram*)⁹⁵ about the fundamental creation story detailing how good became mixed with evil during the creation of the world.⁹⁶ Nevertheless, this is admittedly a rather strange remark on the part of Augustine, as this myth is closely tied to cosmogonic myth concerning the Cross of Light, also known as *Jesus patibilis* in the Roman West, which Augustine otherwise describes rather accurately, for instance, in his *Enarrationes in Psalmos*.⁹⁷ Whether or not Augustine is simply being less forthcoming about his knowledge of Manichaeism, the underlying problems herein for the historian of Manichaeism in working with Augustine are determining how much access Augustine had to Manichaean sources and, subsequently, whether or not the answer to this question should carry any weight on the knowledge of Manichaeism ascribed to him.

⁹²See, e.g., *Serm.* 350F.1; *Haer.* 46.10; cf. *Enarrat. Ps.* 140.12; *Nat. bon.* 44; *Agon.* 4.4. Since *Enarrat. Ps.* is likely a later work, it is certainly fathomable that Augustine somehow only later came across this knowledge, but, given the centrality of this Manichaean tenet (see, e.g., *Keph.* LXXXV) and the lack of data in, e.g., Augustine’s *Retract.* to suggest otherwise, the most likely explanation seems to be that Augustine describes the myth differently depending on whether he is trying to give an accurate account or indeed if he is castigating Manichaeans in front of his congregation to serve as a rhetorical talking point. On the latter, see, e.g., my discussion of *Serm.* 350F in section 2.3.4.1 below. This myth is also discussed in relation to Augustine’s knowledge of Manichaeism below.

⁹³Kósa 2011, 115. Kósa usefully points out that terms that could be used to designate auditors across the various attested languages of Manichaean literature express some notion of hearing: “Latin *audito(res)* [audio = hear]; Greek: ἀκροατῆς [ἀκροάομαι = listen to]; Syriac *šāmūcē* [šmā‘ = to hear]; Middle Persian *nywš’g’n* [nywš = listen to]; Parthian *ngwš’g’n* [ngwš = to hear]; Sogdian *ny’wš’kt* [nywš- = to listen]; Uyghur *äšidtäci* [äšid = to hear]; Chinese *tīng rén* 聽人, *tīngzhě* 聽者, *tīngshì* 聽士 [tīng 聽 = to listen].” Perhaps the only entry missing in this list is the Coptic *ρεωτμε* [ρωτμε = to hear; obey], which occurs at least twice in Coptic Manichaean literature: *Ps-Bk.* 118.28; 234.31.

⁹⁴*Fort.* 3: De moribus autem vestris plene scire possunt qui electi vestri sunt. Nostis autem me non electum vestrum, sed auditorem fuisse; Zycha 1891, 84–85 (text); Ramsey 2006, 147 (translation).

⁹⁵*Fund.* 5.6 (text: Zycha 1891, 197); *Duab.* 12.16 (text: Zycha 1891, 71).

⁹⁶See, for instance, *Keph.* XVI; XVIII.

⁹⁷*Enarrat. Ps.* 140.12; cf. note 92 above. Manichaean cosmogony and especially the coming into being of the Light Cross have been classically studied by Böhlig 1978; Jackson 1932; and recently by Franzmann 2003, 107–18. Sources on the subject both in Manichaean literature and otherwise are discussed in Sundermann 1993, an updated version (31 October 2011) of which is available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/cosmogony-iii>.

On the first point, it is worth considering at least two explicit references Augustine makes to Manichaean books in his writings. The first, if rather incidental, instance occurs in his autobiographical *Confessions*, in which Augustine describes Manichaeans raving about the true God “unremittingly and in so many ways, though only in speech and in their huge, copious tomes.”⁹⁸ If this passage shows that Augustine had access to Manichaeans books, from which he would later quote in his writings against Manichaeans (or, indeed, if these quotations simply survive in Manichaeans writings to Augustine, which in turn are not preserved), Augustine never explicitly says so, even though he should have had access to the books that were confiscated from Felix, a Manichaean Elect with whom he debated, and from which he even reads during their debate.⁹⁹ The second, more telling instance is from his polemical work *On Heresies*:

The (Manichaean) elect are forced to eat a Eucharist of sorts, sprinkled with human semen (*semine humano*)¹⁰⁰ so that the divine substance might also be purified from it as from the other foods they take. . . . One of them, Viator by name, said that those who do this are properly called Catharists (*Catharistas*).¹⁰¹ He claimed that other parts of this Manichaean sect are divided into Mattarians (*Matarios*)¹⁰² and Manichaeans in the

⁹⁸*Conf.* 3.6.10: “frequenter et multipliciter voce sola et libris multis et ingentibus”; Verheijen 1981, 31 (text); Rotelle 2008, 82 (translation).

⁹⁹*Felic.* 1.14. Perhaps these books were simply burned (see *Felic.* 1.12). See further Decret 2002a; Decret 2002b; Van Oort 2012, 191–93.

¹⁰⁰Cf. Epiphanius, *Pan.* 26.4.5–7: “For after having made love with the passion of fornication (πάθει πορνείας) in addition, to lift their blasphemy (βλασφημίαν) up to heaven, the woman and man receive the man’s emission (τὴν ῥύσιν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρρενος) on their own hands. And they stand with their eyes raised heavenward but the filth (ἀκαθαρσίαν) on their hands and pray, if you please—the ones they call Stratiotics and Gnostics—and offer that stuff on their hands to the true Father of all, and say, ‘We offer thee this gift, the body of Christ.’ And then they eat it partaking of their own dirt (τὴν ἐαυτῶν αἰσχρότητα), and say, ‘This is the body of Christ; and this is the Pascha, because of which our bodies suffer and are compelled to acknowledge the passion of Christ (τὸ πάθος τοῦ Χριστοῦ)’”; Holl, Collatz, and Bergermann 2013, 281 (text); F. Williams 2009, 94 (translation). Here, Epiphanius clearly suggests that the passion of fornication (τὸ πάθος τῆς πορνείας) is meant somehow to reflect the passion of Christ (τὸ πάθος τοῦ Χριστοῦ), which is likely the reason why Epiphanius refers here to this practice as a kind of *πάσχα*, just as Augustine refers in *Haer.* 46.9 to a kind of *eucharista* in his description of the same practice he alleges takes place in Manichaean rituals. Augustine also touches on this topic, describing the consumption of semen as a secretive and shameful act in *Mor. Manich.* 18.66; cf. also references to similar acts by so-called Gnostics in *Pistis Sophia* 381.6–10; 2 *Jeu* 100.16–21, for which see Schmidt 1978a; Schmidt 1978b.

¹⁰¹The so-called Manichaean sectarians given here as *Catharistae* are not to be confused with the self-designated *καθαροί* who followed the third-century bishop Novatian (cf. Aug., *Haer.* 38) or the Cathars of the Middle Ages. On the former type, best known for their church membership in exclusion of apostates, particularly in the case of Christians who had lapsed under persecution, see, e.g., Harnack 1898. On the latter Cathars, who came to prominence between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, and their polemical association with Manichaeism by their contemporaries, who likely used either this passage or that of *Haer.* 38 against them, see Varga 1939; Söderberg 1949; Puech 1979. On the so-called Catharist sect of the Manichaeans, Augustine writes the following later in *Haer.* 46.10: “they are called Catharists (*Catharistae*), on the grounds that they are purifiers (*purgatores*), since they purify (*purgantes*) part of God with such great diligence that they are not kept back from the horrid shamefulness of such food (*horrenda cibi turpitudine*)”; VanderHout et al. 1969, 316 (text); Rotelle 2007, 45 (translation).

¹⁰²On the *Matarii*, cf. *Faust.* 5.5: quia in mattis dormiunt, Mattarii appellantur (“because they sleep on mats, they are called Mattarians”); Zycha 1891, 278 (text); Ramsey 2007, 89 (translation).

narrower sense (*specialiter*). . . . Certainly, such books (*illi libri*)¹⁰³ are, beyond any doubt, common to all Manichaeans, in which (*in quibus libris*) all those monstrous tales have been written: about the transformation of males into females and of females into males for attracting and releasing through lust the princes and princesses of darkness so that the divine substance held captive in them might be set free and escape from them. . . . And thus it follows that they are obliged to purify (*purgare*) part of their god from human seed (*semine humano*) by eating it, just as from the other seeds (*aliis seminibus*)¹⁰⁴ which they consume in foods.¹⁰⁵

There are several points of interest in this passage. First, the trope of consuming semen and menstrual fluid, sometimes as here described as a Eucharist of sorts,¹⁰⁶ an allegation discussed further below in section 2.3.6, and is one of the descriptions of so-called “Gnostic” sectarians memorably decried by Michael Williams as an instance in the “life history of a rumor . . . about obscene practices among Christians and others in antiquity.”¹⁰⁷ Second, the description of Manichaean sectarians in the Roman Empire, which exists only in Augustine.¹⁰⁸ And, finally, Augustine’s description of the myth told in Manichaean books, known as the seduction of the Archons, the only part of this passage that can be comparatively proven to be true.

Since this description of Mattarians and Catharists is nowhere corroborated by Manichaean sources, it would be sensible to dismiss Augustine’s claim on this basis alone. Remarkably, however, this solitary attestation has been proof enough for such recent scholars as

¹⁰³Contrary to Teske’s translation, which reads here “these books,” I understand “illi libri” as the antecedent of “in quibus libris.” Teske’s “these” makes little sense, since no books are referred to previously; thus, “illi” must refer forward to “in quibus.”

¹⁰⁴The pun here, connecting the common heresiological trope of consuming human semen (*semen humanum*) as Eucharist with the Manichaean belief in imprisoned light (*alia semina*), is an interesting and clever invention on Augustine’s part as a heresiologist.

¹⁰⁵*Haer.* 46.9–10: coguntur Electi eorum velut eucharistiam conspersam cum semine humano sumere ut etiam inde, sicut de aliis cibis quos accipiunt, substantia illa divina purgetur. . . . Quorum unus nomine Viator eos qui ista faciunt proprie Catharistas vocari dicens, cum alias eiusdem manichaeae sectae partes in Mattarios et specialiter Manichaeos distribui perhiberet. . . . Et certe illi libri manichaeis sunt omnibus sine dubitatione communes, in quibus libris illa portenta ad illiciendos et per concupiscentiam dissolvendos utriusque sexus principes tenebrarum ut liberata fugiat ab eis quae captiva tenebatur in eis divina substantia, de masculorum in feminas et feminarum in masculos transfiguratione conscripta sunt. . . . Ac per hoc sequitur eos, ut sic eam etiam de semine humano, quemadmodum de aliis seminibus quae in alimentis sumunt, debeant manducando purgare; VanderHout et al. 1969, 314–16 (text); Ramsey 2006, 44–45 (translation, slightly altered).

¹⁰⁶On the background to the consumption of semen and menstrual fluid as a kind of Eucharist, see the discussion in note 100 above.

¹⁰⁷M. A. Williams 1996, 184. For his analysis of *Pan.* 1.26.4.1–8, on the licentious acts of “Gnostics,” and a history of scholarship debating the veracity of this passage, see also pp. 179–84. Cf., e.g., Goehring 1988, 339–43; Baker-Brian 2013. Epiphanius makes similar accusations throughout his work to various acts of consuming semen and menstrual fluid, on which as well as a suggested background to the alleged practice, especially in relation to the *Great Questions of Mary*, see the excellent study in Marjanen 1996, 189–99.

¹⁰⁸*Haer.* 46.10; *Faust.* 5.5.

Van Oort and Richard Lim to establish the passage as a valid historical source for Manichaean sectarianism in the Roman Empire and thus merits further discussion.¹⁰⁹

Van Oort’s suggestion that these Manichaean “καθαροί” are attested in *Keph.* 44.27 is dubious at best.¹¹⁰ The relevant passage reads as follows: “Tell us, our Lord, of the *Five Words* which are proclaimed in the sect (ΠΛΟΓΜΑ) of the Baptists and [these] other words which are found in the other sects (ΝΚΕΔΟΓΜΑ). They speak their name, that is, those who are called—‘Pure (Ἰκαθαριος).’”¹¹¹ Not only is this *Keph.* poorly preserved, but the reference to καθαροί alongside the “sect” of the Baptists, which likely refers to the Elchasaites of Mani’s own background,¹¹² would point to sectarians outside of Manichaeism. Moreover, as Ferdinand Christian Baur has suggested of *Haer.* 46.10,¹¹³ the term *Catharistae* is a remarkably apt way of referring to the Manichaean Elect as a whole. Likely, the word is grounded in the use of verbs meaning “to purify” associated with the redemptive activity of the Manichaean Elect and their divine counterparts.¹¹⁴ I suggest that the term *Catharistae* may thus be a clever heresiological invention of Augustine’s, an instance of the common heresiological tactic of “guilt by association,”¹¹⁵ by which Augustine conflated Manichaeans and Novatians, through equivocation, at the locus of their common belief in some form of “purification.” This interpretation, which appears to be new among recent Manichaean scholarship, receives further support from similar language used in *Keph.* XXVI to describe the Elect audience of the teaching: “you yourselves must be purifiers

¹⁰⁹Van Oort 2016a; Lim 1989, 242–45.

¹¹⁰Van Oort 2016, 9n30; cf. the divine καθαροί referred to in P.KellisGk. 98.79.

¹¹¹*Keph.* 44.24–27: τεογο αραν πηχαϊς Ἰπιτοϋ η̅ξεδε ετοϋτ̅εο[ϋ]ο η̅μαϋ ρη̅ πλογμα η̅νωβητις[της η̅]η̅ [η̅]η̅ξεϋ[εχ]ε [ετ] φροπ̅ Ἰη̅ η̅κελογμα σετεοϋ[ο αν η̅πο]ρη̅ν η̅χι η̅[ε]τ̅ροϋμοϋτε αρ̅αϋ δε η̅καθαριος; Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 44 (text); Pettipiece 2009, 122 (translation, slightly altered, emphasis his). Pettipiece’s translation incorporates readings from Wolf-Peter Funk’s unpublished *Addenda et Corrigenda*, written for *Keph.* It is worth noting that, if accepted, Funk’s reading, which adds [η̅]η̅ [η̅]η̅ξεϋ[εχ]ε [ετ] where Polotsky and Böhlig’s (1940) earlier edition does not attempt a restoration, fills a gap that perhaps Van Oort and Lim might have entertained could otherwise have suggested a connection between the καθαροί of *Keph.* 44.27 and the *Catharistae* of *Haer.* 46.10.

¹¹²CMC 5.10–12; 80.6–93.23; cf. *Hom.* 87.13. On the identification of Elchasaites with the Baptists of CMC, see Henrichs 1973; cf. Luttikhuisen 1985, 163–64. Contra all other Manichaean scholars I am aware of, Luttikhuisen alone insists that the Baptists of CMC have no relation with the Elchasaites.

¹¹³Baur 1831, 289: “Ohne Zweifel hatten die *Electi* von ihrer Bestimmung, das Naturleben, oder die Seelen, durch die Nahrungsmitle, die sie genoßen, zu reinigen und zu läutern, den bei Augustin De haeres. c. 46 vorkommenden Namen *Catharistae*.”

¹¹⁴Augustine describes the act of the purification of matter by the elect or otherwise by divine figures with the following three verbs: (*purgare*) *Enarrat. Ps.* 140.12; *Fel.* 2.8, 20; *Haer.* 46.2, 5–12, 19; (*mundare*) *Fel.* 2.20, 21; *C. Jul.* 6.3.7; (*abluerere*) *Nat. bon.* 44. Attestation of similar words to describe the same practice is plentiful as well in all other languages in which Manichaean texts are attested: Syriac *ṣl*; Greek ἀποκαθαίρω, καθαρίζω; Coptic καθαρῖζε, σωτ̅, ḫ̅ οϋτ̅ββε, τ̅ακρε; Arabic *saffā*; New Persian *p’l’y-*; Middle Persian *’sn’y-*, *p’c-*; *p’r’y-*; *pāgēn-*, *pālāy-*; Parthian *p’rw-*; *p’wc-*; Chinese 潔; 淨; 清淨; 浣.

¹¹⁵The phrase coined in Cameron 2003, 480.

and redeemers of your soul.”¹¹⁶ Moreover, given the ambulatory lifestyle of the Elect¹¹⁷ and their use of temporary homes (*m'nyst'n'n*) on their missionary journeys,¹¹⁸ it would hardly be a stretch to see this practice as the background to Augustine’s term *Mattarii*. This is all to say, at any rate, that Augustine’s references to Mattarians and Catharists as Manichaean sectarians should be regarded with great suspicion.

On the myth of the seduction of the Archons,¹¹⁹ Augustine’s account here is more accurate than some of his accounts elsewhere.¹²⁰ The best evidence for this myth comes from Book 7 of Mani’s *Treasury of Life*,¹²¹ a text in fact preserved in Augustine’s writings;¹²² the relevant passage reads as follows:

He (i.e., the blessed Father) knows that all these hostile powers (*hostiles potestates*) are easily taken in because of the deadly unclean lust that is congenital to them, will yield to

¹¹⁶*Keph.* 77.19: ⲁⲓ ⲛⲣⲉϥⲱⲧⲉⲛ ⲙⲛ ⲛⲣⲉϥⲱⲧⲉ ⲛⲧⲉⲛⲛⲓⲅⲁⲛⲓ; Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 77 (text); Gardner 1995, 19 (translation). This commandment is inspired by a telling of the cosmogonic myth, though the text is fragmentary and not entirely sensible, surrounding the current state of affairs (i.e., in which light has been mixed with matter) that necessitates the purification of matter. The conclusion of the myth with the Third Ambassador seems to suggest a further connection with the Elect than has been previously suggested, though the figure is admittedly rather an elusive one—see Coyle 2009c, 112n54; cf. Van Lindt 1992, 109–18. A similar phrase, ⲛⲣⲉϥⲱⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲧⲛⲓⲅⲁⲛⲓ (“purifier of the soul”), is also used in *Keph.* 291.20, but the fragmentary context here is also difficult to understand, though the passage seems to have something to do with the divine figures involved in the redemption of light. Additionally, in *Ps.-Bk. II* 225.2, following Säve-Söderbergh’s reconstruction, there may occur the phrase ⲛⲣⲉϥⲱⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲧⲛⲓⲅⲁⲛⲓ (“at the door of the purifier”), though this restoration means that this is the only occurrence of the word ἀγνιστής (from ἀγνίζω, “to purify”) among the attested Coptic Manichaean sources and is, furthermore, a *hapax legomenon* in Greek. Nagel, on the other hand, suggests ⲛⲣⲉϥⲱⲧⲉⲛ ⲛⲧⲛⲓⲅⲁⲛⲓ (“Folterer”), Gk. βασιανιστής (from βασιανίζω, “to examine; torture”), a much better-attested word, for which the forms βασιανίζε (Gk. βασιανίζω) and βασιανος (Gk. βάσανος) are well attested in Coptic Manichaean sources. Nevertheless, the meaning of the passage remains obscure regardless of the restoration preferred (Säve-Söderbergh 1949, 95n2; Nagel 1980, 64n9).

¹¹⁷*Keph.* 208.21–23.

¹¹⁸M 2 I Ri.18 (“m’nyst’n’n”); M 4579.Rii.3 (“m’nyst’n (qdg)”); Koenen 1983, 99–101; cf. Utas 1985, 655–57. Koenen seems to believe that Manichaeans laid the foundation to monasteries as we now know them, while Utas takes a more conservative approach and speaks only of the “monasteries” as are attested in the sources, which seem to suggest that they served only as resting-places for traveling Elect and even simply as temples to worship at.

¹¹⁹For an overview of the myth in the Manichaean sources as well as the Nag Hammadi corpus, see, e.g., Stroumsa 1984, 145–67; cf. S. N. C. Lieu 1994b, 169–82; Tardieu 1981, 97–100. See, e.g., M 737.R1–4; *Keph.* 137.23–138.19. Theodor bar Khonai also provides a full account in his *Liber scholiorum* 11.59; Scher 1912, 2:313–18 (text); Hespel and Draguet 1982, 2:234–37 (translation).

¹²⁰See, e.g., *Serm.* 350F.1; *Haer.* 46.10.

¹²¹One of Mani’s seven canonical works, the others of which are his *Gospel*, *Pragmateia*, *Book of Mysteries*, *Book of the Giants*, *Epistles*, and *Psalms and Prayers*. This list is attested in Coptic, Arabic, Middle Persian, Sogdian, and Chinese sources, though *Hom.* seems to add the *Picture-Book* and Ibn an-Nadīm the *Šābuhragān*, a Persian handbook on Manichaeism written with Zoroastrian terminology, in their accounts of Mani’s Canon; for these lists, see, e.g., *Hom.* 25.1–6; *Keph.* 5.23–26; 355.8–15; *Ps.-Bk. II* 46.21–47.4; 139.54–61; *Fihrist* (Flügel 1871, 336); M 733.2–4; M 915.R3–V21. For the text of the *Fihrist*, see Flügel 1871; for M 915, see Haloun and Henning 1952, 206.

¹²²*The Treasury of Life* is preserved only in Latin quotation by Augustine: *Nat. bon.* 44 (part of which is quoted below) and *Fel.* 2.5.

the beautiful forms they see, and will so be dissolved. Know that our blessed Father is identical with these powers of his (*suae potestates*),¹²³ which, toward a necessary end, he transforms into the undefiled likenesses of boys and virgins and uses them as particular instruments, with which he accomplishes his will. . . . When reason demands that they appear before men, they show themselves in the form of beautiful virgins. On the other hand, when they are about to come before women, they remove the appearance of virgins and take on that of beardless boys, at which comely sight, ardor and concupiscence (*ardor et concupiscentia*) grow, and the prison of evil thoughts is broken, and the living soul (*vivaque anime*) which was held bound in their members is released and escapes and mingles with the purest air which is its native element.¹²⁴

This account of the myth, which interweaves cosmological explanations with the myth of the seduction of the archons, demonstrates that Augustine reproduces in *Haer.* 46.10 only such parts of the myth as are, without their surrounding context and cosmological underpinnings, especially scandalous to a reader presumably otherwise unfamiliar with Manichaeism. It is also evident that Augustine himself should have had a thorough enough understanding of the myth than one would think if looking at *Haer.* 46.10 in isolation. Augustine's polemicized portrayal of Manichaean myths is furthermore interesting to consider alongside his apparently false claims of Manichaean sectarianism and human semen–menstrual fluid Eucharist ritual, as he thus seems to present factual statements about Manichaean practices with different gradients of truth and falsity, the result of which is perhaps meant to make all of what he writes seem true.¹²⁵

¹²³In the citation of this myth by Theodor bar Khonai, the *hostiles potestates* refer to the archons, from whom light is drawn out, while the *potestates* of the blessed Father (i.e., the Father of the Lights) are understood as the Third Messenger and the Mother of Light, the former appearing in the sun and the latter in the moon. Furthermore, in bar Khonai's account of the myth, there does not seem to be any switching of sexes. See bar Khonai *Lib. Schol.* 11.59 (pp. 316.12–317.6 in Scher 1912) and the discussion in S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 17–19.

¹²⁴*Nat. bon.* 44 (trans. Burleigh, altered): Sciens (i.e., beatus Pater) eas omnes hostiles potestates, propter ingenitam sibi letalem et spurcissimam concupiscentiam facillime capi, atque iisdem speciebus pulcherrimis quae apparent mancipari, hocque modo dissolvi. Sciatis autem hunc eundem nostrum beatum patrem hoc idem esse, quod etiam suae virtutes, quas ob necessariam causam transformat in puerorum et virginum intemeratam similitudinem. Utitur autem his tamquam propriis armis, atque per eas suam complet voluntatem. . . . Itaque cum ratio poposcerit ut masculis appareant eadem sanctae virtutes, illico etiam suam effigiem virginum pulcherrimarum habitu demonstrant. Rursus cum ad feminas ventum fuerit, postponentes species virginum, puerorum investium speciem ostendunt. Hoc autem visu decoro illarum ardor et concupiscentia crescit, atque hoc modo vinculum pessimarum cogitationum earum solvitur, vivaque anima quae eorundem membris tenebatur, hac occasione laxata evadit, et suo purissimo aeri miscetur; Zycha 1892, 882–83 (text); Burleigh 2006, 344–345 (translation, altered). Augustine's entire commentary on this myth runs from cap. 44–47. Cap. 46 additionally preserves part of the *Epistula Fundamenti*, all the quotations of which text are collected in Feldmann 1987; Stein 2002.

¹²⁵Cf. Van Oort 2016a, 19–20. Van Oort takes as fact Augustine's statements about Manichaean "Catharists" in *Haer.* 46.9–10 and provides for comparison an interesting doctrinal summary of how Augustine "logically" develops the doctrine of the human semen Eucharist based on *Nat. bon.* 44–47. If Augustine has to rely on inference rather than reference, however, it is of my opinion that Augustine's text proves to be more fancy than fact.

To return, then, to the question of whether Augustine's knowledge of Manichaean texts should reflect upon the knowledge of Manichaeism ascribed to him, it seems the answer is less than straightforward. Augustine's report of an attested Manichaean cosmogonic myth is mixed with apparently fanciful claims of Manichaean sectarianism and licentiousness. Elsewhere, where Manichaeans have a chance to respond to Augustine's writings, one Manichaean auditor by the name of Secundinus, for instance, claims that his works read as if Augustine is "persecuting Hannibal and Mithridates under the name of Mani."¹²⁶ The danger for the historian thus easily becomes giving too much weight to the truths in accounts such as Augustine's report of the myth of the Seduction of the Archons in *Haer.* 46.9–10 or then to the falseness in his account of Manichaean sectarianism and sexual licentiousness in the same passage. What is evident, at any rate, is that Augustine's corpus is an invaluable source on Manichaeism, as his vast and varied oeuvre allows not only internal comparisons (e.g., comparing his various accounts of the Seduction of the Archons) but also external comparisons (e.g., with the Manichaean literature that survives). By making both forms of comparisons, I attempt to provide a critical account of the evidence for the historical practices of the Manichaean mission. In the following sections, I make use of this critical approach in comparing Augustine's claims about Manichaean missionary practices with the Manichaean evidence.

2.3. *Manichaean Missionary Tactics*

The following sub-sections investigate Manichaean missionary practices as attested in Augustine and compared with Manichaean sources. In most cases, the standard for comparison is that attestation must occur in both Augustinian and Manichaean sources. If attestation is found in Augustine but not in other Manichaean sources (as was, e.g., explored concerning his description of the so-called Catharist and Mattarian sectarians¹²⁷), Augustine's account falls under suspicion. Likewise, if attestation is found only in Manichaean sources and not in Augustine (as, e.g., may be the case with the Manichaean daily prayers¹²⁸), then either Augustine is being coy with his

¹²⁶*Secund.* 1.3: visus enim mihi . . . sub Manichaei nomine persequi te Hannibalem atque Mithridatem; Zycha 1892, 895 (text); Ramsey 2006, 359 (translation, slightly altered).

¹²⁷*Haer.* 46.10.

¹²⁸See notes 41 and 90 above.

knowledge of Manichaeans,¹²⁹ or it may simply be that practices differed in the Roman West from elsewhere.¹³⁰

In one curious instance, I even suggest a missionary practice not entirely attested either in Augustinian or in Manichaean sources, in part because Augustine seems unusually generous to Manichaeans and in part because of the hitherto unexplained Manichaean fascination with apocryphal texts relating to the disciples of Jesus generally and Thomas in particular.¹³¹

2.3.1. *Treatises and Public Debates*

The Manichaean practice of argument (διάλογος) seems to be a missionary practice well attested both during the time of Mani and in his missionary campaigns both to the east and the west.¹³² Augustine himself reports having had three debates with the Manichaean Elect, takes Manichaeans to task in his writings, and even thematizes Manichaean (missionary) rhetoric in his *Conf.* Furthermore, Manichaean arguments seem to have manifested in the form of door-to-door solicitations, though I am doubtful of the authenticity of this account.

Indeed, already Mani's missionary statements both speak about writings (MP/Pa. *nbyg 'n*; Copt. ⲛⲓⲣⲁⲫⲁⲅⲉ) and wisdom (MP *whyh*; Copt. ⲧⲥⲟⲫⲓⲁ), and debates equally feature in his early missionary history.¹³³ We are even told that Addā, the missionary Mani sends to the Roman West, makes writings (of which he also composes his own) and wisdom his weapon (MP/Pa. *zyn*) with which he defeats (MP *'ndrxt*) other religions in doctrinal disputes (MP *hmwg p(ty)k' 'r*; So. ⲡⲣⲃ'ⲣ 'ⲛⲓⲱⲛⲥ).¹³⁴ Most likely, such disputes were with religious officials (as, e.g., those between Fortnatus, Felix, and Faustus with Augustine, which took place after Augustine's ordination in 390), as Mani himself subscribed to a top-down approach to conversion, by which

¹²⁹As is the case with his account of the seduction of the Archons, for which see note 92 above.

¹³⁰This may well be the case, for instance, with Manichaean "monasteries," for which see section 2.3.7 below.

¹³¹See section 2.3.5 below.

¹³²CMC 79.15; 128.[7]; 138.2. Note the discrepancy with Clackson et al. 1998, 16, v. διάλογος, since I have followed the edition of Koenen and Römer 1988.

¹³³M 5794 I + M 5761 V.16–17; *Keph.* 371.20, 22–23, 26, 28; 372.11 (bis), 14, 17–18. See, e.g., Mani's debates with the Baptists (CMC 83.20–93.3) and his successful debate with a leader of an unspecified religious group in a village in the Sasanian Empire (CMC 137.2–140.6).

¹³⁴M 2 I Ri.3, 20, 25; M 1750 + M 216c V.9; S 13941 + S 14285 V.8. A similar account, albeit with a polemical angle, is told in *Act. Arch.* 63.5–6. While it cannot be absolutely certain that the writings (*nbyg 'n*) referred to here are those used for (protreptic) missionary use rather than for paraenetic purposes (i.e., for those who had already converted to Manichaeism), the evidence available surrounding Addā's works (i.e., their reception by Titus of Bostra and Augustine, for which see below) would seem to suggest that they were indeed of polemical nature.

he tried to convert a king in order that the king would convert his kingdom; likewise, it seems that Mani's missionaries attempted to convert religious officials in order that they would, in turn, convert their congregation.¹³⁵ The title of at least one of Addā's writings, his Μόδιος ("Vessel"; cf. Matt 5:14–15; Mark 4:21–25; Luke 8:16–18), from which I draw the title of this thesis, survives in the *Contra Manichaeos* of a certain Heraclion, then bishop of Chalcedon, via Photius's *Bibliotheca*, and may or may not have been the same text Augustine refuted in his *Adim*.¹³⁶ There may also have been a bishop Thomas,¹³⁷ an abbot Mani (So. m'ny m'ny-st'nd'r'k),¹³⁸ or a teacher Pattēg (Pa. [ptyg] (')mwcg; So. pty mwz-'k')¹³⁹ that may have joined bishop Addā (Pa. 'd' 'spsg; So. 't' 'βt'δn) to Egypt and who would then have helped in Addā's mission in some way, though there would not seem to be corroboration of this fact in non-Manichaean sources.¹⁴⁰ Alternatively, the sources do not necessarily say that these figures,

¹³⁵Mani's relationship with Shāpūr I of the Sasanian Empire attests to this fact; see, e.g., the discussion in S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 75–78; S. N. C. Lieu 2015, 125–30.

¹³⁶*Bibl.* 85.65b.11–16 (text: Henry 1960, 2:9–10); *Retract.* 1.22.1–2. On the unusual title of the Modion, see S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 91–92; Van den Berg 2010, 200–203. Augustine only refers to this text as *quaedam disputationes Adimanti*, so it cannot be certain which text he disputes; indeed, Richard Lim is too eager on this basis to see a connection between *Adim.* and the Μόδιος (Lim 1992, 238–39). Pedersen 2004, 183, furthermore doubts that there is any connection at all, arguing that, based on the description given in Photius, Adimantus's *disputationes* does not have anything to do with Mani's *Living Gospel*. The premise of this claim, it should be noted, seems in my opinion to be mistaken, as Photius does not claim that Adimantus's Μόδιος has anything to do with Mani's *Living Gospel*, but simply that Hegemonius thought (οἶετα) he was countering (ἀνατρέπειν) Mani's *Living Gospel* in his *Act. Arch.* when he was simply refuting Addā's Μόδιος all along. This does not mean that Addā's Μόδιος had anything to do with the *Living Gospel* but simply shows Hegemonius's confusion. On the claim that Addā was further responsible for a teaching on anthropogeny, refuted in Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos* 3.4–5, as well as being the author of both codices of the *Kephalaia* from Medinat Madi (though this latter claim is not given much evidence), see Van den Berg 2010, 203–11; cf. Pedersen 2004, 190–99.

¹³⁷Thomas's presence in Egypt seems to be corroborated by Alexander of Lycopolis, a Neo-Platonist, in his *Πρὸς τὰς Μανιχαίων δόξας* 4.19, which also happens to be the earliest attested refutation of Manichaeism; Brinkmann 1895. On the other hand, the Thomas of Manichaean repute is rather associated with the missionary journey to India, for which, see, e.g., *Ps-Bk. II* 192.15; cf. Richter 1994, 205–6.

¹³⁸M 1750 + M 216c R.11; So 13941 + 14285 V.5–6. This is almost certainly a different Mani from the eponymous Mani of Manichaeism. In the Pathian source, this Mani is referred to as [m](')ny dbyr ("Mani the writer"), though this probably has something to do with the copying of texts at m'nysī'n'h.

¹³⁹So 13941 + 14285 V.5, [11–12]. A certain Παττίκιος ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ("Pattēg the master"), whom Sundermann argues should be understood as Mani's father who is also named Pattēg, is also met in CMC 89.7–8; 100.20–22; 140.12–13; Sundermann 1981, 56n4; cf. Römer 1994, 148. According to Sundermann, this is also the same Pattēg we meet in the Parthian M 4575 Rii.4, (p)tyg ms'dr ("Pattēg the bishop"). Based on a comprehensive survey of sources on Pattēg, however, Gardner and Rasouli-Narimani (2017) now propose that Pattēg the father of Mani (though Gardner and Rasouli-Narimani doubt the historical veracity of this alleged parentage), Pattēg the recipient of Mani's letters, and Pattēg the teacher cited here are all different persons. A great teacher (πῆλας νῆαξ) is met also in P.KellisCopt. 20.24 and may potentially be the same person, or at least hold the same office, referred to in P.KellisCopt. 24.17; 25.42, 49; 29.14; 30.3; 52.4; 61.1. On my proposal of the role the Teacher played in training the young Elect, see chapter 3 below.

¹⁴⁰On the role of teachers, bishops, and "householders," knowledge of which largely comes from the Turfan fragments, as well as an etymological discussion of their names in the attested sources, see the excellent study in Leurini 2013, 159–220. The closest parallel in non-Manichaean sources to the Iranian texts discussed above that

training to be an orator, he came across Cicero's *Hortensius* (45 BC), which scintillated in him a "longing for the immortality that wisdom (*sapientia*) seemed to promise."¹⁴⁷ This pursuit for wisdom and rhetoric, he claims, was part of God's divine plan to direct him toward Christianity, but, it also proved to be an obstacle: "when I studied the Bible and compared it with Cicero's dignified prose, it seemed to me unworthy. My swollen pride recoiled from its style (*modum*) and my intelligence failed to penetrate to its inner meaning (*interiora*)."¹⁴⁸ Disappointed by the lack of style and apparent inanity of the scriptures compared to Cicero, Augustine fell instead into the Manichaeans, whose "mouths were diabolical snares" (cf. 1 Tim 2:7; 6:9; 2 Tim 2:26), and by whom he would be encouraged to teach the art of rhetoric.¹⁴⁹ Augustine thus claims that, whereas the Vetus Latina translation of the Bible had failed to evidence good rhetorical style and depth, Manichaeans succeeded.

What follows from there, Augustine claims, is an entire philosophical evolution before he is able to return to the Christian scriptures. Augustine's philosophical journey begins with the Academics (who "recommended universal doubt, announcing that no part of the truth could be understood by the human mind"), from whom he move on to the works of "scholars who disagreed among themselves," including those of Epicurus (who, Augustine says, would have won the debate between him and his friends on the topic of good vs. evil except that Augustine believed, unlike Epicurus, that "after death life remains for the soul"), the Neo-Platonists (from whom he learns about the divine origins of Logos), and finally to Paul (who teaches him to "put on" Christ; cf. Rom 13:13–14).¹⁵⁰ Whether or not this evolution is to be trusted, Augustine's

¹⁴⁷*Conf.* 3.3.6, 4.7: immortalitatem sapientiae concupiscebam aestu cordis incredibili; Verheijen 1981, 30 (text); Rotelle 2008, 80 (translation); cf. *Nat. bon.* 14 for a similar report.

¹⁴⁸*Conf.* 3.5.9: cum attendi ad illam scripturam, sed visa est mihi indigna, quam Tullianae dignitati compararem. Tumor enim meus refugiebat modum eius et acies mea non penetrabat interiora eius; Verheijen 1981, 31 (text); Rotelle 2008, 81 (translation).

¹⁴⁹*Conf.* 3.4.8 (text: Verheijen 1981, 30; translation: Rotelle 2008, 80): Quomodo ardebam, Deus meus, quomodo ardebam revolare a terrenis ad te, et nesciebam quid ageres mecum! Apud te est enim sapientia. Amor autem sapientiae nomen graecum habet philosophiam, quo me accendebant illae litterae. Sunt qui seducant per philosophiam magno et blando et honesto nomine colorantes et fucantes errores suos ("How ardently I longed, O my God, how ardently I longed to fly to you away from earthly things! I did not understand then how you were dealing with me. Wisdom resides with you, but love for wisdom is called by the Greek name, "philosophy," and this love it was that the book kindled in me. There are people who lead others astray under the pretense of philosophy, coloring and masking their errors under that great, fair, honorable name"); 3.6.10 (text: Verheijen 1981, 31): in quorum ore laquei diabolic; 4.2.2.

¹⁵⁰*Conf.* 5.10.19 (text: Verheijen 1981, 68; translation: Rotelle 2008, 128): quod de omnibus dubitandum esse censuerant nec aliquid veri ab homine comprehendi posse decreverant; 6.5.7 (text: Verheijen 1981, 78; translation: Rotelle 2008, 142): confligentium philosophorum, 16.26 (text: Verheijen 1981, 90; translation: Rotelle 2008, 157): Et disputabam cum amicis meis Alypio et Nebridio de finibus bonorum et malorum. Epicurum accepturum fuisse palmam in animo meo, nisi ego credidissem post mortem restare animae vitam et tractus

presentation at least emphasizes the fact that Manichaean “wisdom” (perhaps even simply “rhetoric” can be understood here) was such that a whole sequence of philosophers were required to untangle it before he could finally be brought back to Christianity.¹⁵¹ Elsewhere, Augustine also discusses the logical sequence by which the naïve are lured into the Manichaean belief system, the Manichaeans’ rhetorical strategy of sowing doubt rather than supplying affirmation, though this strategy is not attested in Manichaean sources and may be a heresiological invention.¹⁵²

Polemical reports (in P.Rylands 469 and Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Tim.*) also suggest that, besides public debates, Manichaeans might have engaged in door-to-door solicitations. The evidence used by J. Kevin Coyle and Samuel Lieu to prove this point is, however, rather suspicious to me, not only because the reports come from polemical sources but also because the context of these passages seems to me to suggest that Manichaeans are not engaging in door-to-door solicitations but rather simply penetrating into the daily lives of Christians, perhaps by first converting their wives (Gk. εἰσδύνοντας εἰς τὰς οἰκίᾱς; Ln. subintrantes domos mulieres subdolis et versutis verbis capiant).¹⁵³ However, if these reports are true, then this would be an unusual case of polemicists sticking to the facts.

meritorum, quod Epicurus credere noluit; 7.9.13 (text: Verheijen 1981, 101): quosdam Platonicorum libros; 8.12.29 (text: Verheijen 1981, 131): induite. On the remarkable parallel of this evolutionary development (except for Paul) in *Conf.* to Cicero’s philosophical works, see O’Donnell, 1992, 2:162–63.

¹⁵¹Cf. O’Meara 1954, 57–58.

¹⁵²See, e.g., *Fund.* 14.18 (text: Zycha 1891, 211; translation: Ramsey 2006, 246): offundit (i.e., Manichaeus) nebulas imperitis; primum pollicens rerum certarum cognitionem, et postea incertarum imperans fidem (“he [i.e., Mani] befogs the ignorant, first promising them knowledge of certainties and afterward asking for belief in uncertainties”); *Agon.* 4.4 (text: Zycha 1900, 106): Sed illi quando capiunt homines, non ista prius dicunt; quae si dicerent, riderentur, aut fugerentur ab omnibus: sed eligunt capitula de Scripturis, quae simplices homines non intellegunt; et per illa decipiunt animas imperitas, quaerendo unde sit malum (“But when they are deceiving men, they do not speak of these earlier things [i.e., about how light came to be mixed with matter]; for if they were to, they would be ridiculed, or else rejected by everyone: but they pick out chapters from the Scriptures, which naïve men do not understand, and, through them, they deceive inexperienced soul, with wondering about the origin of evil”); cf. *Conf.* 3.7.12. On *Agon.* 4.4, cf. *Sermo* 350F.1, translated in Appendix A.

¹⁵³P.Rylands 469.29–35 (text and translation: Roberts 1938, 3:42–43): ταῦτα ὡς προεῖπον ἐν συντόμῳ παρεθέμην ἀπὸ τοῦ παρε[μ]πυρόντος ἐγγράφου τῆς μανίας τῶν Μανιχέων ἵν’ ἐπιτηρῶμεν τοὺς ἐν ἀπάταις καὶ λόγοις ψεύδεσι εἰσδύνοντας εἰς τὰς οἰκίας καὶ μάλιστα τὰς λεγομένας παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἐκλεκτὰς ἅς ἐν τιμῇ ἔχουσιν διὰ τὸ δηλονότι χρῆζειν αὐτοὺς τοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀφένδρου αἵματος αὐτῶν εἰς τὰ τῆς μανίας αὐτῶν μυσάγματα (“As I said before, I have cited this in brief from the document of the madness of the Manichaeans that fell into my hands, that we may be on our guard against these who with deceitful and lying words steal into our houses, and particularly against those women whom they call ‘elect’ and whom they hold in honour, manifestly because they require their menstrual blood for the abominations of their madness”); Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Tim.* 2.3.7.tit–1 (text: Vogels 1969, 312): Semper discentes et numquam ad scientiam veritatis pervenientes. Quamvis omnibus hereticis hoc conveniat, ut subintrantes domos mulieres subdolis et versutis verbis capiant, ut per eas viros decipiant more patris sui diaboli, qui per Evam Adam circumvenit, Manicheis tamen prae ceteris congruit (“Those who are always learning and never coming upon the knowledge of truth: although this title could befall all heretics, as those who penetrate into our

From the above review, it thus seems that both Augustinian and Manichaean sources equally and widely corroborate an active missionary practice of treatise-writing and debate. Augustine's thematization of Manichaean rhetoric in *Conf.* is particularly noteworthy in this case, as it suggests that the Manichaean use of rhetoric was such a staple of the mission as to be productively turned into a theme for the sake of a work that Augustine intended to prove his innocence in the face of accusations that he was a crypto-Manichaean.¹⁵⁴ Furthermore, some scholars suggest that Manichaeans also engaged in door-to-door missionary soliciting, though, in my reading, the evidence for this practice is not secure.

2.3.2. *Command of Languages*

The linguistic range of Manichaeans is attested not least by the wide range of literary and documentary texts found in Latin, Greek, Syriac, Coptic, Chinese, Parthian, Middle Persian, Sogdian, Bactrian, Khotanese, and Uyghur. Mani's missionary statement further emphasizes the superiority of his religion both in that his is a panlingual religion and that his canonical writings have been written down.¹⁵⁵ Augustine's knowledge of Mani's canon, originally written in Syriac, and quotations from and reference to his canonical writings further demonstrate that religious

houses take hold of our women with sly and crafty words, so that, through these women, they might deceive their husbands in the manner of the devil, their father, who defrauded Adam through Eve, —in spite of this, the title accords with the Manichaeans above all others"). For the interpretation of the texts that understands Elect women as door-to-door solicitors in P.Rylands 469.32–35 and door-to-door solicitations by Manichaeans in general in *Comm. Tim.* 2.3.7.1, see S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 126; Coyle 2009a, 195–96. Perhaps this notion comes from a similar source as, e.g., Lucian's lampooning of Cynic beggars who engage in door-to-door solicitations (ἐπιφοιτῶντες) for daily sustenance; *Fug.* 14. My own understanding of these two texts, especially in light of *Comm. Tim.* 2.3.7.1, is perhaps that the Manichaeans attempted to convert (or simply ended up converting) women first, who would then attempt to convert their husbands; additionally, a more conservative approach to P.Rylands 469.29–35 would simply be to understand τοὺς εἰσδύοντας εἰς τὰς οἰκίᾳς not as door-to-door solicitations but as the incursion of a foreign religion into one's daily life and ἵν' ἐπιτηρῶμεν . . . μάλιστα τὰς λεγομένας παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐκλεκτὰς not as a comment that Elect women engage in missionary solicitations but rather that one should simply be on guard against female elect above all. At any rate, these texts seem to be rather mixed up in misogynistic language (particularly P.Rylands 469, which later suggests that the Elect women solicit in order to acquire menstrual fluid for a Manichaean ritual unspecified in the text, but doubtless the same ritual referred to, e.g., in Aug., *Haer.* 46.9), on which see the discussion in section 2.3.6 below; see also the discussion on the consumption of human semen and menstrual fluid in section 2.2 above.

¹⁵⁴On the multiple accusations of Augustine as a Manichaean well after his conversion to Christianity and the composition of his *Conf.* in response to such accusations, see BeDuhn 2009.

¹⁵⁵See discussion in section 2.1 above.

(and rhetorical) literature had been readily translated for the purposes of the Manichaean mission.¹⁵⁶

Furthermore, the material from Kellis (mid–late fourth century CE, Dakheleh Oasis, ca. 250 km due west of modern-day Luxor) gives attestation to Syriac–Coptic, Syriac–Greek, and Greek–Latin bilingual texts,¹⁵⁷ in addition to the some intriguing instructions for a boy, possibly a missionary-in-training, from his father, Makarios, to exercise his Coptic and Greek and, separately, about his learning Latin.¹⁵⁸ On the former attestation, there is even a possibility that the instructions were to practice his conjugation of verbs. In the letters, we read, after a brief list of texts titles, “Here too, the $\bar{\nu}\rho\eta\mu\alpha$ are with you: study them! Here are the $\bar{\nu}\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$. Write a little from time to time, more and more. Write a daily examples ($\omicron\upsilon\tau\gamma\pi\omicron\varsigma$), for I need you to write books here.”¹⁵⁹ Since this passage follows a list of titles and is later followed by another list,¹⁶⁰ the editors take $\bar{\nu}\rho\eta\mu\alpha$ and $\bar{\nu}\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ as titles, meaning *Sayings* ($\bar{\nu}\rho\eta\mu\alpha$) and *Prostrations* ($\bar{\nu}\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$), though neither term is attested as a title in Greek or Coptic Manichaean sources; the editors nevertheless suggest that these titles are reminiscent of the Manichaean daily prayers.¹⁶¹ Alternatively, these words can be taken to mean “verb” ($\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha$) and “conjugation/declension” ($\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$), the denotation of which is well attested in Greek grammar books.¹⁶² Thus, the

¹⁵⁶See, e.g., *Fel.* 1.14; *Faust.* 13.18; *Nup.* 2.50; *Nat. bon.* 42. On Faustus’s background in Cicero and Seneca, see *Conf.* 5.6.11. On Mani’s canonical writing, see section 2.3.1 and notes 121 and 124 above. All of Mani’s writings except for the *Šābuhragān*, written in Middle Persian, were composed in Syriac.

¹⁵⁷See T.KellisSyr/Copt 1 and 2, both apparently glossaries, P.KellisSyr/Gk. 1, a fragmentary text of apparently religious nature, and P.KellisGk. 26; for the Syriac bilinguals, see their revised editions in Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 344–59. See also the posthumously published review in Papaconstantinou and Clackson 2010, 89–92; cf. S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 117–18.

¹⁵⁸P.KellisCopt. 19.13–14 (text: Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 157): $\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \bar{\nu}\eta[\epsilon\kappa]\psi\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\gamma\tau\epsilon\ \bar{\nu}\rho\eta\mu\alpha\ \epsilon\gamma\tau\epsilon\ \bar{\nu}\rho\eta\mu\alpha\ \epsilon\gamma\tau\epsilon\ \bar{\nu}\rho\eta\mu\alpha$; 20.24–26 (text: Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 167): $\alpha\ \pi\eta\alpha\varsigma\ \nu\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda[\iota\omicron\upsilon\upsilon]\ \epsilon\mu\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\ \tau\pi\epsilon\upsilon\chi\omicron\mu\epsilon\ \alpha\ \mu\eta\tau\epsilon\ \rho\omega\mu\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$. On the matter context of training missionaries from childhood onwards, see chapter 3 below.

¹⁵⁹P.KellisCopt. 19.17–19: $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \bar{\nu}\rho\eta\mu\alpha\ \alpha\ \nu\ \gamma\alpha\tau\eta\kappa\ \alpha\ \rho\iota\ \mu[\epsilon]\lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \bar{\nu}\mu\alpha\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \bar{\nu}\kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\zeta\ \gamma\eta\kappa[\omicron\upsilon\gamma\iota\ \epsilon]\bar{\nu}\ \gamma\eta\bar{\nu}\sigma\alpha\pi\ \sigma\alpha\pi\ \bar{\nu}\rho\omicron\gamma\omicron\ \bar{\nu}\rho\omicron[\gamma\omicron]\ \epsilon\zeta\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\gamma\pi\omicron\varsigma\ \bar{\nu}\mu\eta\eta\epsilon\ \chi\epsilon\ \dagger\bar{\nu}\chi\pi\iota[\alpha\ \mu\mu]\alpha\kappa\ \alpha\ \epsilon\zeta\ \gamma\eta\bar{\nu}\chi\omega\mu\epsilon\ \bar{\nu}\rho\eta\mu\alpha$; Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 157 (text), 160 (translation, altered).

¹⁶⁰P.KellisCopt. 19.82–84 (trans. Gardner et al.): $\epsilon\omega\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\tau\alpha\mu\omicron\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\gamma\pi\iota\alpha\ \nu\alpha\ \dagger\ \pi\eta\alpha\varsigma\ \nu\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda[\iota\omicron\upsilon\upsilon]\ \epsilon\mu\iota\varsigma\ \bar{\nu}\eta\mu\epsilon\kappa\ \epsilon\omega\omega\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\bar{\mu}\bar{\mu}\alpha\ \nu\ \mu\eta\ \pi\epsilon\chi\omega\mu\ \mu\eta\ \tau\kappa\pi\iota\varsigma\ \bar{\nu}\pi\epsilon\tau\pi\omicron\varsigma$ (“If my mother Kouria will give the great [*Book of Epistles*], bring it with you. If not, bring the small one, with the *Prayer-Book* and the *Judgement of Peter*”); Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 159 (text), 162 (translation). It should be noted that this last text, the *Judgement of Peter*, is unknown in other sources.

¹⁶¹Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 163n17.

¹⁶²This alternative interpretation is suggested by Gardner, notably with less much skepticism than in the commentary to this passage he co-edited, in Gardner 2011b, 256n26; cf. Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 163n207. See also pp. 253–258 for the ritual Manichaean prayer involving prostrations. Just in a single-word proximity search, for instance, for the phrases $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (“decelension of a verb”) and $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon\mu\ \kappa\lambda\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (“conjugation of verbs”) on *TLG* (<http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/>) yielded results from three texts that antedate this letter: Dionysius

exhortation to write a “daily example” (ϥ̅ϥ̅ ⲟϥ̅ϥ̅ϥ̅ⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ⲙⲙⲏⲛ̅) could well refer to the mastery of whatever verbs Makarios has provided his son. This interpretation would at least fit well in the context of the linguistic capacity of Manichaeans.

In favor of this interpretation is a wooden board (inv. #D/2/44) with a list of Greek verbs found in the temple of Tutu, located on the western edge of the archaeological site. This wooden board is written with what Worp describes as “a well-trained hand” and is found together in the same room with a papyrus (inv. #D/2) that lists similar verbs but seems to have been written by “an untrained scribe.”¹⁶³ While the connection between these two texts is obscure and the papyrus is indeed rather fragmentary, it is possible that they belong to a common setting in which instruction on the conjugation of Greek verbs was given by a teacher (= the well-trained hand) to a student (= the untrained scribe). If this was a common or somehow memorable feature of Greek education in Kellis, this would perhaps explain the rather oblique allusion to verb conjugations in P.KellisCopt. 19.

Overall, command of various languages was clearly a central tool for the Manichaean mission, as it facilitated the rapid spread of the religion by the mid–late 3rd century. It also happens to be another of the Manichaean missionary practices that is well attested in the sources, Manichaean and otherwise, manifesting, for instance, in Augustine’s quotations of Mani’s canonical writings (originally written in Syriac) in Latin. In this sub-section, I have additionally suggested that the Kellis archive now perhaps provides two concrete examples of the training of Coptic-speaking residents in Greek. In the case of P.KellisCopt 19, the practice of Greek is related to a missionary trainee discussed further in chapter 3.

2.3.3. Manichaean New Testament Exegesis

Much of the evidence surrounding Manichaean New Testament¹⁶⁴ Exegesis in Augustine comes directly from his debates with the Manichaean Elect and seems to be fundamentally

Thyrax’s *Ars Grammatica* (2nd century BCE) 1.1.53.6, Apollonius Dyscolus’s *De adverbis* (2nd century CE) 2.1.150.2, from Aelius Herodianus, *περὶ παθῶν* (2nd century CE); on the authenticity of this work by Herodianus, see Dickey 2014, 338. Despite Gardner’s note, this interpretation was arrived at independently during the second annual Furubo Coptic camp in Ytterresse, Finland, with Antti Marjanen and Ivan Miroshnikov.

¹⁶³Hope and Worp 2006, 254–57.

¹⁶⁴Although the Manichaeans did not recognize the authenticity of the Old Testament and in fact rejected several parts of the New Testament as we know it today, on which see further, I use the term “New Testament” as a convenient reference point for the modern-day reader rather than as a historical claim about how Manichaeans understood the New Testament.

rooted in the notion that the New Testament became corrupt because it was never written down by the disciples themselves.¹⁶⁵ Given the appeals by Manichaean missionaries in Iran to Zoroastrianism, it seems clear that New Testament exegesis was correspondingly tailored to the Roman Empire, where Christianity had become dominant by the end of the fourth century.¹⁶⁶ Furthermore, this approach to scriptural texts of questionable canonicity is clearly rooted in Mani's missionary claim that his writings had, unlike all other religions until his own, been written down with undisputed authority.¹⁶⁷

It was precisely this weakness (i.e., its lack of canonicity) in Judeo-Christian tradition upon which Manichaeans attempted to capitalize, though Augustine himself claims not to have found these arguments compelling.¹⁶⁸ The exact nature of this argument seems to be explicated in Augustine's debates with Faustus, each chapter of which comprises an exegetical debate; in the final point reported of Faustus's arguments, Faustus justifies the Manichaean practice of choosing to accept some of the New Testament while rejecting others. Discussing the pericope of Jesus's healing of a centurion's servant (Matt 8:5–13; Luke 7:1–10), Faustus claims that Jesus's vision of "Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt 8:11), which does not appear in Luke, was interpolated by the "semi-Jewish" (*semi-Iudaei*) redactors of the New Testament, those who took "rumors and opinions" (*famae opinionisque*) and merely "imposed on them the names of the Lord's apostles and of those who were thought to have followed the apostles."¹⁶⁹ By interpolating these names to the New Testament, these semi-Jews were said to have attempted to justify the evils of the patriarchs, whose sinful acts are shamelessly and openly detailed in the Old Testament. On this point, it should be noted that Manichaeans are thought to

¹⁶⁵Supposedly, Marcion had a similar idea about the NT, though his exact argumentation does not survive—see J. Lieu 2015, 414–17; on Marcion's possible influences on Manichaeism, at least as reported by Augustine, see also section 2.3.4.2 below.

¹⁶⁶Hutter 2000, 313–18.

¹⁶⁷See discussion in section 2.1 above.

¹⁶⁸*Conf.* 5.11.21 (text: Verheijen 1981, 69; translation: Rotelle 2008, 130): Et imbecilla mihi responsio videbatur istorum; quam quidem non facile palam promebant, sed nobis secretius, cum dicerent Scripturas Novi Testamenti falsatas fuisse a nescio quibus, qui Iudaeorum legem inserere christianae fidei voluerunt, atque ipsi incorrupta exemplaria nulla proferrent. ("The Manichees' reply seemed feeble to me, and they were understandably disinclined to bring it out openly, preferring to give it to us in private. They alleged that the New Testament writings had been falsified by some unknown persons bent on interpolating the Christian faith with elements of the Jewish law"). The context of this passage is a private debate held between an unnamed Manichaean and a certain otherwise unknown Christian by the name of Elpidus.

¹⁶⁹*Faust.* 33.1–3 (text: Zycha 1891, 788; translation: Ramsey 2007, 427): qui tamen omnia eadem in apostolorum domini conferentes nomina, vel eorum qui secuti apostolos viderentur. For Faustus's impressive styling of Moses, Abraham, Lot, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, David, Solomon, Hosea as outright sexual and moral deviants, see *Faust* 22.5; cf. 10.1; 20.3.

have rejected the Old Testament altogether—in doing so, they would have additionally fulfilled the third general precept of Mani’s mission statement highlighted above, namely that Manichaeism was a religion that, unlike Christianity, which combined Old Testament with New, held to logical standards that demanded the rational cohesion of their scriptures.¹⁷⁰ Faustus concludes his discussion with the following statement:

It is not without merit that we never listen to such passages from the scriptures (e.g., Matt 8:11), which are so discordant and different (*inconsonantes et varias*), without exercising judgment (*iudicio*) and using our reason (*ratione*). Rather, considering (*contemplantes*) them all and comparing (*conferentes*) them with one another, we weigh whether or not Christ could have said any of them. For many things that bear his name but do not agree with his faith have been inserted into our Lord’s sayings by your predecessors.¹⁷¹

This remarkable conclusion, which stems from the relative lack of canonicity on the part of the New Testament, would thus enable Manichaeans to pick and choose from the New Testament based on their own reason (*ratio*) and judgement (*iudicium*). Faustus even demonstrates the flexibility of this criterion by following up that, even if Matt 8:11 “is authentic (*verum*), it commends to us Christ’s mercy and goodness, and, if it is an interpolation (*falsum*), the crime belongs to its authors. Either way we are safe, as always.”¹⁷² Some other applications of this picking-and-choosing of Manichaeans include the rejection of the whole of the Acts of the Apostles and the rejection of any physical descriptions that implied that Christ was anything other than a spiritual being.¹⁷³

¹⁷⁰By rejecting the Old Testament, Manichaeans also saw themselves as the true Christians, according to which they adhered to Jesus’s analogy, that a new patch (= Gospels) not be sewn onto an old garment (= Jewish laws) (Matt 9:16; Mark 2:21; Luke 5:36); *Faust.* 3.1; see also S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 154–59; Böhlig 2013, 40–42. On the general precept of Mani’s mission statement concerning rational cohesion, see discussion in section 2.1 above. It should be noted that Funk 2009, 122–26, now challenges the notion that Mani rejected the OT entirely, giving some examples of OT pericopes that are used analogously in a positive light in a Manichaean context and thus suggesting that the rejection of the OT may have been a later Manichaean development, as well as that Manichaeans may simply not have been in agreement about the authority of the OT. It is difficult to counter this claim until Funk has published the *editio princeps* of the *Synaxeis* codex, but it seems at least the Manichaeans that were in discussion with Augustine did not accept the authority of the OT. Some of the OT references now collected in Pedersen et al. 2017 (see esp. xxxv–xl for a description of the six OT text clusters found in the Manichaean corpus) perhaps support Funk’s claim and at least demonstrate thorough knowledge of the OT by Manichaeans, though Pedersen et al. 2017 does not attempt to address the question of whether or not this means that Manichaeans would have accepted the authority of the OT (xxiv–xxv).

¹⁷¹*Faust.* 33.3 (text: Zycha 1891, 788; translation: Ramsey 2007, 427): Nec immerito nos ad huiusmodi scripturas tam inconsonantes et varias, numquam sane sine iudicio ac ratione aures afferimus: sed contemplantes omnia, et cum aliis alia conferentes, perpendimus utrum eorum quidque a Christo dici potuerit necne. Multa enim a maioribus vestris eloquiis domini nostri inserta verba sunt, quae nomine signata ipsius cum eius fide non congruent.

¹⁷²*Faust.* 33.3 (text: Zycha 1891, 789; translation: Ramsey 2007, 427): sive est verum, Christi hic miseratio commendetur et bonitas; sive falsum, scriptoribus eius crimen inhaereat: nos utrovis modo in tuto sumus, ut semper.

¹⁷³On the rejection of the Acts of the Apostles, see, e.g., *Adim.* 17.1; *Faust.* 32.5; *Util. cred.* 3.7; *Fund.* 5.6; *Epist.* 236.2; *Haer.* 46.15–16. On the rejection of any physical description of Jesus, see, e.g., *Keph.* 12.20–13.10; *Ps.*-

The Manichaean understanding of the New Testament naturally extended to further exegeses of other passages and is well studied in Manichaean scholarship,¹⁷⁴ so I will reserve my own discussion to a brief examination of one instance, the Manichaean notion of the Kingdom of Light and Darkness and allusions thereto in the NT, referring as well to some other key points of Manichaean exegesis.¹⁷⁵ To explicate the Kingdom of Light and Darkness, Manichaeans seemed to have paid special note to the parable of the good and the bad tree (Matt 7:17–20; 12:33; Luke 6:43–45), a topic that even forms the discussion of *Kephalaï* II. Pointing to these biblical passages, Manichaeans would claim that, if only good fruit came from good trees, then likewise evil could not have come from a good God. This, they claimed, both justified the rejection of the Old Testament and related the passages to the Kingdoms of Light and Darkness, which these two trees were said to represent.¹⁷⁶ In *Keph.* II, this metaphor even explicates the five limbs of the bad tree, this first of which, “consideration” (πιδκμεκ), is “the law of death from which the sects take instruction.”¹⁷⁷ Some other points of exegesis include, for instance, the Manichaean take on the trinity (1 Tim 6:16; 1 Cor 1:24),¹⁷⁸ Pauline conceptions of the old and the new man (Rom 6:6; Col 3:9–10; Eph 2:14–16; 4:22–24),¹⁷⁹ and the two natures at war in man (e.g., Rom 7:5;

Bk. II 121.9–11; *M* 24.R8. On these, as well as the connection between docetic beliefs and Manichaeism, see section 2.3.4.1 below.

¹⁷⁴For further studies on Manichaean NT exegesis, see Sundermann 1968; Tardieu 1987, esp. pp. 134–140, where Tardieu attempts to reconstruct the rules for New Testament exegesis; Böhlig 2013, esp. pp. 35–64. Following the publication of Pedersen et al. 2017, work is still to be done on the New Testament quotations, which will eventually be published in this series, *Biblia Manichaica*, and will be a great help for the study of the Bible in Manichaeism.

¹⁷⁵These two pre-existing kingdoms are at the heart of Manichaean cosmogony and cosmology, the war between which gave rise to the world and the trapping of light in matter, an element of darkness. See, e.g., *Keph.* VI, XV, XXIII, LII, and LXIX. *Keph.* XXIII, e.g., reveals that nothing has been known to have existed before these two kingdoms. See also Heuser and Klimkeit 1998, 14–24.

¹⁷⁶Cf., e.g., *Ps.-Bk. II* 56.21; 136.20–21; *Hom.* 29.5; *Adim* 26; *Fort.* 1.14; *Felic.* 2.2. There may even a reference to the significance of these trees in Manichaeism in the pear theft episode of *Conf.* 2.4.9, on which, see, e.g., BeDuhn 2010, 1:39–41. This passage was likewise used by Marcion supposedly to justify dualistic principles; see, e.g., Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 1.2.1; 4.17 and the discussion below in section 2.4.2 on the possibility of Marcionite influences on Manichaeism in the reports of Augustine; cf. Coyle 2008a.

¹⁷⁷*Keph.* 21.28–31: [πε]ϣμ[ακμεκ πε] ϣνομος ππμ[ο]ϣ ετρε πλομ[α] χισωδ αραϣ; Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 21 (text); Gardner 1995, 26 (translation).

¹⁷⁸*Conf.* 3.6.10; *Faust.* 20.2; cf., e.g., *Ps.-Bk. II* 39.12, 49.29–30, 82.30–31, 87.11, 113.18, 115.7–116.18, 164.14–14, 186.3–12, 189.30, 190.25, 191.13. In 49.29–30 and 87.11, the holy spirit (ππππ ετοϣαβε) is specifically referred to as the paraclete (ππκκς); see, e.g., CMC 17.4–5; 46.2–3; 63.[21–22]; 70.[20–21]; cf. John 14:16. This connection is mentioned somewhat more explicitly in *Ps.-Bk. II* 116.2–3. See also Decret and Van Oort 2004, 55–58.

¹⁷⁹For comparisons to Manichaean sources and discussion, see Falkenberg 2016; Heuser and Klimkeit 1998, 74–76.

8:8–13).¹⁸⁰ Additionally, *Codex Tebessa* II–XI provides a wealth of New Testament quotations used to justify the distinction between the work of the Elect and that of the auditors.

From this review, it is evident that Manichaean New Testament exegesis, corroborated extensively both in Manichaean and anti-Manichaean sources, was used widely as a way of justifying Manichaean practices and beliefs to Christians and to convince Christians of the Manichaean meaning behind the New Testament. One central feature seems additionally to have been the attack on the canonicity of the New Testament with the allegation that semi-Jewish redactors had interpolated many false passages into the New Testament, for which reason these passages should be identified and rejected.

2.3.4. *Disputations: Old vs. New Testament Contradictions*

Another well documented feature of Manichaean polemical criticism, both in Augustinian and Manichaean sources, seems to be their attack on scriptural writings, especially—in the Roman West, at least—of the Old Testament.¹⁸¹ The general strategy—extensively reported in Augustine, especially in his *Adim.*, a refutation of such contradictions alleged by Addā—seems to have been to point out contradictions between Old and New Testament in a calculated effort to discredit the former, and, thus, any form of Christianity that accepted the Old Testament. In so doing, Manichaeans simultaneously attempted to show that they were the true Christians, rejecting the Old Testament according to Jesus’s own analogy that a new patch (= New Testament) not be sewn onto an old garment (= Old Testament).¹⁸² Furthermore, the consistency of the scriptures of a single religion is one of the general principles in Mani’s missionary statements that Mani himself determines makes Manichaeism superior to religions before him and was thus doubtless one of the reasons for the superiority of Manichaeism claimed by his missionaries.¹⁸³

¹⁸⁰For comparisons to Manichaean sources and discussion, see Böhlig 2013, 44–47.

¹⁸¹Two recent efforts to study this tactic, as represented by early Christian opponents, focus on the exchange between Adimantus (= Addā) and Augustine: Van den Berg 2010; Baker-Brian 2009; cf. S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 151–218. Nils Arne Pedersen and René Falkenberg are also preparing a 3-volume edition of Biblical quotations in Greek, Coptic, Syriac, Arabic, and Iranian Manichaean texts for the *CFM*, the culmination of their 3-yearlong project (2012–2015), “Biblia Manichaica—Reception and Transformation of the Bible in Manichaean Sources” at Aarhus University. The first volume has recently been published: Pedersen et al. 2017.

¹⁸²*Faust.* 3.1; cf. Matt 9:16; Mark 2:21; Luke 5:36; see also S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 154–59; Böhlig 2013, 40–42.

¹⁸³See discussion in section 2.1 above.

Among the Manichaean sources, we see some allusions to writing that may have concerned such contradictions, for instance, in a Middle Persian account of the Manichaean *Missionary History*.¹⁸⁴ In this text, Mani compels his disciples,¹⁸⁵ prior to their journey to Rome, to “become familiar with the writings (*nbyg’n*)!”—though this particular reference is just as likely to refer to Mani’s own scriptures.¹⁸⁶ According to this account,¹⁸⁷ Addā, one of Mani’s disciples, was sent westward, to the Roman Empire (*hrwm*), as a merchant (*w’c’rg’n*);¹⁸⁸ there,

Addā¹⁸⁹ laboured very hard . . . founded many monasteries (*ws m’nyst’n’n*),¹⁹⁰ chose (*wcyd*)¹⁹¹ many elect and hearers, composed writings (*nbyg’n*) and made wisdom (*why*) his weapon.¹⁹² He opposed the “dogmas” (*qyš’n*)¹⁹³ with these (writings), (and) in

¹⁸⁴Werner Sundermann has studied extensively the fragments (in Middle Persian, Parthian, Sogdian, and Uyghur) comprising this text in Sundermann 1986b; Sundermann 1986c; Sundermann 1987. For a chronology of the early mission and a comparison of the historical and geographical data across the various fragments, see Sundermann 1986c, 243–50.

¹⁸⁵On the possibility that Addā was accompanied by others already in this first journey, see the discussion of the Sogdian and Parthian parallels to this text in section 2.3.1 above.

¹⁸⁶M 2 I Ri.1: *nbyg’n’ndwš bwyd*; Andreas and Henning 1933, 301 (text); Gardner and Lieu 2004, 111 (translation). Nothing before these first three words survives, so the context of this statement is not completely clear. Nevertheless, these disciples who are sent to the Roman Empire (i.e., Addā and Pattēg) are said to witness “doctrinal disputes” (MP *hmwg p(ty)k’r*; So. *prβ’r’nywnch*), which would be incomprehensible unless they were familiar with the scriptures of those other religions; M 2 I Ri.3; S 13941 + S 14285 V.8 (Boyce 1975, 39; Sundermann 1981, 36). At any rate, “writing” (*nbyg*) seems to be well-attested both in the general meaning of “writing” and as sacred scriptures of Manichaeans and non-Manichaeans alike; see Durkin-Meisterernst and Sims-Williams 2004, s.v. *nbyg*.

¹⁸⁷For its Parthian parallel (M 1750 + M 216c), see Sundermann 1981, 25–26; for its Sogdian parallel (So 14285), Sundermann 1981, 34–36. For translations, see Klimkeit 1993, 202–3; Gardner and Lieu 2004, 112. While the Sogdian parallel is the most detailed, the Parthian text is fragmentary and the Middle Persian text, which I have selected here, the most concise.

¹⁸⁸On the use of established trade routes by merchants-proselytizers of the Manichaean mission, see the discussion in section 2.3.7 below.

¹⁸⁹In the Sogdian text, Addā performs all these acts jointly with Pattēg—perhaps the same as the father of Mani and one of the twelve teachers, who joins Addā in Rome for one year—and an abbot whose name happens to be Mani (So13941 + So14285 V.5–12); cf. Gardner and Rasouli-Narimani 2017. This is assumed to be the case as well in the MP text in Klimkeit 1993, 202.

¹⁹⁰References to monasteries, as here, in the Turfan collection (e.g., M 36 R.1, V.14; M 1750 + M 216c V.6; M 67 Vii.4, 6, 15) has led many scholars to conclude that there must have existed a vast monastic network between and within Egypt and Syria; see Koenen 1983, 96–102, 106. Iain Gardner has himself sought to secure references to monastic contexts, especially from the Kellis archive—i.e., P.KellisGk. 12.18: τὸ μοναστήριον; P.KellisCopt. 12.7: γενερε; P.KellisGr. 96: Τόπος Μανι(χαιων)—with mixed results; see, for instance, Gardner 2013, 304n50; cf. Pedersen 2012, 269–70. Nevertheless, there are too few archaeological data at the moment for scholars of Manichaeism to confirm the existence of such monasteries in the Roman Empire. On the possibility of such “monasteries” in the Roman West which may have been more resting-places for wandering Elect than permanent residences for ascetics, see further the brief discussion in section 2.3.7 below.

¹⁹¹While no agent is expressed with *wcyd* (“chosen”), it seems to be most natural to assume that Addā (and perhaps Pattēg) is the one who has done so; see Boyce 1960, 39n1.

¹⁹²On the basis of this text, the word wisdom is one possible restoration in the Parthian parallel, M 1750 + M 216C V.8–9, where it is then related to the rebuttal of other religions (*pswx (c)y dyn’n*); Sundermann 1981, 26.

¹⁹³A common word for religions other than Manichaeism in Manichaean sources. See Durkin-Meisterernst and Sims-Williams 2004, s.v. *qyš*; Clackson et al. 1998, 65–66, s.v. δόγμα.

everything he acquitted himself well.¹⁹⁴ He subdued and enchained the “dogmas” (*qyš ’n*).¹⁹⁵

The use of rational discourse (*whyh*) against (or with) writings (*nbyg ’n*) thus features prominently in Manichaeans’ own account of their missionary history.¹⁹⁶ If Addā subdued the Western dogmas (i.e., non-Manichaean religions) by means of any other more prominent method than disputations of Old Testament *versus* New Testament contradictions, none of the other texts or notions seem to have survived. Thus, the only viable conclusion, given the sources available, was that Addā’s supposed success in opposing forms of Christianity in the Roman West was chiefly by pitting Old Testament against New Testament pericopes.¹⁹⁷ It is perhaps to this sort of argumentation that Augustine himself reportedly succumbs to Manichaean proselytizers, “in whose mouths were diabolical snares . . . and they kept saying, ‘Truth, truth!’”¹⁹⁸

Manichaean use of scripture, comparing Old Testament with New Testament pericopes, is, furthermore, a well-attested source of Manichaean exegesis in Augustine, for which his debate *Contra Adimantum Manichaei discipulum* (*Adim.*) is the amplest source.¹⁹⁹ For this reason, I borrow the term “disputation” from what Augustine claims was the title of the work by Adimantus²⁰⁰—a student of Mani’s and likely the first Manichaean missionary active in the Roman West,²⁰¹ whose *Disputations* was the subject of Augustine’s refutation in *Adim.*—to

¹⁹⁴The Sogdian text (S 13941 + S 14285 R.15) additionally reports that Mani gave *prβ’yr ’ny-t’k* (“exhaustive instructions”) concerning how to associate with women; Sundermann 1981, 35 (text); Klimkeit 1993, 203 (translation). Unfortunately, this part of the text is rather fragmentary and thus does not provide the context surrounding this commandments.

¹⁹⁵M 2 I Ri.11–22 = MM ii.302: ’d’ . . . ws rz bwrđ. nš’sť ws m’nyst’n’n, wcyd prhyd wcydg’n ’wd nywš’g’n. kyrd nbyg’n ’wd whyy hs’xt’ zyn. pdyrg qyš’n rpt, ’b’g ’wyš’n pd hrwtys bwxt. sr’xšynd ’wd ’ndrxt ’w qyš’n; Sundermann 1981, 301–302 (text); Asmussen 1975, 21 (translation).

¹⁹⁶On *nbyg ’n*, see note above.

¹⁹⁷On the compositions of Addā, cf. also section 2.3.1 above. His *disputationes*, which would have collected these contradictions, is discussed further in this section.

¹⁹⁸*Conf.* 3.6.10: in quorum ore laquei diaboli . . . et dicebant, veritas et veritas; Verheijen 1981, 31 (text); Rotelle 2008, 82 (translation, slightly altered). For the argument that “truth” here refers to literal utterances of words meaning “truth” in, e.g., Manichaean homilies, divine epithets, and prayers, see Van Oort 1997, 238. Contra Van Oort, I see no reason why “truth” here cannot rather be understood as Manichaeans’ claims to be speaking the truth, e.g., about the Father of the Lights, who, in Manichaean belief, is the true God, or the truth that the OT and the NT stand in contradiction to one another. For the case that this passage in Augustine was likely directed protreptically at specifically Manichaean readers, see Kotzé 2008, 193–95; Kotzé 2011, 5–8.

¹⁹⁹See Appendices B and C for tables listing passages in Augustine’s corpus in which Manichaeans are said to pose Old Testament against New Testament pericope. A list of scholarship follows in Appendix B. Two recent monographs on *Adim.*—Baker-Brian 2009; Van den Berg 2010—were greatly helpful in this effort, but, as can be seen in the scholarship listed in Appendix B, do not cover all attested disputations.

²⁰⁰*Retract.* 1.22.1: quaedam disputationes Adimanti; Mutzenbecher 1984, 63 (text).

²⁰¹On the likely, though hotly debated, association of Adimantus with the Addā of, e.g., M 2 I and thus a direct disciple of Mani, see, e.g., Decret 1986; Gasparro 2000; S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 90–92. An overview of the scholarly debate is also given in Van den Berg 2010, 11–23.

mean Manichaean juxtapositions of Old and New Testament texts. In each chapter of *Adim.*, Augustine poses a disputation by Adimantus,²⁰² which he then refutes, arguing that the scriptural texts are in fact in harmony.²⁰³

Rather than recapitulating the analyses of Manichaean disputations, I refer instead to the relevant literature in the notes to the table in Appendix B. Additionally, in Appendix C, I have opted to arrange Manichaean disputations by the topic of their disputation, as opposed to the more theoretical lens of Baker-Brian—who organizes the disputations in *Adim.* to those on behavior, theology, and anthropology—and the descriptive categories of Decret—who organizes the disputations attributed to Adimantus that he is aware of into those dealing with the evils of God and the prophets of the Old Testament, with the crucifixion of Christ, and with the low morals of the Old Testament.²⁰⁴ This choice is deliberately made, as my purpose is not to study disputations attributed solely to the figure of Adimantus but to Manichaeans as a whole. Indeed, I see no reason why it has to be assumed that all Manichaean disputations derived from a single source (i.e., Adimantus), when Augustine refers to Manichaeans in general when rebutting their disputations.²⁰⁵ One drawback of this approach is that it fails to distinguish the disputations which are authentically Manichaean and those which Augustine himself may have invented.²⁰⁶ Nevertheless, I argue that it is worth considering the possibility that Augustine reports disputations similar enough to the Manichaean missionary tactic that they are worth studying in this perspective.

Indeed, looking at the table compiled in Appendix C, while the exact scriptural texts cited in the disputations do not always line up, even for those certainly from the same Manichaean sources,²⁰⁷ the argumentation of the thematically grouped disputations is very similar. In the case of *Adim.* 4 (Gen 4:10–12 vs. Mat 6:26, 34) and *Enarrat. Ps.* 145.13–14 (Ps 36:6 vs. 1 Cor 9:9), for instance, the scriptural proof-texts have great variation and even opposite points, yet Augustine poses a similar argument in either case. In *Adim.* 4, the disputation is between a

²⁰²*Adim.* 1–21. In cap. 22–28, Augustine’s references to Adimantus’s use of disputations and their exact argumentation become more obscure.

²⁰³The influence of Manichaean disputations might be seen, for instance, in the composition of Augustine’s later work *On the Harmony of the Gospels (Cons.)*.

²⁰⁴Baker-Brian 2009, 135–37; Decret 1978a, 96–100; Decret 1978b, 73n19–75n44. There are some points in which I disagree with Decret about what is considered a disputation; see, e.g., the note to *Adim.* 18.1–2 in Appendix B.

²⁰⁵See, e.g., *Gen Man.* 1.22.32–33; 2.13.19.

²⁰⁶This possibility is discussed below in section 2.3.4.1.

²⁰⁷Cf., e.g., the thematically similar but scripturally different disputations commonly discussed in *Adim.*

pericope that curses all life²⁰⁸ to barrenness as a result of Cain's fratricide (Gen 4:10–12) and one in which Jesus suggests to his disciples, by comparison to the fowl of the sky, that they need not worry about food (Matt 6:26, 34). In *Enarrat. Ps.* 145.13, the disputation is between a pericope in which God has blessed all manner of life (Ps 36:6) and one in which Paul seems to imply the God does not care about oxen (1 Cor 9:9). If the rhetorical similarities are not enough, Augustine even uses Matt 6:26, the NT proof-text of the disputation in *Adim.* 4, to prove his case in *Enarrat. Ps.* 145.14. Whether or not this link can establish a connection between Augustine's citation in *Enarrat. Ps.* 145.13–14 and the disputations of Adimantus is empirically unknowable and unprovable.²⁰⁹ Rather, my approach is more conservative in indicating that Manichaeans were somehow involved in Augustine's presentation of the disputations and that, if anything, it can be most securely said that the Manichaeans would most likely have given similar disputations on the same topic.

In the following sub-sections, I consider the disputations attested in *Serm.* 350F, a recently discovered text and thus one that has not yet received discussion in Anglophone Manichaean scholarship, then move on to the topic of the influence Marcion may have played in the formation of Manichaean disputations, using *Serm.* 170 as a point of comparison.

2.3.4.1. *Sermo 350F: An Example of Augustine's Appropriation of Manichaean Disputations*

Serm. 350F, on universal almsgiving, is among the sermons of Augustine recently discovered in Erfurt in an incomplete 12th-century manuscript of the *Bibliotheca Amploniana*.²¹⁰ The sermon, discussed in this context for the first time, seems to be one instance in which Augustine appropriates the Manichaean missionary practice of highlighting Old Testament *versus* New Testament contradictions for the sake of discoursing on a problematic Old Testament passage. This evidence puts the Manichaean disputations cited by Augustine (for which see Appendices B and C) into perspective, as they suggest that Augustine sometimes uses

²⁰⁸This is at least the argument according to Augustine. *Adim.* 4 (trans. Teske): *Evangelio contrarium demonstrare cupientes, non sane, mihi videntur cogitare cum hominibus se agere, sed prorsus quasi pecora forent, qui eos audirent vel eorum scripta legerent* ("In their desire to prove that it is contrary to the gospel, it certainly seems to me that they do not think that they are dealing with human beings; instead they act as if those who listened to them or read their writings were animals").

²⁰⁹Cf. Van den Berg 2010, 93–94, who attempts to do otherwise.

²¹⁰The text is published in Weber and Weidmann 2008; Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann 2009. *Serm.* 350F is also thus referred to as *Serm.* Erfurt 4. Since an English translation has not yet been made available, I have provided my own translation of this text with commentary, for which see Appendix A.

Manichaeans simply as a rhetorical tool for dealing with complex exegetical matters. Even if such disputations are inauthentic, however, I argue that they remain useful, as they demonstrate the Manichaean mindset when it comes to forming Old vs. New Testament disputations (see especially Appendix C for the similarity between Manichaean disputations and what seems to be Augustine's own inventions).²¹¹

The text of *Serm.* 350F is itself an expanded version of a previously known sermon (= *Serm.* 164A)²¹² and expounds on the merits of almsgiving for both the righteous and the unrighteous (*eleemosyna, misericordia, stips*).²¹³ The sermon itself begins with an accusation that Manichaean cosmology fosters a callous attitude toward almsgiving, in which the unrighteous are to be ignored.²¹⁴ Augustine then passes over this accusation and proceeds from there to untangle an Old Testament pericope (Sir 12:4, 6–7)²¹⁵ that seems to be in contradiction with a New Testament one (Gal 6:9–10).²¹⁶ In light of this disputation, as well as the relative newness of this text,²¹⁷ it is worth considering how Augustine exploits the Manichaean topos of disputation for the purposes of his discourse on almsgiving.

Little, unfortunately, can be said about the date of the sermon based on its contents, though the editors of the Erfurt texts propose a *terminus a quo* of 390 on the basis of Augustin's

²¹¹I have not attempted to determine, in Appendices B and C, exactly which disputations are authentic but have simply indicated in which instances it seems Augustine lays out a disputation he explicitly says comes from a Manichaean. Alternatively, it may be that some of the contradictions he does not explicitly say come from Manichaeans are in fact Manichaean disputations, but Augustine simply omits any mention of them in his discussion and reserves his discussion to the exegetical solution he proposes to apparent contradictions in the OT and NT pericopes. From this brief discussion of possibility, it should be evident that this is a rather complicated matter, one that perhaps cannot be falsifiably argued one way or the other with the available data, so I have not attempted to do so.

²¹²Lambot 1956. This sermon, comprising seven manuscripts, was referred to as *Serm.* Lambot 28 (now *Serm.* 164/A auct.) until the re-systematization of Augustine's sermons in Verbraken 1976, 53–196.

²¹³On the understanding of *misericordia*, a term whose connotation fluctuates throughout the text, as concrete almsgiving vs. general mercy in *Serm.* 350F, see the discussion in the commentary in Appendix A below.

²¹⁴*Serm.* 350F.1; cf. *Haer.* 46.10; *Enarrat. Ps.* 140.12; *Nat. bon.* 44; *Agon.* 4.4.

²¹⁵Comparisons made herein to the Vetus Latina (VL), the OT text used by Augustine, are to editions currently available in the ongoing Das Beuronener Vetus Latina-Institut 1949. On Augustine's preference of the VL over to the Jerome's Vulgata, which was a work in progress during his time, as well as Augustine's use of Sirach in four of his sermons, see Beentjes 2013.

²¹⁶*Serm.* Lambot 28 was originally assigned 164/A on the basis that the content of the sermon seemed to Verbraken focus on an exegesis of Gal 6:9–10, quotation of which occurs in cap. 2 and 4; Verbraken 1976, 93, 172. The expanded text now doubles the text, revealing that the point of almsgiving, rather than exegesis, constituting the focus of the sermon.

²¹⁷For instance, because the text was published in the same year as Van den Berg 2010, he does not discuss *Serm.* 350F in his consideration of Sermons containing Manichaean disputations (pp. 75–95).

more active pursuit of religion after his ordination to priesthood.²¹⁸ Likewise, not much is known about where and to whom this sermon was given, or indeed whether or not Manichaeans would have been present in the audience or within the vicinity to merit Augustine's reference to them.²¹⁹ In fact, in comparison with the language and direct quotation of Manichaeans in other sermons,²²⁰ it is perhaps even likely that Manichaeans were not present. Rather, Augustine's reference to Manichaeans is likely for rhetorical effect.

The discussion of the sermon opens with the accusation that some people believe that “alms (*eleemosyna*) should be given merely to the righteous, while nothing ought to be given to the sinful.”²²¹ Worst of all such people, Augustine says, are the Manichaeans, who refuse to feed (*parcere*) the unrighteous (*impii*) on the basis on their twisted belief system.²²² This madness (*haec insania*), Augustine insists, should alone be enough to “offend the senses of all sane people.”²²³ This tactic of giving incriminating details without further explanation, known commonly as apophasis,²²⁴ is used to great rhetorical effect in this sermon, branding guilty by association any among his audience—even those that might “think no such thing but still believe that sinners ought not to be supplied with food”²²⁵—who would dare think in like manner, that almsgiving (*miseriordia*) should be restricted from the unrighteous (*impii*). Thus, based on the lack of details comparable to other works that feature Manichaeans more prominently and Augustine's prominent use of apophasis, it seems likely that no Manichaeans were in fact present.

²¹⁸Lambot 1956, 155; Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann 2009, 202. On this matter, Lambot simply suggests that this sermon has the ring of those given “lorsqu’il était prêtre.”

²¹⁹A recent thesis from the University of Padua makes note of this but does not give comparative data outside of scriptural quotations: Catapanco 2014, 23–24.

²²⁰Cf., e.g., *Serm.* 1.1–3; 12.1–2; 50.1, 13. As noted by Van den Berg 2010, 29, 94, the verb *calumnari* is used amply throughout *Adim.* and *Serm.* 1; 12; 50. It is likewise worth noting the use of the noun *calumnia* in these texts.

²²¹*Serm.* 350F.1: Sunt qui eleemosynas putant iustis tantummodo esse praebendas, peccatoribus autem nihil eiusmodi dari oportere. In hoc errore primum sacrilegii locum Manichaei tenant.

²²²Referring to the cosmogonic myth by which light is trapped in matter, for which see note 92 above. As with Franzmann 2013, I can find no proof elsewhere in Manichaean writings of this precept, so here again, as with *Nat. bon.* 44–47; *Haer.* 46.9–10, Augustine seems to be taking liberties in taking Manichaean beliefs to their logical end. Manichaean almsgiving, in fact, is described in terms of what ought to be given to the Elect and never in terms of what should be restricted; see, e.g., *Keph.* LXXX (192.3–193.22); M 6020.

²²³*Serm.* 350F.1: Haec insania minus digne fortasse repellitur quam sanorum omnium sensus offendit, si tantummodo proponatur; Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann 2009, 207 (text).

²²⁴Also known as praeteritio or paralipsis; see, e.g., Kirchner 2007, 190: “*praeteritio* (παράλειψις, ἀντίφρασις) is when an orator mentions something only to state that he will omit further discussion of it.”

²²⁵*Serm.* 350F.1: Nonnulli autem nihil tale sentientes ideo putant peccatores non esse pascendos; Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann 2009, 207 (text).

Why, then, mention Manichaeans at all? This passage seems to give evidence into Augustine’s mindset after debates with such Manichaean *doctores* as Felix, Secundus, Fortunatus, Adimantus, and Faustus. It is, in fact, a popular if rather unprovable conviction among Manichaean scholars that sects like Manichaeans played a prominent role in pushing thinkers like Augustine—and subsequently Christianity as a whole—to develop theories of Christology in order to justify apparently contradictory biblical passages.²²⁶ It likewise seems here that Augustine has internalized strategies of combating Manichaean disputations, using arguments similar to those that deal with the theme of “Revenge vs. Forgiveness or Kindness”: *Adim.* 7; 8; 17; *Serm.* 110a; 82.²²⁷

The similarities across all six of these texts (i.e., *Adim.* 7; 8; 17; *Serm.* 110a; 82; 350F) are rather striking. In all but *Serm.* 82, for instance, the golden rule (Matt 5:38–40, 44, 45) appears in some form or another to combat various Old Testament pericopes that seem to advise doing otherwise (Sir 12:4, 6–7; Exod 20:5; 21:24; 23:22–24).²²⁸ In *Serm.* 350F, the argument goes that, while the Old Testament seems to distinguish treatment between the humble or just (*humiles*)²²⁹ and the unrighteous (*impii*) (Sir 12:4, 6–7),²³⁰ the New Testament seems to advise universal kindness (*humanitas*) upon both righteous and unrighteous (Matt 5:44; 7:12; Rom 12:20; Gal 6:9–10).²³¹ In fact, Augustine argues, these pericopes are not contradictory so long as one understands that there is both a sinner (*peccator*) and a man (*homo*) inside every individual, and it is only this spiritual sinner that is unrighteous (*impius*) and deserving of punishment (*persequi, punire*). And, in fact, when the Old Testament reads punishment or vengeance (*vindicta*; cf. Sir 12:6), what is really meant is censure (*obiurgatio*), which theology Augustine draws from Old Testament and New Testament texts alike (Ps 149:5–7; 1 Cor 11:31–32; 2 Cor 2:2; 13:2–3).²³² Harmonization of the alleged contradiction by first offering a figurative reading of the Old Testament text, then citing similar Old Testament–New Testament proof-texts of this

²²⁶See, e.g., Widengren 1961, 123–27; Ries 1988, 129–207.

²²⁷See Appendix C.

²²⁸*Adim.* 7.1; 8; 17.1; *Serm.* 110a.8; *Serm.* 350F.2.

²²⁹Scriptural variation here between V *da misericordi/misericordiam*, VL *da justo*, and LXX δὸς τῷ ἐσθβεῖ, a rather odd discrepancy for Augustine, is discussed in note 371 below.

²³⁰*Serm.* 350F.2; Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann 2009, 208 (text). For *humilis* as humble in the spiritual rather than the monetary sense, see Blaise 1954, s.v. *humilis*.

²³¹*Serm.* 350F.2–3, 5.

²³²*Serm.* 350F.4.

figurative reading is common throughout Augustine's responses to Manichaean disputations.²³³ One further similarity across these texts is that, no matter how certain one can be that Manichaeans are present around the time of Augustine's speech,²³⁴ there is always some mention that Old Testament and New Testament pericope are contradictory (*contraria, adversantia, falsa*) and often a notion of the deception (*decipere, detestabilis crudeiltas*) of the ignorant (*imperiti, non intellegere*).²³⁵ Thus, even if *Serm.* 350F does not seem to be a contradiction that derives from Manichaean disputations, it nevertheless follows the same logic as and shares similar features with disputations that discuss the same theme.

²³³In *Adim.* 7.1, for instance, the contradiction between God's punishment of the fourth generation of a sinner (Exod 20:5) and His treatment of righteous and unrighteous alike (Matt 5:45) is resolved by arguing that punishment in the OT means self-punishment (*ostenditur non esse saevum Deum, sed unumquemque in se saevire peccando*, "it is quite clear that God is not brutal but that each person is brutal to himself when he sins"), for which Augustine cites Wis 2:21; Prov 5:22; Rom 1:24. He then goes on to say that, in fact, the OT does elsewhere talk about fair treatment of all in Wis 11:27, and that, at any rate, if the Manichaeans are upset with a *zelans Deus*, "a jealous God" (Exod 20:5), they should likewise be upset about the same phrase used in 2 Cor 11:2. The most striking example of this latter strategy (i.e., attempting to point out faults in NT literature that should upset Manichaeans, since they value only the NT) is Augustine's rebuke of the Acts of Thomas in *Adim.* 17.2.

²³⁴In fact, of the ones listed here, only the references to *Adim.* securely locate a Manichaean interlocutor. *Serm.* 82.8 employs the rhetorical device of apophrisis, like in *Serm.* 350F.1, and thus likely also uses Manichaeans as a straw-man figure.

²³⁵Similar wording, in bold, can be found in the following passages: *Adim.* 7.1 (text: Zycha 1891, 127; translation: Ramsey 2006, 184): Sed cum ad capitula veteris et novi testamenti veniunt, ut **imperitos decipiant**, et ea sibi **adversa** esse crimentur, fingunt se nimis bonos ("But when the Manicheans come to passages of the Old and the New Testament, they pretend that they are extremely good, in order to **deceive the ignorant** and in order to charge that the Testaments are **opposed** to each other"); 8 (text: Zycha 1891, 130; translation: Ramsey 2006, 186): Huic loco Manichaei, quod in veteri lege par vindicta permittitur, et dicitur oculus pro oculo, dentem pro dente esse perdendum, sic calumniantur, quasi et ipse dominus haec duo sibi veluti **adversantia** atque **contraria** in evangelio demonstraverit ("The Manicheans criticize this passage because the old law permitted punishment equal to the crime and because it says that an eye should be lost for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, as if the Lord showed in the gospel that these two were in **opposition** and in **contradiction** to him"); 17.1 (text: Zycha 1891, 164; translation: Ramsey 2006, 207): His verbis de veteribus libris ita commemoratis, tamquam **contrarium** opponit Adimantus quod in evangelio scriptum est, dicente domino ("Against these words quoted in that way from the old books, Adimantus sets, as if **contrary** to them, the words of the gospel"); *Serm.* 82.5.8 (text: Migne 1865, 509; translation: Hill 1990a, 374): Metuendum est, ne sibi **contraria** sint praecepta divina. Sed intellegamus esse ibi summam concordiam, non quemadmodum quidam vani sapiamus, qui errantes opinantur **contraria** sibi esse duo Testamenta in Libris veteribus et novis ("I'm afraid it looks as if divine injunctions are **contradicting** each other. But let us be sure about this, that in fact perfect harmony prevails here; don't let's share the ideas of some deluded people, who hold the erroneous opinion that the two covenants, represented by the books of the Old and New Testaments, **contradict** each other."); 110a.8 (text: Dolbeau 1994, 48; translation: Rotelle 1997, 101): non **contra** legem dicit, quomodo nonnulli male intellegentes opinantur quod Evangelii mansuetudo **contraria** est legis asperitati ("it is not contradicting the law, the misunderstanding of those who fancy that the mildness of the gospel is contrary to the harshness of the law"); 350F.1–2 (text: Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann 2009, 207–8): Haec verba quemadmodum accipienda sint non intellegentes **detestabili crudelitate** induuntur. . . . ne **cogitatione perversa** cum divinam voluntatem in divinis libris **non intellegitis** . . . humanae pravitati. . . . Nec ideo tamen falsa sunt illa quae supra posuimus ("Not understanding how these words ought to be understood, these people deck themselves with **detestable cruelty**. . . . should you **not understand** the divine will in the divine books because of this perverse way of thinking . . . with this **human deformity**. . . . Nor, however, is the passage we have set out earlier **false**, for they themselves are holy tenets").

If Augustine is indeed using Manichaeans by this time purely as a rhetorical device, as I have tried to show, it can perhaps only attest to the rhetorical strength of the Manichaean missionary tactic of disputation that the Old Testament stands in contradiction to the New and that, by dismissing the Old Testament, Manichaeans were thus able to fashion themselves successfully as the true Christians. This interpretation is perhaps also strengthened by the remark in Augustine's *Retractions* that he had "solved with reason (*sane*) some of Adimantus's disputations in sermons delivered to the people in church."²³⁶ That is, rather than responding to a Manichaean contradiction directly, Augustine appropriated the practice of Manichaean disputations for the sake of his own exegetical interests. This may well be the case for any or all of the sermons labeled uncertain in the table compiled in Appendices B and C.²³⁷ Thus, even after Manichaeans had been driven out of Hippo,²³⁸ Augustine would continue to contemplate the disputations they posed and used his refutations of them to continue to persuade his congregation to resist such efforts of proselytization.²³⁹

2.3.4.2. Marcion's Influence on Manichaean Disputations?

One rather striking comparandum to the Manichaean practice of disputations is to be located in Marcion's book, the *Antitheses*, which largely survives in Tertullian. While the conclusion by both Marcionites and Manichaeans (i.e., that the Old Testament and the New Testament stand in contradiction to one another) seems to be rather similar, I argue, contrary to some previous studies, that the argumentative means, at least as attested in Augustine, seems to be quite different. While Marcion targeted the Old Law given by Moses and the New Law given by Jesus, Manichaeans regarded the *whole* of the Old Testament as false. Furthermore, in Augustine's corpus, only three passages discuss Old Law *versus* New Law contradictions, one of which even seems to equate Marcionites with Manichaeans in the rather suspicious trope of guilt by association.²⁴⁰ It thus seems that Marcionite influence on Manichaeans, specifically on the

²³⁶*Retract.* 1.22.1: Aliquas sane earumdem quaestionum (i.e., Adimanti) popularibus ecclesiasticis sermonibus solvi; Mutzenbecher 1984, 64 (text).

²³⁷Viz., *Serm* 2; 71; 82; 152; 153; 170; 354a.

²³⁸S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 192–207.

²³⁹See, e.g., *Serm.* 12.1–3; 182.3, where Augustine explains to his audience in dialogue form how to defend themselves against Manichaean disputations.

²⁴⁰See, e.g., Cameron 2003.

Manichaean practice of disputations—at least as attested in Augustine—is fabricated on a heresiological basis.

Previous scholarship has been mixed on the discussion of Marcionite influence on Manichaeism. In his article on the topic, Jason BeDuhn draws rather convincing parallels between the *Antitheses*, as reconstructed by Harnack, and *Act. Arch.*, though these disputations both survive in highly polemical works.²⁴¹ Samuel Lieu, in an effort to explain these parallels, speculates that Addā was a Marcionite prior to his joining ranks with the Manichaeans.²⁴² This view is supported by Nils Arne Pedersen, who highlights the connection between Manichaean and Marcionite notions of the ignorance of the Creator God as well as Mani’s awareness of Marcion in his canonical writing, the *Treasury of Life*.²⁴³ Tardieu, on the other hand, focuses on the differences between Marcion and Manichaeans, noting the striking differences between the Pauline epistles Marcion regarded as authentic and those of Manichaeans, as well as their entirely different approaches to the Gospels—whereas the Gospel of Marcion, which Marcion used instead of the Synoptics, is Luke “expurgé du début (parenté de Jésus, généalogie, nativité, circoncision, scènes du Temple, baptême, tentation, épisode de Nazareth),” the Manichaeans simply aimed to create “une harmonie évangélique au sens propre.”²⁴⁴ At any rate, the fundamental difference agreed upon by all these scholars is that the connection between Manichaeans and Marcion was the bifurcation of Old and New Testament on the basis that a false law had been given in the Old and the true one in the New.²⁴⁵ The thematic arrangement of Manichaean disputations in Augustine (see Appendix C), which proves here to be an invaluable research tool, enables me to revisit this claim at least through Augustine’s works.

²⁴¹BeDuhn 2007, esp. 140–41; Harnack 1921.

²⁴²S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 92.

²⁴³Pedersen 2004, 177–254; Pedersen 1993, 168. On the canonical writings of Mani, see section 2.3.1 above.

²⁴⁴Tardieu 1987, 142–45. See also Tardieu’s table on p. 143, which compares the canonical order of the Pauline epistles according to Marcion’s *Apostolicon* and Tardieu’s own reconstruction of the Manichaean order of the Pauline letters. It should be noted, however, that Tardieu does not give the exact principles by which he restores the list he provides for Manichaeans—no such list exists in the Manichaean sources—rather that the list is “réconstituée à partir de la fréquence des citations transmises isolément ou groupées” (142n136). The statement that Manichaeans simply formed “une harmonie évangélique” is presumably just meant for rhetorical effect; the Manichaean approach was much more nuanced, for which see the discussion in section 2.3.3 above.

²⁴⁵A similar argument related to Old and New Testament Law is also to be found in Ptolemy’s *Letter to Flora*, quoted in Epiphanius, *Pan.* 33.3.1–7.10. For further comparisons, see J. Lieu 2015, 410–14.

All the disputations that explicitly pit the Old Testament law with the New Testament gospel occur in the group of Augustine's sermons that deal with the New Testament: *Serm.* 152 (418/9); 153 (418/9); 170 (417).²⁴⁶ The last text even implicitly mentions Marcionites:

That's (i.e., that there was a giver of the law and another of the gospel) what the Manichees suppose, with their twisted minds, and the other heretics (i.e., Marcionites) who said that there was one giver of the law (*datorem legis*) which was given through Moses, and another bestower of the grace of the gospel (*largiotrem evangelicae gratiae*); the first a bad God, the second a good God.²⁴⁷

If the above dates are right, by the times these sermons were given, Manichaeism had long passed as a problem in North Africa, which was now at a climactic point in its struggle with Pelagians, who were especially known for their belief in and theology surrounding the inborn ability of all post-lapsarian humans to discriminate between good and evil.²⁴⁸ Thus, there is no reason to think, unlike in, e.g., *Serm.* I, XII, and L, that Augustine was dealing with actual Manichaeans among his congregation. Rather, what the three sermons have in common is that they all deal centrally with a New Testament text that problematically mentions the law (*Serm.* 152: Rom 7:25–8:3; *Serm.* 153: Rom 7:5–13; *Serm.* 170: Phil 3:6–16). The problematic nature of the New Testament pericope seems to call to Augustine's mind the Manichaean practice of disputations and, in the passage cited above, the Marcionate error in particular. It is further suspicious that no attested Manichaean disputation draws on the claim that "the law of God which was given through Moses was not in fact given by God."²⁴⁹ This claim is suspicious because it is in fact much too weak. Manichaeans did not focus on the Mosaic law in particular but rather the entirety of the Old Testament. Almost as if responding to Augustine's claims that Manichaeans focused their attention on the Old Testament law, Faustus himself says,

We are certainly not enemies or opponents of the Law and the Prophets (*inimici Legis ac Prophetarum*) or of anyone at all. In fact, if you will now permit us, we are ready to

²⁴⁶According to the grouping in Verbraken 1976. For the dates suggested, see the citations on pp. 90, 94; on Verbraken's organization of Augustine's sermons, see note xli to Appendix B below. In addition to these texts, *Adim.* 5.1; 16.1, 1–2; *Faust.* 1, 6; 18.2 (bis); *Gen. Man.* 1.22.33 also deal with individual issues like whether or not Sabbath should be observed or circumcision practiced. In contrast, these three sermons deal with the Old Testament laws wholesale.

²⁴⁷*Serm.* 170.2.2: sicut Manichaeus mente perversa sentit (i.e., alium dedisse legem, alium Evangelium), et reliqui haeretici, qui dixerunt, alium fuisse datorem legis quae data est per Moysen, alium autem largitorem evangelicae gratiae; illum quidem Deum malum, illum vero Deum bonum; Migne 1865, 927 (text); Hill 1990b, 240 (translation).

²⁴⁸Brown 2000, 355–77.

²⁴⁹*Serm.* 153.2: Manichaei enim legem Dei per Moysen datam, dicunt non a Deo datam; Partoens 2008, 51 (text); Hill 1990b, 59 (translation).

admit that all those things (i.e., which are written in the Old Testament) are false which were written about them and because of which they seemed odious to us.²⁵⁰

What Faustus's statement shows is that the Manichaeans did not pick the Old Testament apart, agreeing with one thing and disagreeing with another—to them, the Old Testament was to be rejected in its entirety. The Old Testament, in other words, did not constitute an exegetical problem, the sort of which Augustine proposes in *Serm.* 152, 153, and 170. Rather, Augustine seems merely to be using Manichaeans as a convenient rhetorical tool, using their own scriptural disputations against them. In addition, what Augustine seems to have done in *Serm.* 170.2, by connecting Marcionites with Manichaeans, is to further link the two, branded guilty by association, chiseling away at the boundaries of identity by which any aberrant sect can claim uniqueness from another. In short, the case of Marcionite influence in Augustine's report of Manichaeism seems to be nothing short of Augustine's own contrivance.

The evidence in Augustine's corpus thus seems to suggest that Marcionite influence on Manichaeans was a heresiological invention. While both Marcion and Manichaeans rejected the Old Testament, they did so on crucially different grounds. While Marcion focused on the Mosaic Law *versus* Jesus's abrogation of the law, Manichaeans had a larger focus on the Old Testament, discounting, *inter alia*, its abhorrent mores and evil God. Thus, even if Addā was once a Marcionite, the Manichaean approach to the disputation of Old Testament *versus* New Testament contradiction was evidently a practice markedly different from that of Marcion, one that even seems to have been used toward missionary ends by demonstrating that Manichaeism was a religion with logical consistency, unlike Christianity, and one that followed Jesus's commandment of discarding the Old Testament.

2.3.5. Likeness to Disciples and the Example of Thomas

The use of scriptural literature considered apocryphal and perhaps also the appeal to the mindset of the disciples of Christ in their incredulity at seeing Jesus arisen are two possible missionary tactics that emerge from curious details in Augustine's sermons, in his attacks against docetic Christology, the belief that Christ existed on Earth in spiritual form only,²⁵¹ a notion that

²⁵⁰*Faust.* 22.1: Minime quidem nos hostes sumus, aut inimici Legis ac Prophetarum, sed nec ullius omnino: adeo ut si modo per ipsos vos liceat, simus parati fateri, falsa illa omnia (i.e., in Veteri Testamento scripta) esse quae de eis scripta sunt, et quorum causa videntur nobis exosi; Zycha 1891, 591 (text); Ramsey 2007, 299 (translation, slightly altered).

²⁵¹On the uncertain origins and tents of Docetism, see Slusser 1981; cf. Goldstein and Stroumsa 2007.

certainly seems to have been shared by Manichaeans.²⁵² This practice (i.e., the appeal to similarities with Jesus’s disciples and Thomas in particular), as linked to the Manichaean understanding of the corruption of the New Testament²⁵³ is, to my knowledge, proposed here for the first time in Manichaean studies. Evidence for this practice is taken from what, in his sermons, Augustine calls the common mistake of both Jesus’s disciples and the Manichaeans (i.e., Docetism) and the use by Manichaeans of the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel of Thomas in the Roman West.

On what he perceives as a heretical belief in Docetism, Augustine is characteristically acerbic in his treatment throughout his corpus. In his sermons, Augustine frequently touches on the beliefs of Docetism and equates it with Manichaeism: “Whoever denies that Christ is human is a Manichaean.”²⁵⁴ In one instance, Augustine even launches into a tirade of insults upon discussing Manichaeans’ denial that Jesus had a mother: “You contentious, loathsome troglodyte!”²⁵⁵ One rather lengthy discussion on Manichaean docetic beliefs even switches to an analogy of Manichaeans as wolves (*lupi*) that Augustine urges his audience to catch (*capere*) and butcher (*trudicare*), following which Augustine lays out how to rebut docetic arguments against scripture.²⁵⁶ All manner of docetic beliefs is thus met swiftly with Augustine’s furor—that is, until Augustine discusses them in relation to the disciples of Jesus.

Then enters a curious line of reasoning in which Augustine seems to give the Manichaean logic, from his own volition, some merit. After opening a sermon delivered during the Octave of Easter (ca. 400) on the abhorrent beliefs of Docetists, Augustine turns to the Catholic church (“What about you, Catholic Church”), reads some relevant scriptural passages (John 1:1–2; 19:30), then says, “Listen now. Pardon those who think the same as the disciples before them

²⁵²See, e.g., *Keph.* 12.20–13.10; *Ps.-Bk. II* 121.9–11; M 24.R8; cf. Franzmann 2003, 51–87. For the latter text, a Parthian hymn on the crucifixion of Jesus, see Henning 1944, 112. The docetic nature of Jesus in Manichaeism has also been studied by Rose 1979, 120–28. Furthermore, Faustus seems to use John 1:1 and Mark 1:1 as proof-texts that Jesus was not born from man but from God only: *Faust.* 3.1 (text: Zycha 1891, 262; translation: Ramsey 2007, 78): Quorum (i.e., Ioannis Marcique) mihi principia interim non immerito placuerunt, quia nec David, nec Mariam inducunt, nec Ioseph. . . . Nisi forte alterum hic (i.e., Mattheus), et alterum ille (i.e., Marcus) annuntiat Iesum. (“The beginnings of John and Mark immediately and quite rightly pleased me because they introduce neither David nor Mary nor Joseph. . . . perhaps Matthew and Mark each announced a different Jesus”); cf. his longer explanation in *Faust.* 26.1 as well as *Adim.* 1; *Serm.* 1.1–3, which discuss in disputation form the Genesis account of the creation as opposed to the that of the Johannine prologue.

²⁵³On this, see discussion in section 2.3.3 above.

²⁵⁴*Serm.* 92.3: Qui negat hominem Christum, Manichaeus est; Migne 1865, 573 (text); see also *Serm.* 37.17; 72a.5; 92.3; 116.4; 159b.12; 182.2–3; 183.9.13; cf., e.g., *Faust.* 3.2–6; 23.5–10; 26.3–8.

²⁵⁵*Serm.* 72a.5: O stulte, o contentiose, o merito odiose!; Morin 1930, 1:160 (text).

²⁵⁶*Serm.* 182.2–3.

mistakenly thought (cf. Luke 24:37).”²⁵⁷ Even if this is only a rhetorical remark on the part of Augustine, as immediately afterwards he goes on to say that the disciples at least “didn’t persist in their mistake,”²⁵⁸ it is significant to note that Augustine’s tone is much softer.²⁵⁹ It is likewise rather strange that Augustine would volunteer this detail in support of Manichaeans, when he nowhere else claims that Manichaeans make this defense of themselves. I argue that this seemingly unintentional defense of Manichaeans reveals a Manichaean belief, at least in the Roman West where Christianity was the prevailing religion of the 4th century, that is unattested elsewhere in our sources.

In the telling remark by Faustus about Manichaean New Testament exegesis²⁶⁰ may lay the explanation to the unusual passage in this sermon. In *Faust.* 33.3, we learn that Manichaeans thought of the New Testament as it existed then as a composition by semi-Jews (*semi-Iudaei*) on the basis of rumor and opinion (*famae opinionosque*), which, besides rejecting parts of the New Testament, enabled them also to reject the Acts of the Apostles in its entirety—Manichaeans did so on the basis that they believed that the Paraclete (i.e., ἄλλος παράκλητος) of Christ’s promise did not manifest in the Holy Spirit of the Acts of the Apostles but in fact in Mani himself.²⁶¹ In its stead, Manichaeans are known, at least in Coptic, to have made use of the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles.²⁶²

Returning to *Faust.* 33.3, this passage seems to show that Manichaeans made a distinction between the disciples and the later redactors of their gospels; while they praised Jesus’s disciples, they lamented the fact that the disciples themselves did not write the text of the Gospels. This distinction between the disciples and the redactors of their Gospels would then

²⁵⁷*Serm.* 238.2: Quid tu, Catholica? . . . Modo audi. Ignosce illis qui hoc putant, quod prius errantes discipuli putaverunt; Migne 1865, 1123 (text); Hill 1990c, 57 (translation).

²⁵⁸*Serm.* 238.2: illi in errore non perseveraverunt; Migne 1865, 1123 (text); Hill 1990c, 58 (translation).

²⁵⁹Cf. *Serm.* 229j.1; 237.1; 265.1; 265d.2; 375c.3, which discusses the same relationship between the mistakes of the disciples and those of the Manichaeans, though with a uniformly negative tone.

²⁶⁰See section 2.3.4 above.

²⁶¹John 14:16; cf., e.g., CMC 17.4–5; 46.2–3; 63.[21–22]; 70.[20–21]. On the Manichaean rejection of the Acts of the Apostles, cf. *Adim.* 17.1; *Faust.* 32.5; *Util. cred.* 3.7; *Fund.* 5.6; *Epist.* 236.2; *Haer.* 46.15–16. See also Decret’s discussion in 2004, 68–71.

²⁶²Nagel 1973; Kaestli 1977. Cf. Kósa 2011, who claims that evidence of readership of the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles among Manichaeans is attested largely in polemical sources and that the Manichaean sources often cited (i.e., *Ps.-Bk. II* 141.1–143.32; 192.5–193.3) indicate that references to the Apocryphal Acts were simply part of the rhetorical appeal of adapting Manichaeism to a regional audience. Even if Manichaeans did not make ample use of the Apocryphal Acts, however, my point still stands that the use of the Apocryphal Acts may somehow have been linked to certain Manichaean beliefs about the disciples and their perceived similarities in belief, especially concerning Jesus.

perhaps explain why, in Augustine, we find comparisons of the mistake made by the disciples and the Manichaeans, as Manichaeans may have used this comparison in a favorable light, since it would have cohered with their exegetical approach to the New Testament. That is, they would have argued that, by seeing Jesus as all spirit and no body, they were closer to the original thinking of the disciples than the later interpolation by the redactors of the Gospels.

In addition to the Manichaean use of the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, Manichaean comparisons of themselves with the disciples may also have extended to their use of the Gospel of Thomas.²⁶³ In *Serm. 375C*, Augustine returns to the topic of docetic beliefs held by the disciples again during the Octave of Easter (ca. 403), a couple years after *Serm. 238*, focusing on a cryptic episode about Thomas touching the flesh of Christ (John 20:24–29). Upon seeing Christ arisen, the disciples run to Thomas to tell him what they saw, to which he responds, “Unless I put my hands in his side, and touch the places of the nails, I will not believe (John 20:25).”²⁶⁴ But, whereas Jesus says to Mary Magdalene, “Do not touch me, for I have not yet ascended to my Father (John 20:17),” Thomas is told, “Touch me (cf. John 20:27).”²⁶⁵ It seems to be on the incredulity of the latter that the Manichaeans privilege Thomas among the disciples: “What do we think a Manichaean says?: ‘Thomas saw, and Thomas touched, and Thomas felt the places of the nails, and his flesh was not real.’”²⁶⁶ Even though it seems likely that Augustine is not quoting a Manichaean verbatim, it is nevertheless perhaps the case that Manichaeans did use this passage to prove that Christ was not flesh; after all, John does not say *what* Thomas felt or came to believe, the ambiguity of which seems to be captured in the discussion of *Serm. 375C*. This theory is given further support by Manichaean use of the Gospel of Thomas and the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, the possible comparison between the disciples’ docetic beliefs and those of

²⁶³On the Manichaean use of the Gospel of Thomas, see Gathercole 2014, 80–90, especially the literature cited in p. 80n66. Note that Matteo Grosso’s dissertation has since been published; see now his revised table of parallels, which includes those between the Gospel of Thomas and Manichaean literature: Grosso 2012, 285–98. I am especially grateful to Grosso for mailing me a copy of his monograph. See also the analysis of these parallels in Coyle 2008b, which Coyle describes as thin, though he does not discount the possibility that the Gospel of Thomas might nevertheless have been used by Manichaeans.

²⁶⁴*Serm. 375C.1*: Nisi misero manus meas in latus eius, et tetigero loca clavorum, non credam; Morin 1930, 1:340 (text); Hill 1990d, 340 (translation).

²⁶⁵*Serm. 375C.1*: Noli me tangere, nondum enim ascendi ad Patrem . . . tange; Morin 1930, 1:340–41 (text); Hill 1990d, 340 (translation, slightly altered). On the narrative gap in this episode with Mary Magdalene, see Antti Marjanen’s discussion in 1996, 117, 219–20, 223; cf. Coyle 1991.

²⁶⁶*Serm. 375C.2*: Putamus, Manichaeus quid dicit? Et vidit Thomas, et tetigit Thomas, et loca clavorum palpavit Thomas, et falsa caro fuit; Morin 1930, 1:342 (text); Hill 1990d, 341 (translation, altered).

Manichaeans themselves, and the general Manichaean approach to the New Testament that privileged the disciples to the redactors of their gospels.

Thus, on the question of why Manichaeans were interested in the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, to which Jean-Daniel Kaestli has suggested may have been because of their “préoccupation missionnaire : s’adapter au langage et aux traditions chrétiennes pour gagner des adeptes à la foi nouvelle,”²⁶⁷ I add that a further reason may well be that these texts were bound together with Manichaean missionary appeals to the disciples and the favorable comparisons they would have made between the incredulity of the disciples (and Thomas especially) upon seeing Christ arisen. It may perhaps have helped also that at least the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles seemed to have promoted a docetic Christology.²⁶⁸ This conclusion should not be seen as mutually exclusive with but rather as complementary to that of Wolf-Peter Funk, who argues that Manichaeans were drawn to Thomasine texts based on the affinity with their own beliefs, and with that of Ernst Hammerschmidt, who highlights the connection between the epithet of Thomas as twin (Δίδυμος; John 11:16; 20:24; 21:2) and the notion of Mani’s syzygy (σύζυγος; CMC 18.15; 19.17; 22.16; 23.5; 32.8; [35.14]; 69.14; 73.1; 105.18; 125.16; 130.16; 139.16).²⁶⁹

In the above analysis, then, I have attempted to show that Augustine’s accusation of Manichaeans as having made the same mistake as the disciples in their docetic notions of Christology obfuscates a claim that Manichaeans may well have made of themselves—i.e., that they were like the disciples in their beliefs about Jesus’s incorporeality. There is a further possibility that John 20:24–29 was used by Manichaeans to show that Thomas himself discovered Jesus’s incorporeality by attempting to touch his body. This proposal perhaps adds one additional explanation to others that have been suggested in scholarship history for why Manichaeans used the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel of Thomas.

²⁶⁷Kaestli 1977, 112.

²⁶⁸See, e.g., Foster 2015. While scholars have previously also described a certain docetic nature in the Gospel of Thomas, it seems that this is no longer really the case—see Gathercole 2014, 332n9. The nature of the *Gospel* as “secret sayings (ἄποκρυφαὶ εἰρη)” (text: Layton 1989, 32) can nevertheless be seen as connected to the cryptic episode of Thomas and Jesus described in John 20:24–29, since the latter would seem to imply, according to Augustine’s description of the Manichaean reaction, a hidden message not conveyed in the Johannine text.

²⁶⁹Funk 2002, 91–92; Hammerschmidt 1958. On the identification of Mani’s σύζυγος as a “twin brother” or as simply a “pair” in the Manichaean corpus and the influence of the notion by Elchasaite and Zoroastrian tradition, see the overview, especially of the Iranian sources, in de Blois 2003. The opinion of Hammerschmidt is echoed in Sundermann 1986a, 12.

2.3.6. Sensationalism: Poverty and Association with Women

The notion that sensationalist methods for conversion were used by the Manichaeans admittedly come from rather cryptic sources dealing with women on the one hand and the notion of “poverty” on the other. It does not seem that previous scholarship has touched on the missionary nature of these sensationalist appeals. While the Manichaean sources clearly refer to the “poverty” of the Elect and there is even a missionary connotation to poverty implied in one of the literary texts found at Kellis, the only explanation for what this poverty actually looked like in the Roman West seems to be found in polemical sources that describe the appearances of the starving Elect as a strange and curious sight to behold. I suggest as well that there may be a connection between Manichaean poverty and the nature of poverty as a religious ideal in Late Antiquity and the fourth century in particular. As for their association with women, the Manichaean missionary strategy seems to have been to convert women first in order that they would then convert their husbands, though the nature of this claim is difficult to untangle from the general misogynistic association of women with *superstitio*, the notion of often overzealous religious faith.

The most explicit reference to the missionary implications of poverty occurs in a recently discovered Coptic source from Kellis that Gardner identifies as the canonical *Letters* of Mani:²⁷⁰

You have become people made better by blessed poverty (ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲛⲕⲉ ⲛ̅ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ). Now, since you have been bringing forth catechumens and churches—you proclaimed and they listened to you—you are obliged the more now to perfect (ⲭⲟⲕ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ) the blessing of this poverty (ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲛⲕⲉ), by which you will gain victory over the sects and the world (ⲛⲁⲔⲟⲖⲙⲁ ⲙⲛ̅ ⲛⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ). It is profitable (ⲛⲁⲕⲣⲉ) for you to perfect it (ⲁⲭⲁⲕⲥ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ) and be vigilant in it; because (poverty) is your glory, the crown of your victory.²⁷¹

While it is clear that blessed poverty (ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲛⲕⲉ ⲛ̅ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ) is supposed to give an edge to the Manichaean mission, it is not actually clear why it should nor how this poverty actually manifested itself. The Manichaean Psalms are even more cryptic, referring ambiguously, for instance, to the “peace of poverty” ([ⲉⲓⲣ]ⲛⲛⲛ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲛⲕⲉ), “a great name” of poverty (ⲟⲩⲣⲉⲛ

²⁷⁰On the recent discovery of Kellis and its finds, see section 3.1 below.

²⁷¹P.KellisCopt. 53 51:08–17: ⲉⲗⲧⲛ̅ⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̅ⲉⲛ̅ⲣⲟⲙⲉ ⲉϥⲁⲛⲓⲧ ⲉⲛ̅ ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲛⲕⲉ ⲛ̅ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ: †ⲛⲟϥ ⲭⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲧⲛ̅ ⲭⲡⲉ ⲕⲁⲑⲛ̅ⲕⲟϥⲙⲉⲛⲟⲥ ϩⲓ ⲉⲕⲕⲗⲛⲓⲁ ⲉⲗⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲟϥⲟ ⲁϥϩⲟⲧⲙⲉ ⲛ̅ⲥⲉⲧⲛⲉ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲛⲓⲧ̅ ⲛ̅ⲉⲟϥⲟ ⲁⲭⲟⲕ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ †ⲛⲟϥ ⲛ̅ⲙⲁⲕⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ ⲛ̅ⲧⲙⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲛⲕⲉ ⲧⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲧⲟⲣⲟ ⲛ̅ⲉⲛⲧⲥ ⲁⲛⲁⲔⲟⲖⲙⲁ ⲙⲛ̅ ⲛⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ: ⲥⲣ ⲛⲁⲕⲣⲉ ⲛⲛⲧⲛ̅ ⲁⲭⲁⲕⲥ ⲁⲃⲁⲗ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲣⲁⲓⲥ ⲉⲣⲱⲧⲛ̅ ⲛ̅ⲉⲛⲧⲥ: ⲉⲡⲓⲁⲛ̅ ⲛ̅ⲧⲁⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲉⲁϥ ⲡⲕⲗⲁⲙ ⲛ̅ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̅ⲧⲟⲣⲟ; Gardner and Choat 2007, 54–55 (text and translation). On the identification of P.KellisCopt. 53 with Mani’s *Letters*, see Gardner and Choat 2007, 11, 13, 79.

εφαῖ), and “putting on blessed poverty” († αχωῖ ν̄τμ̄ν̄τ̄ζηκε μακαριος).²⁷² One Psalm even refers to the “commandment of poverty” (τεντολη ν̄τμ̄ν̄τ̄ζηκε),²⁷³ a notion that has parallels in Uyghur (*kutlug čigayin [ärmäk čxšapt]*), Sogdian (*frnxwndc δšt’wc*), and Arabic (the subdual of *šahwa*).²⁷⁴ *Codex Tebessa*, a text in Latin on Manichaean church order, also refers to the Elect as those who are “poor in resources” (*opi[bus] pauper*).²⁷⁵ A Middle Persian source likewise reports that the Elect do not store treasures because of which they are persecuted.²⁷⁶ Thus, the idea that poverty somehow makes it possible to “gain victory over the sects and the world” (τμ̄ν̄τ̄ζηκε τεῖ ε̄τε̄νᾱτ̄ρο̄ ν̄ζη̄τ̄ς̄ ἀ̄νᾱο̄γμᾱ μ̄ν̄ π̄κο̄σμος) is difficult to understand even with this number of parallels.

I suggest, in this case, that the poverty of the Elect has something to do with the sensationalism associated with the religiosity of poorness in Late Antiquity—i.e., that the poor, visibility and social marginalization of whom grew under the Roman Empire, would one day be redeemed. Appeal to poverty was already, for instance, one of the missionary tactics evident in the New Testament and has recently been given a thorough study by Peter Brown.²⁷⁷ The rise of Christian monks to prominence in the fourth century further “announced wider changes in late Roman culture and society”: mobilized by their religious leaders, the Christian poor, over the course of the fourth century, solidified as a constituency wielding significant political force.²⁷⁸ Thus, the advantage of poverty (So. *δšt’wch*) about which Mani specifically instructs Addā before he is sent to the Roman Empire²⁷⁹ would have been targeted at a world that already had a

²⁷²*Ps.-Bk. II* 79.10; 97.31; 157.1–[2], 3. On αῖ as stative for αἶα (= αἰε̄τε, “increase”), see Clackson et al. 1998, 91.

²⁷³*Ps.-Bk II* 33.22; *Keph.* 192.6–28.

²⁷⁴U 95.V184; M14 V.22; *Fihrist* (Flügel 1862), 63. For the Uyghur text, see Clark 2013, 161. The five commandments, to which the commandment of poverty belongs, have parallels also in Middle Persian and Chinese, but these do not include the term “poverty”; see Sims-Williams 1985, 573–77; BeDuhn 2000, 40–45.

²⁷⁵*CT A.9.R.5*; Stein 1998, 46 (text), 254–255 (commentary); cf. BeDuhn and Harrison 1997, 70n9. A further parallel, albeit reconstructed, occurs in *CT A.XII.R.12*, 15–18: elect[i] . . . in quo beati sunt appellati et felices [o]b terrestrium [paup]ertatem “the elect . . . have been named blessed and happy among those who dwell on earth because of their poverty”; Stein 1998, 50 (text); Gardner and Lieu 2004, 268 (translation, slightly altered). On the page sequence of Stein 1998, which reverse that of Omont 1918, see Stein 1998, 120–124. Gardner and Lieu follow the reconstruction [libe]rtatem (“freedom”) proposed in the *editio princeps*, Omont 1918, 244. Stein’s reconstruction of [paup]ertatem, however, makes better sense in light of Luke 6:20.

²⁷⁶S 9 Vi.9–14.

²⁷⁷Brown 2002, 1–44.

²⁷⁸Brown 1992, 72. See further 71–117 for Brown’s thesis that the fourth century marked a transformation of the meaning of poverty and the poor for Christian society and more generally for the late Roman Empire.

²⁷⁹So 13941 + So 14285 Ri.11–13 (trans. Klimkeit): rtβn ’yw w’nkw ’pš(t)[y’m ’skwn] ’sk’tryk ’’δsw n’ pčxšδ(t’) rt(p)[yšt prw] δšt’wch p(rnx)wnt’ky’kh (“And so I com[mand] you: first, take of nothing more (than you

certain (Christian) preoccupation with poverty.²⁸⁰ Like early Christians, this perhaps meant that Manichaean missionaries appealed to the poor among their audiences or simply that they used the sensational appearances of beggars to lure in audiences.

It is perhaps with this latter sense of (Elect) poverty that, in conjunction with Matt 19:29, Faustus declares to Augustine:

You see (*vides*) someone poor (*pauper*), someone meek, a peacemaker, someone with a pure heart, who mourns, who hungers and thirsts, and who endures persecutions and hatred for the sake of righteousness, and do you doubt whether I accept the gospel? . . . When you ask whether I accept the gospel, I say to you: I have left all I possess (*omnia mea dimisi*)—father, mother, wife, children, gold, silver, food, drink, comforts, and pleasures.²⁸¹

According to Faustus, then, there is a visual appeal to poverty by which seeing someone poor and meek already conveys the notion of Christianity, since Jesus himself commanded his own disciples to do the same (cf. Matt 19:29). This appeal to similarities between Manichaeans and the disciples of Jesus, which topic I have explored above,²⁸² is further expanded on by Mani's own description of the disciples by way of justifying his dietary habits: “they did not eat by earning their living by laboring and farming the earth, in the way you do today. Similarly, when the savior sent his disciples everywhere to preach they did [not] take a millstone or [oven with] them.”²⁸³ The implication here is that, just as the first Christian missionaries did not work for their food, so would the Manichaean Elect succeed in their missions if they acted similarly.²⁸⁴ The striking visual features of such poverty, then, if it was loaded with this Christian meaning, would indeed have been perceived by Mani, who saw himself as the Johannine Paraclete, as the secret to gaining “victory over the sects and the world.”

Manichaean association with women, on the other hand, is rather more problematic to interpret, but seems to be related to the common association of Late Antiquity between women

need); you should [rather remain in] poverty and [blessedness]”); Sundermann 1981, 34 (text); Klimkeit 1993, 203 (translation).

²⁸⁰Cf. Luke 6:20; Matt 5:3.

²⁸¹*Faust.* 5.1: *Vides pauperem, vides mitem, vides pacificum, puro corde, lugentem, esurientem, sitientem, persecutiones et odia sustinentem propter iustitiam; et dubitas utrum accipiam evangelium? . . . si perroganti utrum accipiam evangelium dixero: omnia mea dimisi, patrem, matrem, uxorem, filios, aurum, argentum, manducare, bibere, delicias, voluptates; Zycha 1891, 271–72 (text); Ramsey 2007, 85 (translation).*

²⁸²See section 2.3.5.

²⁸³CMC 93.10–20 (trans. Lieu and Lieu): οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ ἐργασίᾳ καὶ γεωργίᾳ τῆς γῆς ἐργαζόμεν[οι] ἦσθιον ὄν τρόπον τῆμερον διαπράττεσθ[ε]. ὁμοίως δὲ ὀπηνίκα ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοῦ τοῦ[ς] μαθητὰς ὁ σω(τή)ρ καθ’ ἕκ[αστον] τόπον κηρύττειν, [οὔτε] μύλον οὔτε κλί[βανον] συνεπέφερον[το με]τ’ αὐτῶν; Koenen and Römer 1988, 64 (text); Gardner and Lieu 2004, 63 (translation); cf. Luke 9:2–5; Mark 6:7–11; Matt 10:5–15.

²⁸⁴On this understanding of the text, see Henrichs and Koenen 1978, 177–178n268.

and *superstitio*, the notion of over-zealous religious fervor (vs. *religio*, proper faith), often attributed to the supposed phenomenon that more women than men flocked to a new religion.²⁸⁵ This feverish obsession to “protect” women from these new religions is highlighted, for instance, by the scandalous, if likely false, account of the human semen eucharist of *Haer.* 9–10 discussed above. We are told by Augustine, furthermore, that the account of this sexually deviant practice originates from the trials of direct participants, a certain Margarite, a “girl . . . not yet twelve years old,” and Eusebia, “a Manichaean nun, as it were,” whom Augustine’s biographer Possidius tells us belong to the Elect.²⁸⁶ Similar accounts of this Manichaean practice (some of which swap human semen out for *καταμήνια*, “menstrual blood”) are reported elsewhere in the Roman West.²⁸⁷ Discussed in like manner is also the topos of the fear that Manichaeans would separate husbands from wives and otherwise discourage marriage, a polemic with a long tradition in early Christian writings against asceticism and, subsequently, in heresiological works.²⁸⁸ In contrast to these colorful details, Augustine is uncharacteristically and suspiciously silent about the “detestable superstition” (*exsecrabilis superstitio*) of Manichaean sexual practices when it comes to the woman “with whom I had been cohabiting.”²⁸⁹ When asked to

²⁸⁵On this association and reasons why women would have been advantaged in seeking new religions given their effective social class, including the appeal of asceticism and to a more equal social standing, see, e.g., Beard, North, and Price 1998, 1:214–27, 297–301; Coyle 2009a, 193–94. Research on the role of women in Manichaeism is still relatively new; see the sources cited in Van Oort 2015b, 312–313n1. To these works can now be added Kristionat 2013; Van Oort 2017. Cf. Burrus 1991 for a discussion gender politics in the Patristic sources generally and on Manichaean women as an example

²⁸⁶*Haer.* 46.9 (text: VanderHout et al. 1969, 315; translation: Rotelle 2007, 44): Ubi puella illa nomine Margarita istam nefariam turpitudinem prodidit, quae cum esset annorum nondum duodecim, propter hoc scelestum mysterium se dicebat esse vitiatam. Tunc Eusebiam quamdam manichaeam quasi sanctimoniam, idipsum propter hoc ipsum passam, vix compulit confiteri (i.e., Ursus tribunus); Possidius, *Vit. Aug.* 16.2 (text and translation: Weiskotten 1919, 76–77): et quae inter se illi suo more malo indigna et turpia facere consueverant, feminarum illarum vel electarum prodicione, illis ecclesiasticis gestis declaratum est.

²⁸⁷By Augustine: *Mor. Manich.* 19.66; *Fort.* 3; *Nat. bon.* 47; *Adim.* 3 and 23; by Cyril of Jerusalem: *Catech.* 6.23, 33; cf. Ambrose: *Epist. Chrom.* 14; P. Rylands 469, which comes from the Roman East, discusses the Manichaean eucharist of menstrual blood. On the “fig” of Cyril’s mention, see the discussion in Van Oort 2016b. Following his own discussion of *Haer.* 46.9–10, Van Oort assumes that the human semen eucharist was a real Manichaean practice but does not account for the rhetorical nature of apophysis in Cyril’s description—on the use of apophysis in Augustine’s *Sermo.* 350F, see section 2.3.4.1; Van Oort 2016a. Nevertheless, he provides interesting parallels that to the Manichaean eucharist that need not be considered that of human semen and/or menstrual blood discussed in the polemical sources.

²⁸⁸See, e.g., *Mor. Manich.* 18.65; *Adim.* 3.1–4; 23; *Gen Man.* 2.13.19; *Haer.* 46.13; Hunter 2007, 86–170.

²⁸⁹*Haer.* 46.9 (text: VanderHout et al. 1969, 314); *Conf.* 6.15.25 (text: Verheijen 1981, 90; translation: Rotelle 2008, 157): cum qua cubare solitus eram; cf. *Conf.* 4.2.2. On these two passages, see further the discussion in Van Oort 2015b, 316–20. As for the reference to the Manichaean mother of the bishop of either Thagaste or Carthage in *Conf.* 3.12.21, see chapter 3 below for my proposal for how to reconstruct the Manichaean practice of child-giving.

explain the false charges he brings against the Manichaean way of life, Augustine even concedes to Fortunatus that

only those who are your Elect can be fully informed about your way of life . . . For I have often heard from you (i.e., Elect ones) that you also receive the eucharist (*Eucharistiam*), but, since the time that you receive it was kept hidden (*lateret*) from me, how could I have known (*novisse potui*) what you receive?²⁹⁰

Thus, the particular claims that women were used in acts of sexual deviance can hardly be trusted. Nevertheless, these vehement attacks on and colorful claims about women's involvement in the Manichaean religion reveals that some attention was paid, whether by the heresiologists only or the Manichaeans or indeed both, to the role women played in the Manichaeism of the Roman West.

These polemical entanglements of the attestations of women in the Manichaeism of the Roman West thus makes it an exceedingly difficult task to reconstruct the role of women in the Roman West, to “rescue” their religious role from their heresiological portrayal. Nor is it of any help that, of Mani's instruction to Addā, the Manichaean missionary assigned to the Roman West, we have only the following cryptic note: “he (i.e., Mani) spoke of association with women and [gave] exhaustive instructions (*prβ'yr 'ny-t'k*) (concerning this matter).”²⁹¹ Thus, although Manichaean sources speak generally of the Elect performing missionary work and of women among the ranks of the Elect,²⁹² the fact that no source in the Roman West offers any evidence concerning the role women played in the Manichaean mission suggests that no firm conclusion can be established that Manichaean women were actively involved as missionaries.²⁹³ The least that can be said, then, is that women were used either by Manichaeans as “easy targets” for conversion, perhaps appealing to the advantages of asceticism and purportedly equal status, if we

²⁹⁰*Fort.* 3: De moribus autem vestris plene scire possunt qui Electi vestri sunt. . . . Nam et Eucharistiam audivi a vobis (i.e., Electis) saepe quod accipiatis: tempus autem accipiendi cum me lateret, quid accipiatis, unde nosse potui?; Zycha 1891, 84–85 (text); Ramsey 2006, 147 (translation).

²⁹¹So 13941 + 14285.Ri.15: 'yncmy-nch wry-δ w'β ZY prβ'yr 'ny-t'k; Sundermann 1981, 35 (text); Klimkeit 1993, 203 (translation).

²⁹²On the Elect as missionaries, see, e.g., *Keph.* LXXXV (208.11–213.20); 257.13–18. The female Elect are referred to, e.g., in *Hom.* 24.9; *Keph.* 229.10, and depicted in frescoes (c. 9th/10th century?) among the findings at Turfan; see Klimkeit 1982b, 44–45.

²⁹³In the Roman East were supposedly a certain missionary known as Julia, reported by Mark the Deacon in his *Life of Porphyry of Gaza*, and another known as Bassa, whose name survives in an inscription. While Madeleine Scopello treats these instances as factual accounts, J. Kevin Coyle and Jessica Kristionat (who discusses other contested sources) have expressed their reservations about the figures of Julia and Bssa; Scopello 2001; Coyle 2009a, 196–98; Kristionat 2013, 132–63. Besides discussing the lack of evidence suggesting missionary women, Kristionat's research finds that women were not able to climb to the higher ranks afforded to the male Manichaean Elect.

work backwards from polemical critiques on Manichaeism toward marriage to anti-ascetic writings in early Christianity, or then that women were simply used by polemical writers as appeals to the wholesale (religious) ownership of women by men. The former is perhaps somewhat more likely given Mani's "exhaustive" (*'ny-t'k*) instructions on women, but nothing absolute can be concluded from the above reviewed data.

If, at any rate, my proposal that women and poverty played some role in the form of sensationalism in the Manichaean mission is right, it would seem to confirm a relevant observation (366–84) made by an anonymous commentator of Paul:

They (i.e., Manichaeans) arrogantly proclaim that they devote themselves to fasting, though they seem perfectly well-fed (*saginati*), for it is only by some clever design (*arte quadam*) that they appear pale, for the sake of deception (*falliant*). . . . They come upon women (*mulieres*), who, on account of their singular vanity, desire to hear something, and they persuade them through whatever pleases their ears to commit foul and illicit acts (*foeda et illicita*). For women are desirous to learn (*cupidiae discendi*), even if they do not possess the faculty of judgment of right and wrong (*iudicium probandi*).²⁹⁴

While the latter statement (i.e., regarding women) is rather more suspicious, as it appeals to the general stereotype linking women to *superstitio*, it seems to be the case that poverty was used as some sort of sensationalist appeal to the masses. Earlier in this passage the commentator even seems to suggest that Manichaeans converted women first in order that these women would then go on to convert their husbands, just as "the devil, their [i.e., the Manichaeans'] father, deceived Adam through Even"—a sensationalist strategy, indeed, but unfortunately an uncorroborated one.²⁹⁵

Altogether, I have tried to suggest that Manichaeans made certain sensationalist appeals to poverty, using the visual appeal of a beggar in a context that early Christian missionaries themselves exploited, and to their association with women, by which they perhaps converted

²⁹⁴Ambrosiaster, *Comm. Tim.* 2.3.7.1–2: *ieiuniis insistere se iactanter praedicant (i.e., Manichei), cum omnes saginati videantur, tantum quod arte quadam pallidi cernuntur, ut fallant. . . . hi inveniunt mulieres prae vanitate nova aliquid desiderantes audire et per ea, quae placita sunt, suadent illis foeda et illicita; cupidiae enim sunt discendi, cum iudicium non habeant probandi; Vogels 1969, 312 (text). Note that Ambrosiaster (or Pseudo-Ambrose) is the name often ascribed to this text of uncertain authorship, the proposed date of composition for which means that Augustine may have read it himself and been influenced by it; see Kinzig 2012. Samuel Lieu seems to understand the Latin quite differently (e.g., he translates "sagianti" as "well weighted down," which does not make sense to me), for which reason I have opted to make my own translation; cf. Gardner and Lieu 2004, 119.*

²⁹⁵*Comm. Tim.* 2.3.7.2: *ut per eas viros decipiant more patris sui diaboli, qui per Evam Adam circumvenit; Vogels 1969, 312 (text). This connection to the fall of man seems to be the connection played on in the phrase iudicium probandi, which I have attempted to convey by translating "the faculty of judgment of right and wrong" (cf. Gen 2:9, 17; 3:9, 17). On the comparison between this passage and P.Rylands 469.29–35, as well as the possibility that Elect women were specifically accused of door-to-door solicitations, see note 153 above.*

women first in order that they would then go on to convert their husbands. While attestation of poverty in the Manichaean sources is ample, they are also cryptic. Likewise, an Iranian source speaks explicitly about the association with women, but it is not clear what is meant. Only in the polemical sources, then, are these explanations found. While the polemical nature of these sources are rather suspect, the context of these missionary appeals to sensationalism at least seems to suggest that there is some truth to their reports.

2.3.7. *Ambulatory Lifestyle*

On the ambulatory lifestyle of the Manichaean Elect,²⁹⁶ Augustine mentions in passing, in his time at Rome (388), that a certain *auditor*, upset by those around him who objected “the utterly depraved morals of the Elect, who lived here and there as vagabonds in a very wicked manner,” once attempted to organize a home that would support the Elect with their necessities.²⁹⁷ In fact, that the “monasteries” of Manichaeans seem generally to have served this purpose of providing temporary homes for the Elect.²⁹⁸ While this practice in particular seems not to have served a missionary purpose, the wandering lifestyle may have had another connection to the Western mission. That is, the early Manichaean mission made extensive use of the trade route between Rome and Persia, which allowed for the Elect, in the form of wandering merchants, to spread the religion widely and rapidly.²⁹⁹ If we can believe Possidius’s rather remarkable account, Augustine may have met one such merchant, a certain Firmus, who “had paid out much money in vain to the Manichaeans, or rather to those whom they call Elet” and who, upon inadvertently hearing his sermon, “fell down on his knees and prostrated himself at his feet, shedding tears and asking that the priest and his holy companions intercede with the Lord for his sins.”³⁰⁰ While this story is perhaps a rather too remarkable to believe, it at least

²⁹⁶See, e.g., *Ps.-Bk II* 133–186, the $\Psi\alpha\lambda\mu\iota\ \sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\omega\tau\omega\sigma\iota$, from $\sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\omega\tau\epsilon$ (“wanderer”), which depicts the wanderings of the Elect from the point of view of the Elect; an excellent study of these texts can be found in Villey 1994.

²⁹⁷*Mor. Manich.* 20.74: *vage pessimeque habitantium passimque viventium electorum mores perditissimi*; Bauer 1992, 154 (text); Ramsey 2006, 103 (translation).

²⁹⁸On Manichaean monasticism, see, e.g., S. N. C. Lieu 1998b. While the majority of this article focuses on Monasticism in Eastern Manichaeism, it is nevertheless worth noting that Manichaean monastic practices in the West are scarcely attested; cf. Koenen 1983. Thus, I have used quotation marks around monastery here to indicate that Manichaean monasteries do not seem to be the same as those attested in the east or indeed as later Christian monasteries.

²⁹⁹S. N. C. Lieu 2006, 97–106.

³⁰⁰Possidius, *Vit. Aug.* 15.5: *et propterea pecuniam multam ipsis Manichaeis, vel eis quos dicunt electos, incassum erogasset . . . ad pedes genibus provolutus sese iactavit, lacrymas fundens, et rogans ut pro suis delictis sacerdos cum sanctis Dominum precaretur*; Weiskotten 1919, 74–75 (text and translation).

seems to attest to the fact that the merchant wandering of Manichaeans, possibly even of the Elect, was known as far as the Roman West. Even if this story about this Firmus is not to be believed, since he is a merchant auditor, while we would have expected a merchant Elect missionary, it perhaps attests to the fact that Possidius may have known about the Manichaean practice of employing missionaries in the guise of merchants.

2.3.8. *Use of Visual and Auditory Media*

Lastly among this review of the practices of the Manichaean mission is the use of visual and auditory media. Unfortunately, attestation of this practice in Augustine is rather scant. We know that he sang songs during his time as a Manichaean *auditor*, and, based on the Coptic psalm books from Medinat Madi, that the Manichaean hymns were well-suited to religious instruction, but there seems to be no further evidence on this part.³⁰¹ Augustine also once reports Faustus's singing as a form of instruction,³⁰² refers once directly to the Bema psalms which are known from the Coptic psalm books from Medinat Madi,³⁰³ and twice refers to the singing of Manichaean Elect as a ritual performed to save soul.³⁰⁴ The situation is equally dismal for visual media in the west. Based on Manichaean literature outside of the Roman West, one would have expected to find ample evidence of visual media in the Roman West used as missionary tools.³⁰⁵ As discussed earlier, Mani even includes his *Picture-Book* as one of the strengths of his religion in his mission statement. In two Iranian sources, the *Picture-Book* (MP *ng'r*; Pa. *'rhnd*) is even connected explicitly to the Manichaean mission.³⁰⁶ It is thus rather disappointing when Augustine reports the following: "The Romans have made images even of bodily defects, such as Pallor and Fever. . . . You (i.e., Faustus) do not show us in paintings or sculptures or

³⁰¹*Conf.* 3.7.14; Van Oort 2006, 721–24. Van Oort additionally compares Augustine's knowledge of Manichaean cosmology with that presented in the Manichaean Psalm books.

³⁰²*Faust.* 15.5.

³⁰³*Faust.* 18.5

³⁰⁴*Enarrat. Ps.* 140.12; *Mor. Manich.* 17.55. This is probably related to the salvific work by the Elect who save the Catechumenate in imitation of cosmogonic figures (*Keph.* CXV), for which see discussion below in section 3.2. The references here to hymn-singing is also mentioned in passing in BeDuhn 2010, 1:57, where they are not at all explored. Furthermore, BeDuhn mistakenly says that these references are to Augustine's hymn-singing as an auditor, which only seems to be the case for *Conf.* 3.7.14. As for *Conf.* 10.33.49 and *Faust.* 13.18, these passages seem only to attest to Augustine's recognition of the power of songs to engrave images and emotions in the mind of the psalmist.

³⁰⁵See Gulácsi 2015, whose compilation of sources on pp. 25–204 is indispensable for the study of art in Manichaeism; see also Gulácsi's note on p. 54 on the Manichaean missionary use of visual media.

³⁰⁶M 2 I Rii.7: Andreas and Henning 1933, 303 (text); M 5815 II Ri.2.3, 25: Andreas and Henning 1934, 858 (text). For a discussion of these texts, see Gulácsi 2015, 70–75

interpretations these and countless other equally silly and crazy things.”³⁰⁷ It therefore seems quite likely that visual and auditory media were not largely used in the Roman West toward missionary ends.

2.4. Conclusions

I have tried to show in the above sections that Manichaeans exhibited a wide range of missionary practices that can be corroborated in both Augustinian and Manichaean sources. In addition to Manichaean treatises (2.3.1), their command of language (2.3.2), their exegesis of the New Testament (2.3.3), and their method of scriptural disputations (2.3.4)—all practices that have been well studied in Manichaean scholarship—I have further proposed some missionary practices based on my own findings in the Manichaean sources. For one, I have argued that the missionary practice of Manichaean disputations ended up being used in Augustine as a convenient tool for working with problematic passages (2.3.4.1) as well as toward heresiological ends of associating heresies together as guilty by association (2.3.4.2)—here, I have also revisited the common scholarly claim that Manichaean disputations were heavily influenced by Marcion, showing that, at least in Augustine’s corpus, this does not seem to be the case. Additionally, I have argued that Augustine’s corpus attests to Manichaeans’ use of favorable comparisons of themselves to the disciples of Jesus (and to Thomas in particular) (2.3.5), as well as to sensationalist appeals to the fasting and beggarly appearance of the Elect, known in Manichaean literature as “poverty,” and to their association with women (2.3.6). The ambulatory lifestyle of Manichaeans (2.3.7) seems also to have manifested in the form of merchant missionaries, while the Manichaean use of media other than the written form (2.3.8)—e.g., hymn-singing and illustrations—seem to have been missionary practices used outside the Roman West, or at least they are not attested within Augustine’s corpus.

³⁰⁷*Faust.* 20.9: *Nam et corporalium vitiorum simulacra Romani consecraverunt, sicut Palloris et Febris. . . . et alia innumerabilia pariter inepta et insana, nec pingendo aut sculpendo, nec interpretando demonstratis*; Zycha 1891, 545–46 (text); Ramsey 2007, 269 (translation). Gulácsi additionally takes *et quis numeret omnia deorum vestrorum officia fabulosa, nulla veritate manifesta, nullis aenigmatibus figurata* (*Faust.* 20.10) as an attestation, translating “Indeed, your gods have innumerable occupations, according to your fabulous descriptions, which you neither explain, nor represent in a visible form”; Gulácsi 2015, 51. However, *aenigma* can hardly carry the meaning of physicalness she is searching for here; rather, it must refer to some kind of figure of speech, which Augustine here implies is on the same level as truth (*veritas*).

As a kind of summary to this section, I provide the following table to show how corroboration has been met for each of the missionary practices discussion (the general precepts in the last column refer to those discussed in section 2.1):

	Manichaean sources	Augustine	General precepts
<i>Treatises and debates</i>	X	X	
<i>Command of languages</i>	X	X	1
<i>NT Exegesis</i>	X	X	1, 2, 3
<i>Disputations</i>	X	X	3
<i>Similarity to the disciples</i>		(X)	2
<i>Sensationalism</i>	X	(X)	
<i>Ambulatory lifestyle</i>	X	(X)	
<i>Visual/auditory media</i>	X		

() signifies some corroboration

The above table shows that Manichaean missionary practices extended well beyond the general precepts declared by Mani, which seem only to be related to Manichaean missionaries' command of language, New Testament exegesis, disputations of Old and New Testament pericopes, and comparisons between themselves and the disciples of Jesus (with a particular focus on Thomas). While this last practice seems to be attested only in Augustine, the others are well attested in both Augustinian and Manichaean sources, in addition to the composition of treatises against and debates with non-Manichaean religions, which does not appear in the general precepts, but is well attested already in Mani's own mission.³⁰⁸

On the other hand, while sensationalist practices dealing with poverty and association with women, the ambulatory lifestyle of the Elect, and visual and auditory media seem to have some relevance to the Manichaean mission as reported by Manichaean sources, Augustine seems to corroborate these weakly or not at all. While Manichaean "poverty" seems to play the role of attracting audiences to the pale and famished wandering Elect and association with women to do perhaps with the practice of converting women in order that they convert their husbands or simply with targeted appeals to women in general, these are practices that are rather ambiguously referred to in Manichaean sources and in rather polemical detail in Augustinian sources. As for the ambulatory lifestyle of the elect, there is an oblique report in Possidius's biography of Augustine that seems to suggest that Possidius had some knowledge of Manichaean missionaries, though it is not secure whence he received this information or indeed whether he is

³⁰⁸See S. N. C. Lieu 1992, 70–85.

actually aware of this practice at all. Furthermore, the missionary use of visual and auditory media does not seem to be corroborated by Augustine. In fact, Augustine even makes the explicit remark that Manichaeans make no use of visual media.

At any rate, this section seems to show that external comparisons between Augustine and Manichaean sources and internal comparisons within Augustine's corpus for consistency has proved to be a productive method for recovering the missionary practices used by Manichaeans in the Roman West.

3. Child Donations as Missionary Trainees

In the following chapter, I propose one further Manichaean missionary practice that seems to be well attested in Manichaean sources of the Roman West—i.e., the donation of children to train as missionaries and become members of the Elect. It seems these children were expected also to pray for the redemption of the catechuminate, especially for the catechuminate parents, in a manner that is justified in the Manichaean cosmogonic myth. Augustinian corroboration is found only obliquely. Before evaluating this evidence, I first introduce the scholarly discussion surrounding the sources. In the end, I provide a reconstruction of this missionary practice and the beliefs surrounding it.

3.1. *Scholarly Background and the Finds of Kellis*

The apparent Manichaean practice of the training of child missionaries has recently gained attention due to a set of related letters (P. Kell. Copt. 19–30; 52)³⁰⁹ recovered at Kellis, which, among other things, has renewed the discussion about the practice of donating children for missionary work.³¹⁰ The connection between these letters and Manichaean missionary practices was suggested by Iain Gardner already in 1993,³¹¹ though his first publication arguing for the existence of “a multilingual missionary context” based on this evidence does not appear until 1996 in an article co-written with Paul Mirecki and Anthony Alcock.³¹² This provocative argument is repeated in several publications.³¹³ However, to the best of my knowledge, there has been no study that examines the claim critically, offers an extensive comparison of relevant texts in the Manichaica, or discusses the broader implications for Manichaean missionary work.³¹⁴

³⁰⁹In Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 56, 156–203.

³¹⁰Most spectacularly in *Keph.*, LXXX.

³¹¹Gardner 1997a, 83.

³¹²Gardner, Mirecki, and Alcock 1997, 7–8; Gardner 1997b, 166.

³¹³S. N. C. Lieu 1994d, 89, has even speculated that the house in which the Syriac–Coptic bilinguals and missionary letters were found functioned at a Manichaean “safe house,” to which persecuted Manichaeans would flee and continue their work as a “proselytising centre,” though no evidence has yet emerged to support this assumption. Cf. Franzmann 2005, 120; on the missionary connotations of the command of languages see sections 2.1 and 2.3.2 above.

³¹⁴Cf., e.g., Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 39; Gardner 2000, 251; Gardner and Lieu 2004, 275; Franzmann 2005, 120–22; BeDuhn 2008, 267; Van den Berg 2010, 42; Baker-Brian 2011, 130; Moss 2012, 510–11.

In 1986, an Australian excavation team under the direction of Colin A. Hope³¹⁵ began to unearth in the Dakhleh Oasis what would prove to be the greatest archaeological find to date in Manichaean studies for a genuine, Manichaean community.³¹⁶ The site of Ancient Kellis³¹⁷ is located in modern-day Ismant el-Kharab where it was among some 2000 to 2500 villages comprising Egypt in Late Antiquity.³¹⁸ Located over 300 kilometers from the Nile River, journeys between the oasis and Egypt would have been relatively infrequent, so letters were often heartfelt and communication fairly regular.³¹⁹ Indeed, epistolary material would be one of the most important finds between 1991 and 1992, during the excavations of House 3.³²⁰

Built with a mud-brick structure, House 3 is the largest among the houses of the excavation area, totaling 10 rooms and containing by far the most amount of documents and vases among the houses of the residential area.³²¹ Numismatic data and papyrological evidence date the occupation of House 3 reliably to the mid- to late-4th century, with the house having been completely abandoned by the 390s.³²² The dialect has been tentatively assigned the category “general southern” Coptic with the provision label *L** due to its unique morphologies.³²³

³¹⁵Hope 1985.

³¹⁶While Khosroyev 2005 has expressed his doubts about the Manichaean nature of the prayer text found among the Kellis archive (P.KellisCopt. 98), after the study of the Arabic and Iranian parallels to this text in de Blois 2005; Gardner 2011b, there is no longer any question about the Manichaean identity of this particular text; see further Gardner 2013. Khosroyev does, however, introduce valid critique of the philological work that has been done on the prayer and suggests alternative ways of understanding what the editors of texts have otherwise understood to be references to Manichaean dogma, a perspective that should prove especially useful in parsing the religious identity of the material found in the archive that are less securely Manichaean in nature.

³¹⁷The name is attested within the letters themselves, though with some variation. Generally, as in P.KellisCopt. 40.15, ⲃⲗⲗⲉ but also ⲃⲏⲗⲗ in P. Kell Copt. 50.40 and ⲃⲏⲗⲏ in P. KellisCopt. 41.9. P. KellisCopt. 26 even has Ⲙⲉⲗⲗⲓⲥ in its (Greek) address.

³¹⁸Bagnall 1996, 110.

³¹⁹Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 12.

³²⁰Hope 1991; Hope, Kaper, and Bowen 1989; Hope, Kaper, and Bowen 1992.

³²¹As of my writing this text, the Dakhleh Oasis Project is still ongoing, having only begun to complete the publication of its findings from Area A, the residential section of Kellis; see Hope 1999, 97–98, 116.

³²²Hope 1999, 109–16. The numismatic data yielded by the 206 coins recovered from House 3 provide especially valuable information about the history of economic activity in the house, as well as a reliable date for its abandonment.

³²³Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 95.

3.2 Evaluating the Evidence of Child Donations and the Training of the Elect

By far the largest group of texts³²⁴ found at House 3 is a set of papyri that has been dubbed the “Makarios family texts,” due to its exchanges between a certain Maria (μαρια), with her two daughters at Kellis, and her husband Makarios (Μακάριος), who, for a reason left unexplained in the letters, is visiting one Apa Lysimachos (απα λυσιμαχος)³²⁵ in the Nile Valley along with his sons Matthaios (μαθηαιος)³²⁶ and Piene (πιενη).³²⁷ Of interest for the present study is the figure of Piene, the younger of Makarios’ two sons.

Piene features in 5 letters,³²⁸ wherein Makarios relates how Piene has joined the great Teacher (πιασ νσαε) on his travels to learn Latin,³²⁹ the two of whom had left Kellis for Antinoopolis³³⁰ and were presumably headed to Alexandria.³³¹ Relating this news to his mother, Matthaios writes the following:

But my brother he [πσαε] brought to follow him. I think that he will perhaps come³³² from the north and leave him in a certain place [ογμα]. If he does so, you (sg. fm.) will

³²⁴P.KellisCopt. 19–30 and 52. All but P.KellisCopt. 24 were found in Room 6 of the house; see Hope 1999, 108.

³²⁵Lysimachus is the only figure appellated with the honorific “Apa” in the entire archive from House 3. The title (ἄπα/ἄββᾶς), which derives from Aramaic ܢܦܢ, itself from Heb. ܢܦܢ (“father”), is frequently cited as evidence for Christian monks in papyrological studies, especially from this period; see, e.g., Derda and Wipszycka 1994; Choat 2006, 62–72.

³²⁶As it appears in P.KellisCopt. 26.8 and the addresses to P.KellisCopt. 25; 26; 27, but also presumably the same person, or at least the same name, referred to as μαθεος in P.KellisCopt. 19.3–4, 32, 77, 87, and as μαθηαιος in P.KellisCopt. 20.23, 33, 42, 58.

³²⁷Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 6, 56, offer a note of caution regarding the identification of conjugal families in the Kellis archive since familial language appears frequently and more often refers to the religious connotations of, e.g., “father” and “mother” as elders in the community rather than as actual family members. Nevertheless, scholarship has generally assumed kinship, especially for the Makarios family texts.

³²⁸P. Kell. Copt. 20; 21; 24; 25; 26.

³²⁹P. Kell. Copt. 20.24–26.

³³⁰P. Kell. Copt. 25.48–49. This letter, unlike the others that feature Piene, is written by Matthaios.

³³¹P. Kell. Copt. 24.24.

³³²The unusual—and what seems to be the hitherto unattested—use of the conjunctive (in 𐩢𐩪𐩣) with ταχα is quietly translated thus in the *editio princeps*, but it is worth looking into this unusual grammatical employment. First, one must note that τάχα carries the same meaning as the Coptic expression 𐩢𐩪𐩣 (literally, “you know not”) (Crum 1939, 202a). Secondly, the 𐩢𐩪𐩣 construction is used as what Bentley Layton calls an “initial attitude marker” in combination with the conjunctive to express doubt (Layton 2011, §§238, 354), a use that is attested in the Coptic New Testament (e.g., Rom 5:7); see Layton 2011, §381. I am indebted to Ivan Miroshnikov for this convincing coptological analysis. Besides this instance, we see the same usage of the conjunctive with ταχα in the following documents from P.KellisCopt. 19.74: ταχα 𐩢𐩪𐩣 ογλαγε (“Perhaps she will give something”); 19.81: ταχα 𐩢𐩪𐩣 κελαγε 𐩢𐩪𐩣. (“Perhaps he will give some other things to us [?]”); 22.14: ταχα 𐩢𐩪𐩣 ογμαδε 𐩢𐩪𐩣 𐩠𐩢𐩪𐩣 𐩠𐩢𐩪𐩣 𐩠𐩢𐩪𐩣 (“perhaps he will give a small amount [i.e. *maje*] of jujube and fig”); 25.28–29: 𐩢𐩪𐩣 𐩢𐩪𐩣 𐩢𐩪𐩣 𐩢𐩪𐩣 𐩢𐩪𐩣 𐩢𐩪𐩣 (“Or rather perhaps they are again changing and throwing us another time to you”). All the examples above also happen to derive from the Makarios family collection, perhaps suggesting that this construction may have been idiosyncratic. In these examples, at any rate, it is clear that ταχα is employed with the conjunctive as a kind of initial attitude marker. Three further examples to this newfound pattern are to be found within the Kellis

know. For he loves him exceedingly and makes him read at church. If he depends on the boy, and the boy (παιδοῦ) is satisfied, by following him, this will be his glory (πραγ).³³³

Several questions arise in reading this passage. What is Piene doing on his travels with the teacher? What does he end up doing in Alexandria? In what way will these activities result in his glory? To answer these questions, we must pause briefly to examine some relevant texts, including some of Augustine’s works and relevant material from the Coptic *Kephalaia*, *Psalm-Book*, and *Homilies*.

Augustine relates a similar story early in his *Confessions* that gives light to some of the activities Piene might be expected to engage in. Shocked by her son's conversion to Manichaeism, Augustine’s mother, Monica, turns for advice to a local bishop, who just so happens to have been a Manichaean:

he told her how he had himself been handed over (*datum fuisse*) to the Manichees as a little boy by his mother, who had also been led astray (*seducta*);³³⁴ he had not only read nearly all their books (*omnes paene non legisse tantum verum*)³³⁵ but had even copied (*scriptitasse*) some himself, and without anyone having to argue or persuade him it had become clear to him that the sect was something he should flee from. So he had fled.³³⁶

Thus, we hear the report of a Manichaean apostate whose childhood experiences serve as a parallel to P.KellisCopt. 25. Since this report occurs in a work that is rather critical of Manichaeans, however, it is important to reflect on the veracity of this report as historical evidence. While the narrative coincidence that an unnamed ex-Manichaean bishop just so happens to be in the vicinity of Augustine’s mother in response to her prayer leads me to doubt the historicity of such a bishop, there is no probable reason to doubt that this passage indicates that Augustine was somehow aware of the practice of Manichaeans donating their children to the

archive: P.KellisCopt. 103.39-40: ταχα ρεμῆ [ογκολ]λαριον ηηῖ (“Perhaps he could repair a [col]lar for me”); 105.26–27: ταχα ϒεῆ [ρολοκ]οτι η ϒηῆραμῑ (“Perhaps I could find a *solidus* or some bronze”); 115.34–35: ταχα ϒωτ ϒεῆ οε ηπωϒ [α]ρωτῑ (“Perhaps I myself will find the way to reach you all”). These instances, use the unusual pronominal conjunctive form without η-, for which see Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 327; Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 2014, 356.

³³³P. Kell. Copt. 25.42–48: πασαη δε ραϒιτῑ ρατρεϒοϒαϒῑ ηωῑ εῖμεϒε ϒε ταχα ηῑει ηϒητ ηῑϒαῑ ἡογμα· εϒωραηκαϒ αν τεηαημε εϒ[η]ειε γαρ ημαϒ τ[ον]οϒ εϒτρεϒωϒω κατῑ εκκληϒια· ει ηεν εϒωπε εϒειῑε ημαϒ ητῑ παιλοϒ ηταν εϒοηηε ηωῑ ηῑεαϒ ηε; Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 188 (text), 191 (translation).

³³⁴On the Manichaean mission and association with women, see the discussion in section 2.3.6 above, in the context of missionary appeals to sensationalism.

³³⁵Unfortunately, Augustine does not elaborate which books these are. On the books of the Manichaeans and their relevance to the Manichaean mission, see the discussion in chapter 2 above.

³³⁶*Conf.*, 3.12.21: Simul etiam narravit, se quoque parvulum a seducta matre sua datum fuisse Manichaeis, et omnes paene non legisse tantum verum etiam scriptitasse libros eorum, sibique adparuisse nullo contra disputante et convincente, quam esset illa secta fugienda: itaque fugisse; Verheijen 1981, 39 (text); Rotelle 2008, 92 (translation, slightly altered).

Elect to copy³³⁷ and read out³³⁸ the works of the Manichaeans, given that at least these elements are reflected in the Manichaica.

To be sure, Augustine’s anecdote is corroborated by the Coptic *Kephalaia* [“Chapter-Books”], a relatively late redaction of central Manichaean teachings that was among the finds of Medinat Madi,³³⁹ specifically in *Keph. LXXX*,³⁴⁰ which additionally explains how such a child, given up by its family, would attain glory. The same teaching details the well-known “seals” of the Manichaeans, most infamously characterized as the *signacula oris, manuum, et sinus* that Augustine reports as the sexual and dietary restrictions of the Elect.³⁴¹ Following this section on the mandates of the Elect, *Keph. LXXX* describes three works (ζωβ) that ought to be performed by the catechumenate. The second of these three concerns us here: πρωμε νατ [ο]γωμρε ντ[εκ]κλησια ατδικαιοσυνη (“A man shall give a child to the church for righteousness (δικαιοσύνη”).³⁴² Here, I agree with Jason BeDuhn’s intuitive analysis that δικαιοσυνη here

³³⁷In P. Kell. Copt. 19,14–19, Makarios himself exhorts his son to practice his Greek and Coptic in order to copy some books back home at Kellis: μελετε π[ε]ν[ε]κ[ε]ψαλμος ειτε πογιαμιν ειτε π[ε]ρ[ε]π[ε]κ[ε]ν[ε] ροογ <νιμ> . . . [. . .] π[ε] μ[ε]π[ε]ρ[ε]κε τεκεπαγγελια εβαλ εις τ[ε]κ[ε]ρ[ε]σις π[ε]πετρος ρατ[ε]κ ε[ρ]ι παπ[ε]οστολος η π[ε]μαν αμαρτε π[ε]ναδ π[ε]ωληλ ηπ[ε] π[ε]ψα[λ]μος η[ο]γ[ε]μ[ε]ν εις π[ε]ρ[ε]μα αν ρατ[ε]κ αρ[ε] η[ε]λετε π[ε]μαγ εις π[ε]κ[ε]λις εζ ρ[ε]π[ε]κ[ε] [ο]γ[ε] ρ[ε]π[ε] ρ[ε]π[ε]καπ σαπ ηρ[ε]ογο ηρ[ε]ο[γ]ο εζ ογ[ε]τ[ε]πος π[ε]μ[ε]νε δε τ[ε]π[ε]ρ[ε]ψ[ε] α μ[ε]μακ εζ ρ[ε]π[ε]χ[ε]ομ[ε] π[ε]π[ε]μα (“Study your psalms, whether Greek or Coptic, <every> day . . . Do not abandon your vow. Here, the Judgement of Peter is with you. [Do the] Apostolos; or else master the Great Prayers and the Greek Psalms. Here, too, the Sayings are with you: study them! Here are the Prostrations. Write a little from time to time, more and more. Write a daily example, for I need you to write books here.”); Gardner, Alcock, and Funk 1999, 157 (text), 160 (translation). For a discussion of this text and the possibility that π[ε]ρ[ε]μα refers to verbs and π[ε]κ[ε]λις to conjugations, see section 2.3.2 above.

³³⁸See discussion in note 92 in section 2.2 above.

³³⁹On the Medinat Madi texts, see the discussion in sections 1.2–3 above; on the *Kephalaia* as a text that emerged only after Manichaean dogma became well established and thus as a relatively late text in the timeline of Manichaean theological development) see Pettipiece 2013. On the question of the authorship of the *Kephalaia* as well as other useful comments on its content and text, see Wolf-Peter Funk’s progress report on the editing of the text in Funk 1997; cf. Tardieu 1987, 134; Pettipiece 2009, 7–19.

³⁴⁰*Keph. LXXX* 192.3–193.22; Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 192–93 (text); Gardner 1995, 201–2 (translation).

³⁴¹*Mor. Manich.* 7.10; 9.18. The Four Light-Seals are also reported in the *Xuāstvānift* VIII B—for which, see Asmussen 1965, 173–180 (text), 196 (translation)—where they refer to Love, Faith, Fear, and Wisdom. An etiological explanation is also given for the “seals” of the Elect in *Keph. LXX*: 172.4–29; in these teachings, however, there are in fact five seals detailed: the seal of the face (= Keeper of Splendour; looking upon the Good), of the heart (= King of Honour; emotional moderation [?]), of the chest (= mystery of the Adamas of light; prohibition of sexual), of the stomach (= King of Glory; dietary regulation), and of the feet (= Porter; treading carefully upon the Cross of Light [?]). On the numerical significance of five for missionary activities, see Pettipiece 2009, 88–89; I have not included this in my discussion of missionary practices in chapter 2, as there does not seem to be enough evidence to support the claim that Manichaeans consciously used numerology in their mission.

³⁴²*Keph. LXXX*: 193.5–7; Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 193 (text); Gardner 1995, 202 (translation). The teaching offers these alternatives to donating one’s child, directly following the section quoted above, in *Keph.* 193.7–10: η περωβρενος [η πρμ]π[ε]νη η εραωτε πογε εραε ρετ[ε] ρ[ε]π[ε] ογ[ε]λιψ[ε] η εραταγ ογ[ε]ραγαν ηρεεε ατδικαιοσυνη (“or his relative [or a member] of his household, or he shall save someone in distress (=adopting an

most probably means the Elect way of life.³⁴³ BeDuhn does not, however, offer a compelling explanation for why ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ should be understood this way beyond connecting this explanation to his social reconstruction of the Manichaean community. On the other hand, Fernando Bermejo Rubio³⁴⁴ demonstrates convincingly that δικαιοσύνη is used in “The Prayer of the Emanations” (“Εὐχὴ τῶν προβολῶν”), and throughout the Coptic Manichaica, as a *terminus technicus* for the Elect.³⁴⁵ It is also likely to surmise, given the use of *parvulum* in Augustine, πλιλογ in P.KellisCopt. 25, and references to little children in a similar context in the Coptic Manichaica,³⁴⁶ that οὐωηρε in *Keph.* LXXX likely refers not only in biological terms to one’s child, but also in terms of age as in a *young* child. But why does it matter that the young proselytes be given away while still young?

Although our available sources are silent on the matter, one can surmise that only the children of the catechumenate could become Elect, and if this is so, that only young children could become the Elect, due to the structure of the Manichaean order. To be sure, the catechumenate was commanded to provide food as alms to the Elect,³⁴⁷ since the Elect were themselves completely forbidden from agricultural labor and work,³⁴⁸ as doing so would harm the light that was “crucified” in matter.³⁴⁹

To explain the continued existence of the Elect, then, in Manichaean communities and as missionaries, I posit the following hypothesis: only very young children—too young to produce food for themselves—could be raised as the Elect, since their auditor parents would provide them food as alms, allowing them already as young children to maintain the Elect prohibition of

orphan?), or buy a slave and give him to Righteousness”); Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 193 (text); Gardner 1995, 202 (translation).

³⁴³BeDuhn 2000, 31.

³⁴⁴Bermejo-Rubio 2013, 233–35.

³⁴⁵Bermejo-Rubio 2013, 234n84; *Keph.* 36.5–6; *Hom.* 14.8–9; 15.12; 31.5; 53.6; *Ps.-Bk. II* 140.12

³⁴⁶*Hom.* 31.6–7, wherein “little girls” (πκογῑ πλιλαγε) are explicitly mentioned and grammatically linked to “a crowd of children” (οὐμηωρε̄ πωηρε̄ εριμε̄), and possibly later in *Hom.* 31.15–17, which discusses “the first ones fleshly born . . . they will be given to righteousness” (πωρηπ̄ (. . .) ετογαμεστογ̄ η̄ε̄ρη̄ . . . εγατεγε̄ ατδικαιοσυνη); Pedersen 2006, 31 (text and translation). Other possible attestations of relatively young children having been given away in the same missionary context include *Hom.* 26.22–34; *Ps.* CCXLVIII, CCXLIX, CCLXI, CCLXVIII, CCLXXII; see discussion below.

³⁴⁷M 49 I; M 825I; M 6020; *Keph.* 192.29–33; 208.27–29; 217.11–16; *Conf.* 4.1.1. See also Franzmann 2013.

³⁴⁸Known, e.g., in Augustine’s terminology as *signaculum manuum*. See discussion above.

³⁴⁹Known generally as *Jesus patibilis*, the suffering Jesus that represents the sum of all light that was crucified upon matter in the creation of the world. See Böhlig 1978; Koenen 1978, 176–87; Ries 1994, 238–41; as well as the discussion in section 2.2 above.

agricultural labor. Furthermore, the Elect could never give birth to the Elect, since sexual contact was absolutely forbidden—so where else could the Elect have come from?³⁵⁰ It is only logical then that the Elect could only have been supplied by the children of the catechumenate. Toward this evidence, in the *Manichaean Psalms*, among those dedicated to Jesus, we in fact find five references to the palmist's status of having been an Elect “since my youth” (ⲭⲛⲛⲧⲁⲙⲛⲧⲕⲟϥⲓ).³⁵¹

From this evidence, it becomes apparent that the children to be donated to the Elect described in *Keph. LXXX* must clearly mean that such a child has been born an Elect. The Coptic *Homilies*, in an apocalyptic section known as the *Sermon on the Great War*,³⁵² contains some eschatological imagery that further corroborates this argument. Especially telling is *Hom. 31.15–17*: “The first ones (i.e., the first ones following the Great Persecution of the Manichaeans) from time to time which will be fleshly born [. . .] they will be given to righteousness. And the usual vice (πονηρία) will cease among them”].³⁵³ This eschatological

³⁵⁰Known especially from Augustine's term *signaculum sinus*. See discussion above. In *Mor. Manich.* 18.65, Augustine misleadingly concludes that reproduction among Manichaeans is dogmatically contradictory: *nonne vos estis qui filios gignere, eo quod animae ligentur in carne, gravius putatis esse peccatum quam ipsum concubitum?* (“Are you not the people who think that the begetting of children, by which souls are bound in the flesh, is a more serious sin than intercourse?”); Bauer 1992, 147 (text); Ramsey 2006, 99 (translation). In fact, the production of more catechumenate meant more alms-giving for the Elect, thus accelerating the process by which light would be returned to the Kingdom of Light. If it was the catechumenate who biologically furnished the new generations of the Elect, as I suggest, then reproduction among the catechumenate should be seen as especially central to the Manichaean mores.

³⁵¹*Ps.-Bk. II CCXLVIII* (56.17), *CCXLIX* (58.10), *CCLXI* (75.16-17), *CCLXVIII* (86.15), *CCLXXXII* (91.22). Only Psalm *CCXLVIII* potentially presents a problem, since later in the psalm, the singer adds that he or she has given alms (ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲛⲁⲉ) since his or her youth, the term used almost exclusively for catechumenate almsgiving in the Coptic Manichaica. It would be unusual for these alms to refer to the practice of the catechumenate rank, however, since the same psalms contain various references to practices and beliefs that identify the singers as belonging to the Elect: the renunciation of the world (*Ps. 57.23*; *91.23*) and of sexual intercourse (*Ps. 85.29*; *86.31*) and the singer's own election (*Ps. 58.8, 14*; *75.28*; *76.16–18*; *86.6–9*). In the Coptic Manichaica, however, we do in fact find non-catechumenate use of the term alms-giving: the Father of the Lights (*Hom. 4.7*), Bema (*Ps. 28.23*), the angels of compassion (*Ps. 139.41*), the compassion of glory (*Ps. 162.27*), Saints (*Keph. 270,30*), and the daughter of the first Man (*Ps. 175.20*) are said to “give alms”, by which is meant to petition for the souls of others. In *Keph. CXV*, the Manichaean doctrine is explained: only by “giving alms” in such manner is one truly saved; that is, in order to be saved, one must pray for another to be saved. This is the sort of “alms-giving” performed by those above the rank of the catechumenate. It is likely, then, that *Ps.56.17* refers to this particular kind of almsgiving, which is unique to the orders above the catechumenate. This for of Elect alms-giving seems also to be tied to these children Elect in their petitioning for the souls of their parents, discussed below.

³⁵²An excellent introduction to this text is to be found in Pedersen 1996, 11–29.

³⁵³ⲛⲟⲩⲁⲣⲏ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲥⲁⲡ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲙⲉⲥⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲁⲣⲗⲓ[. . .] ⲉϥⲁⲧⲉϥⲉ ⲁⲧⲁⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟϥⲛⲏⲏ ⲧⲓⲛⲟⲛⲏⲣⲓ ⲙⲓⲙⲏⲉ ⲉⲉ ⲛⲁⲗⲟ ⲛⲉⲣⲏⲧⲟⲩ; text and translation, slightly altered Pedersen 2006, 31. In his edition, Polotsky 1937, 31n2, Polotsky explains that this implies that sexual intercourse (= πορνεία) will be undergone for none other than the purpose of producing more Manichaean believers. This seems to be true even if Polotsky seems here to have mistakenly understood *ⲧⲓⲛⲟⲛⲏⲣⲓ* as πορνεία (“sexual intercourse”) as opposed to *ⲧⲓⲛⲟⲛⲏⲣⲓ* (“vice”), since *ⲧⲓⲛⲟⲛⲏⲣⲓ*, as it also occurs on l. 10, seems there to be related to *ⲡⲉⲧⲁⲣⲓⲡⲟⲣⲛⲉϥⲉ* (“he who will fornicate”) on l. 13. Additionally, given the parallel of *ⲉϥⲁⲧⲉϥⲉ ⲁⲧⲁⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟϥⲛⲏⲏ* in *Keph. LXXX* (*ⲡⲣⲟⲙⲉ ⲛⲁⲧ [ⲟ]ϥⲁⲩⲣⲉ ⲛⲧ[ⲉⲕ]ⲕⲏⲥⲓⲁ ⲁⲧⲁⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟϥⲛⲏⲏ*), we can even surmise that these end-time Manichaean catechumenate produce *only* more Elect. While Pedersen 1996, 264n284, on the topic of “the

passage suggests that, after the great persecution of Manichaeans, the catechumenate will engage in sexual intercourse *only* to produce more Elect, as suggested by the phrase “given to righteousness.” This phrase is used as well earlier in the *Homilies*: “καθῆτο[γ] τῆ[ρογ] ἡνάσ ἡν κογῖ · οὐμῆωε ἡωῆρε ἡτῆε [ἡκα]τῆχογμενος · εὔατεγε ἀτῆκαῖοςγῆη [κατα] πολ[ις:] καθῆ ἡκογῖ ἡλιλαγε ἡςριμε ε[γχι] σβω ἀςεῖῖ εὔρῆαλε εὔωω” (“You will find the[m] a[ll], the great and the small, a large number of children [sons?] of [ca]techumens, being given to righteousness in [every] cit[y]. You will find the little girls, b[eing ta]ught to write and singing psalms and reading”).³⁵⁴ Here, at least boys, and possibly even girls, that have been given to the Elect are seen teaching Manichaean doctrine through hymn-singing, a Manichean practice that may be attested to in Augustine.³⁵⁵ This eschatological image also parallels P. Kell. Copt. 25 in that it emphasizes teaching such donated children to read and write.

A further detail in the donation of children to become Elect seems to be its connection to the belief that these children, raised among the Elect, would in turn pray for the salvation of their catechumenate parents. This theology, in turn, explains why the catechumenate need not themselves become Elect. That is, while sinners are consigned to wander from soul to soul,³⁵⁶ the catechumenate need only make alms-giving³⁵⁷ in order to be saved from “ten thousand

Manichaean practice of giving children to the Church,” refers to Koenen and Henrichs 1970, 116–19; Henrichs 1973, 54; Koenen 1983, 102n58, 106n19; in fact, none of the scholars cited in these references expand our knowledge of child donation practices among the Manichaeans. Rather, they discuss the possibility that the Elchasaite community in which Mani was raised adopted children due to the moral devaluation of sexual reproduction in conjugal relationships among Elchasaites, and that this practice may perhaps have been influenced by the Essenes, a similar groups of sectarian Jewish-Christians. It should be noted that Pedersen does refer as well to *Keph.* 193.4–11, the passage discussed above, but does not expand further on this connection. To the best of my knowledge, this passage has not otherwise been connected with the donation of children for missionary practices discussed herein.

³⁵⁴*Hom.* 31.6–7; Pedersen 2006, 31 (text and translation). It is possible that the grammatical structure of the latter sentence suggests that only boys are given over to the Elect. This is unlikely, however, due to the large amount of women we find among the Elect; see note 10, above. It is worth noting, however, that the widespread travels of female Elect are reported only in anti-Manichaean polemical sources. It may very well be that we simply do not yet have any genuine Manichaean sources attesting this phenomenon, or indeed that this passage from the *Homilies* evidences the limitation of Manichaean child donation to boys. With the current data, neither thesis can be argued with unequivocally reliable corroborations. It should also be noted that the entire text is eschatological, so that one cannot ascertain precisely what is exaggerated in this passage—whether the fact that even *girls* are made literate or that the practices described here (i.e. the normal Manichaean practice of child donation) is seen in *every* city.

³⁵⁵*Faust.* 15.5; on hymn-singing in the Manichaean mission, see also the discussion in section 2.3.8 above.

³⁵⁶*Keph.* XCIX (249.31–251.25); cf. Epiphanius, *Pan.* 28.1–5. See, e.g., BeDuhn 2000, 80–81

³⁵⁷*Keph.* 280.5: ρ εἰῆμῆτῆε; Polotsky and Böhlig 1966, 280 (text). Heuser and Klimkeit 1998, 77, understands this passage as referring to the catechumen, who must be reborn ten thousand times until he is reborn as an Elect and is then saved. Although the passage is admittedly rather fragmentary, I argue that, given the theology of redemption discussed here, this passage must refer to the catechumen as the one who is saved from ten thousand transmigrations due to his or her alms-giving.

transmigrations.”³⁵⁸ This is because, as *Keph. CXV* explains, the Elect beseech the Father of the Lights on behalf of the catechumenate in the same manner as was done when the deceased First Man had been redeemed by the prayers of the Mother of Life.³⁵⁹ This *kephalaion* not only reveals the Manichaean notion of the fate of the soul after death and their concern for the dead, it demonstrates a connection between the alms-giving of the catechumenate and their salvation by the prayers of the Elect. Furthermore, since the chief form of alms-giving by the catechumenate is the donation of their children,³⁶⁰ it follows that the children of the catechumenate as Elect were expected to pray for the redemption of their parents after their parents had died. It is this prayer for the dead that is referred to in the cosmogonic myth that the Mother of Life redeemed the First Man through prayer.³⁶¹

One final connection to consider is the possible relationship between the donated child of the catechumenate and the figure of Jesus the Child (Copt. *παιλογ*; Pa. *kwm'r*).³⁶² While not much is understood of this figure, it seems that he is somehow related to the Living Soul, the divine principle that, in the cosmogonic myth alluded above, redeems the First Man through the prayer of the Mother of Life.³⁶³ If this is the case, it seems that it may be more than a coincidence that Jesus the Child is associated with the same myth used to describe the petitioning of the souls of deceased catechumenate by what I have proposed are Elect who were donated as children.

³⁵⁸*Keph.* 280.13–14: *ϩⲏⲧⲃⲁ ⲛⲙⲉⲧⲁⲅⲣⲓⲥⲏⲟⲥ*; Polotsky and Böhlig 1966, 280 (text). On the transmigration of the souls in the *Keph.* see further the thematically linked teachings in XC–XCII.

³⁵⁹*Keph.* 271.15–20: *ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲓⲁⲣ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛⲉⲕⲕⲗⲉⲕⲧⲟⲥ ⲙⲓⲙⲛⲛⲁⲓⲟⲥ [ⲉⲓ]ⲧⲱⲃⲉ ⲛⲟϩⲛⲁⲉ ϩⲛ ⲟϩⲛⲁⲅⲣⲧⲉ ⲉⲓⲃⲏⲕ ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲧⲓⲛⲟϩⲁⲓⲧⲏⲙⲁ ⲛⲧⲏ ⲛⲛⲓⲟⲧ ⲛⲛⲁⲏⲧ. ⲉⲓ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲉⲓⲧⲱⲃⲉ ⲁⲃⲱⲓ [ⲟϩⲁ]ⲉⲉⲧⲓ ⲟⲩⲁϥⲕⲁⲣⲓⲗⲉ ⲛⲉⲓ ⲛⲓⲉⲓⲧⲱⲃⲉ. ⲉⲓ ⲙⲉⲛ ⲉⲓⲧⲱⲃⲉ ⲁⲛ ϩⲁ ⲕⲉⲟϥⲉ ⲟⲩⲁϥⲣⲟⲥⲕⲁⲣⲓⲗⲉ ⲛⲉⲓ ⲙⲓⲛⲉⲓⲧⲱⲃⲉⲓⲧⲏⲙⲁ* (“For every elect [Manich]aeon person [if he] beseeches charity in total faith, he is [claimi]ng a [re]quest from our compassionate Father. So, if he is beseech[ing]over him[sel]f alone, he shall be favoured in his entreaty; [bu]t i[f] again he is [be]sееching on behalf of someone else, he shall be granted [hi]s r[eq]uest”); Polotsky and Böhlig 1966, 271 (text); Gardner 1995, 278 (translation). For a discussion of the cosmogonic myth of the First Man saved by the prayer of the Mother of Life through the Living Spirit as well as a discussion of this myth in relation to that of the Gnostic “redeemed redeemer,” see Heuser and Klimkeit 1998, 33–35. See also the notion of “alm-giving” (*ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲏⲙⲁⲉ*) by the Elect and divine principles in note 351 above. As Gardner notes (1995, 278n146), Böhlig’s reconstruction of *ⲙⲛⲛ* (“Manichaean”) is suspicious since the self-reference of Manichaeans as Manichaean is rare; cf. Lim 2008; Pedersen 2013.

³⁶⁰*Keph.* 193.5–7.

³⁶¹This, in turn, seems to be the redemptive work of the Elect through prayers and psalms to which Augustine refers in *Enarrat. Ps.* 140.12; *Mor. Manich.* 17.55.

³⁶²See, e.g., *Keph.* 35.27–34; 61.25–28; *Ps.-Bk. II* 167.64; 204.2–205.9; cf. the discussion on the word *παιλογ* above.

³⁶³Heuser and Klimkeit 1998, 34–39, 58–60; Franzmann 2003, 107–24; Van Lindt 1992, 35–44, 81–93, 149–53. Franzmann 2003, 132, even goes so far that, in relation to the Living Soul, *Jesus patibilis*, on which see the discussion in section 2.2 above, and Jesus the youth are “equivalent.” It is with the body of the First Man, devoured by the enemies of Darkness, from which the world is said to have been constructed. The Living Soul, equivalent to *Jesus patibilis* in the Roman West and consubstantial with all beings of Light, comprises the light particles that are cut up and dismembered, or “crucified,” in the matter of the world.

Furthermore, in a Parthian text, Jesus the Child is said to have been left behind like an orphan (*sywg*) when Jesus the Splendor ascended to the heavens.³⁶⁴ Perhaps this description of Jesus the Child as *sywg* lends further support to a link between Jesus the Child and the donation of children to the Elect, as donated children become, in a way, orphaned.³⁶⁵ Unfortunately, the scantiness and obscurity of the material surrounding Jesus the Child prevents deeper analysis, but it is at least worth considering that the language and mythical association of Jesus the Child, as well as of course the description of Jesus the Child *as* a child and the similarity in the notion of the orphaned Jesus the Child and the donated children of the catechumenate, are all compelling links to the practice of donating children to the Elect.

My review of the Manichaean sources on the practice of donating children for missionary work thus suggests that this is a well-attested practice. While the Kellis archive provides a concrete model in the boy Piene as a missionary trainee, the Coptic sources of Medinat Madi provide the theological background to the donation of children as a “work” or “alms-giving” of the catechumenate. Furthermore, by donating their children, the catechumenate seem to have safeguarded their own redemption, since the Elect were expected to pray for the redemption of the souls of the catechumenate in a manner that seems both to reflect the cosmogonic myth of the redemption of the First Man and to be related to the enigmatic figure of Jesus the Child (= the “alms-giving” of the Elect and divine principles of Light). Based on this review of sources, I provide the following summary regarding the practice of Manichaean child donation:

1. Children of the Catechumenate were offered up to join Elect
 - a. Alternatively, a relative, adoptee, or else slave could be donated, perhaps to serve as an provider of food, rather than as a member of the Elect
2. Donating one’s child was one of the three crucial “alms” of the catechumenate
3. Donated children were educated to read, probably in multiple languages
 - a. Children would read texts in church and sing hymns
 - b. These children, perhaps also as adults, copied books for the Manichaean community
4. Children would accompany the ambulatory Elect to learn the practices of the mission

³⁶⁴M 42 Ri.12–16; Andreas and Henning 1934, 879 (text). This language is reminiscent of John 14:18.

³⁶⁵In the Coptic texts, the Greek loan-word ὄρφανος seems to be used in all but one instance with the biblical allusion to the care for orphans (ἄορφανος) and widows (ἄνηρα): *Hom.* 7.19; [17.12]; 44.26; 53.5, 31; 56.13; 58.14; 61.7; *Ps.-Bk II* 53.25; 62.17; 175.22; 187.12 (cf., e.g., Exod 22:22; Deut 14:29; Ps 68:5; 94:6; 146:9; Job 31:16–17; Jer 7:6; Lam 5:3; James 1:27). In the fragmentary passage of *Ps.-Bk. II* 187.12, Allberry reconstructs ⲛⲟⲣ[ϕⲁⲛⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲥⲁ]ⲣⲛⲉ, “these wandering orphans,” though, even if this reconstruction is correct, the term “wandering” (ⲥⲟⲣⲛⲉ) seems to refer not to the kind of wandering of the Elect (e.g., *Ps.-Bk II* 133.1: ⲥⲁⲣⲁⲕⲟⲩⲧⲟⲩⲛ, “wanderer”) but rather to “going astray” or “sinning”; Allberry 1938, 187 (text and translation); Clackson et al. 1998, 132.

5. After the death of their catechumenate parents, the donated children (now Elect) prayed for, among others, their parents' redemption
 - a. This act, the "alm" of the Elect and the divine principles, echoes the redemption of the First Man by the Mother of Life in Manichaean cosmogony, a myth also associated with Jesus the Child

4. The Light in the East: Conclusions

Over the course of this thesis, I have given a comparative examination of the sources that evidence Manichaean missionary practices. By comparing Western polemical sources with genuine Manichaean sources, I have tried to produce a critical evaluation of the available data on Manichaeism as to the details of the Manichaean mission that can be securely established in the context of the Roman West. In the second chapter, I used this method to evaluate Augustine, from whose corpus can be extracted six general Manichaean practices that seem to be corroborated in Manichaean sources:

- 1) the use of polemical treatises and public doctrinal debates;
- 2) the use of language to translate texts as well as for effective rhetorical persuasion;
- 3) exegesis of the New Testament to demonstrate the Manichaean nature of the biblical scriptures;
- 4) the comparison of Old and New Testament scriptures to demonstrate that the Old Testament was of ill mores and ought to be discarded—were any Christian sects not to, they could not claim to be true Christians;
- 5) the use of the naïve docetic beliefs by Jesus's disciples to justify Manichaean Christological beliefs and the use of certain apocryphal texts;
- 6) sensationalist appeals to the visual aspects of poverty and association with women

In addition, in the third chapter, I have tried to show that the further practice of the donation of children by the Manichaean catechumenate to the Elect can be recovered from the sources with the reconstructed belief that these children would be raised as Elect missionaries and would in turn pray for the salvation of their community and particularly of their parents.

One of the limitations of this study, especially in chapter 2, has been the heavy focus on Augustine. While Augustine is the wealthiest source for Manichaeism in the Roman West, he is hardly the only source. My case for focusing on Augustine has been that his own attestation of Manichaean practices can be subjected to an internal comparison—that is, attestation in his corpus of any given missionary practice can be checked within his own corpus for consistency. Without this focus, for instance, it would have been easy to lose sight of the fact that his implicit claim of Manichaeism's link to Marcion seems already to have been refuted in his debate with Faustus (2.3.4.2) and seems to be more polemical in nature than other instances in his corpus where he refers to the Manichaean practice of Old *versus* New Testament disputations.

Nevertheless, I hope in the future to improve this aspect of the study by including a comprehensive survey of the available data in the Roman West. Furthermore, the study of the Manichaean mission would benefit from a comparison with practices evidenced in the Roman

East and in South and Far East Asia. A dissertation with this topic would not only fill a scholarly gap in the study of the Manichaean mission discussed herein, it would naturally lend itself to the spirit of international scholarship because of the rapid and wide geographical dispersion of the religion over just a few centuries.

However, even though this thesis could not comprehensively study even the Manichaean mission of the Roman West, by studying Augustine's corpus, it has provided most of the verifiable data on the Manichaean mission in the Roman West. Furthermore, this thesis has produced unique insights, including an analysis of a recently discovered sermon by Augustine that evidences the appropriation of the Manichaean missionary practice of disputations (2.3.4.1) and the following missionary practices: comparisons by Manichaeans to the disciples of Jesus (2.3.5), sensationalist appeals to poverty and to association with women (2.3.6), and the donation of children to the Elect (3.2). Additionally, the appendices present the first translation into English of Augustine, *Serm.* 350F with a commentary, as well as two tables that draw up the Manichean disputations of Old *versus* New Testament contradictions in Augustine's corpus. These insights, together with a fresh review of what is known about the Manichaean mission, contribute overall to a better understanding of what the Manichaean mission looked like in the Roman West, a work that I hope can continue to be built on.

Appendix A. Translation of *Serm.* 350F (= *Serm.* Erfurt 4)

I have translated *Serm.* 350F here to accompany the discussion of the text in chapter 2.3.4.1. Since the edition of the text is still relatively new, translations have thus far appeared only in Spanish and Italian.³⁶⁶ The translation is based on the edition prepared by Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann, the *editio princeps* of the unique manuscript discovered in Erfurt.³⁶⁷ The editors suggest that the textual tradition attested here is parallel to the shorter one attested by Lambot's edition (= *Serm.* 164A),³⁶⁸ which is based on 7 manuscripts.³⁶⁹

The sermon of St. Augustine on almsgiving, which ought to be for all³⁷⁰

1. There are those who believe that alms (*eleemosyna*)³⁷¹ should be given merely to the righteous, while nothing ought to be given to the sinful. The Manichaeans hold the foremost rank of sacrilege³⁷² relating to this error, being those who believe that the limbs of God are imprisoned, mixed thoroughly with and bound up in all manners of food, and ought to be treated sparingly lest they be polluted by sinners and woven into more lamentable knots.³⁷³ This

I am grateful to Ivan Miroshnikov and Georgy Obatnin who provided helpful comments in our *ad hoc* Latin reading group of this text.

³⁶⁶Anoz 2010; Catapano 2012.

³⁶⁷Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann 2009, 201–13. As the title suggests, the two other texts in this publication are also on the topic of almsgiving, but do not touch on Manichaean themes so are not discussed herein. *Serm.* 350F is here assigned *Serm.* Erfurt 4.

³⁶⁸A recent translation can be found in Hill 1990b, 199–201. Prior to Verbraken's resystematization of Augustine's sermons, this text was previously referred to as *Serm.* Lambot 28.

³⁶⁹Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann 2009, 206; Lambot 1956. In this text, cap. 1–3, 8 are parallel texts, while cap. 4–7 are unique. While the earliest manuscript in this tradition predates the parallel tradition by at least three centuries, this tradition is not only shorter but seems to be more prone to errors.

³⁷⁰This title is attested as such in Possidius, *Indic.* X⁶.192; Wilmart and Morin 1932, 207 (text). Cf. the title of *Serm.* 164A, *De generalitate elemosinarum* ("On the universality of almsgiving"), about which the difference with Possidius's attested title Lambot does not seem to express any reservations, rather claiming that the titles "convient parfaitement" (Lambot 1956, 154).

³⁷¹The Greek loan-word *eleemosyna* (Gk. ἐλεημοσύνη) is used here and two other instances in this sermon, in cap. 7 and 8; otherwise, all other 13 instances of the word "alms(giving)," including those in biblical citations, use the native Latin word *miserecordia*; additionally, *stips* is used once. While the term *miserecordia* throughout the sermon slips between connotations of general "mercy" and concrete "almsgiving," I am of the opinion that concrete almsgiving serves as the chief metaphor for mercy in this sermon rather than the other way around—thus, the references to feeding (*pascere*), assistance (*suscipere*), money-giving (*ergogatio*, *erogare*), making rich (*ditare*), reward (*praemia*, *merces*), beggars (*medicans*, *mendicus*), hunger (*fames*), thirst (*sitire*), wealth (*ops*), purses (*loculi*), feasts (*epulum*, *festus*), purchasing (*emere*), the wealthy (*dives*, *largus*), the poor (*pauper*), and terms that unambiguously mean almsgiving (i.e., *opus misericordiae*, *stips*, *eleemosyna*). I have therefore translated below all instances of *miserecordia* as almsgiving—except once, *miserecorditer* ("mercifully"). The alternate approach would be to interpret *miserecordia* as always meaning "mercy" (N.B., *opus misericordiae* would still mean "act of mercy," or "almsgiving") or then to see the denoted meaning of *miserecordia* as shifting throughout the sermon.

³⁷²All manuscripts except this and R (Paris BN. Lat. 2030, s. XV, 180v–181r), a late recension in the alternate textual tradition, suggest "sacrilegious Manichaeans (sacrilegi Manichaei)," though -i in that tradition could just as well be understood as in this case if understood as a syncopation of the genitive singular ending -ii, the full form of which is attested here. An argument can also be made that the *sacrilegi et impii* of cap. 5 could point to a preference for the adjectival use here of *sacrilegi*, but this phrase occurs in a separate context, and *primum sacrilegii locum* here seems to be the better word order.

³⁷³On Augustine's varying treatments of this Manichaean cosmogonic myth, cf. *Enarrat. Ps.* 140.12; *Faust.* 6.3; *Haer.* 46.10; *Nat. bon.* 44; *Agon.* 4.4, discussed above in section 2.2.

madness is perhaps not worthy to rebut than to let it offend the senses of all sane people, if it should be set out in such a manner.

But some who think³⁷⁴ no such thing still believe that sinners ought not to be supplied with food, lest we venture against God, whose indignation against those sinners has been made clear, so much so that he might even become angry with us for this reason, that we would want to aid those whom he himself wants to punish. They even employ proofs from sacred scripture, where we read: *Give alms, do not assist the sinner, and return vengeance upon both the impious and the sinful; do good unto the humble man, and give not to the impious one, for the one most high hates sinners and will return vengeance upon the impious* (Sir 12:4, 6–7).³⁷⁵ Not understanding how these words ought to be understood, these people deck themselves with detestable cruelty. For which reason, we ought, my brothers, to address your charity for some time on this matter, lest you should agree with this human deformity, should you not understand the divine will in the divine books because of this perverse way of thinking.³⁷⁶

2. For Paul the apostle most clearly teaches that alms ought to be bestowed upon all, saying, *So let us do good tirelessly to all while we have time, especially to those at home in the faith* (Gal 6:9–10).³⁷⁷ From this, it is abundantly clear in works of this manner that the righteous ought to be placed ahead. For whom else might we understand as *those at home in the faith*, since elsewhere it is clearly put,³⁷⁸ *Does the righteous man live by his faith?* (Gal 3:11; Heb 10:38; Rom 1:17 cf. Hab 2:4). However, we ought not to close our hearts to almsgiving, not even should they carry a hostile demeanor against us, since, as our Savior himself reminds us, saying: *Love your enemies; do good unto those who hate you* (Matt 5:44). Nor is this absent from the

³⁷⁴The reference here to *nonnulli . . . sentientes* (“some who think”) is obscure and cannot be fully established, since the dating of this text is equally uncertain. Most likely, if Augustine had a group in mind, he would not have hesitated to name them, as he like to do in his sermons to defend his congregation from heretical influences (see, e.g., *Serm.* 73a.2; 252.4; 364.4). Rather, this *nonnulli* seems to have the same referent as the Manichaeans mentioned earlier—namely, to serve as rhetorical devices to facilitate Augustine’s exegesis of a problematic passage, one perhaps that has even been critiqued by Manichaeans. For this discussion, see section 2.3.4.1 above.

³⁷⁵Augustine’s quotation here of Sir 12:4, 6–7 mostly agrees with the extant VL fragments, except for the first two words (*da misericordiam*, “give alms”; Sir 12:4). LXX gives δὸς τῷ εὐσεβεῖ (“give to the pious”), while V gives *da misericordi* (“give to the merciful”). The VL text, on the other hand, gives *da justo* (“give to the righteous”). This is a remarkably curious discrepancy on Augustine’s part, as he even insists to Jerome that the latter should rely on a Greek-based translation of the OT—see, e.g., Jerome, *Epist.* 112.22; Augustine, *Epist.* 82.5.35. Perhaps Augustine is avoiding the Manichaean overtones that might have emerged from the comparison of the LXX of Sir 12:4 to the later NT reference *operemur bonum ad omnes, maxime autem ad domesticos fidei* (Gal 3:11; Heb 10:38; Rom 1:17), which could be understood as a justification of the practice of almsgiving by the Manichaean catechumenate to their Elect; cf. *Keph.* LXXX. For the VL text (= Text I), attested by a fragment in the Bavarian National Museum of Munich (CLM 29265/6) and a fragment in the Capitulare Museum of Verona (I(1) App; frag. 1 (fol. 1–3)), see Thiele 2005a, 14, 26; Thiele 2005b, 134–36.

³⁷⁶The parallel tradition is quite different here and much shorter (see Lambot, 1956, 156): “For which reason, we ought, my brothers, to address your charity on this matter, lest you should come to disagree with the divine will because of this perverse way of thinking.”

³⁷⁷Cf. *Keph.* 165.21: “As long as there is time to do good” (ἕως ἐρε καιρος ὡσπ ἀρπαγαθον) (text: Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 165; translation: Gardner 1995, 174); M 5815 ii.1.1–2 (text: Boyce 1975, 48; translation: Klimkeit 1993, 260): “And do not put off the good you can do now, for time is passing swiftly” (ʿbystn ny krʿh; byc cy ʿwʿs kyrbg šhʿh kyrdn, ny frgwšʿh, cy jmʿn rg nydfʿryd).

³⁷⁸The pun here of *aperte sit positum* (= *ponere*) “clearly put” with *praeponendos* (= *praeponere*) “ought to be placed ahead” seems to be intended for rhetorical effect.

Old Testament,³⁷⁹ for there it is written: *If your enemy should hunger, feed him; if he should thirst, give him drink* (Prov 25:21), of which text the apostle also makes use (cf. Rom 12:20). Nor, however, is the passage we have set out earlier false, for they themselves are holy tenets: *Give alms and do not assist the sinner* (Sir 12:4). For those words are said against your doing good to some sinner for the reason that he is a sinner, so that you would rather do good to one you hate, not because he is sinful, but because he is human.

Thus will you keep both tenets, neither being lax toward vengeance, nor inhuman toward aid. For everyone who rightly censures a sinner—what else could it be than that he wishes the sinner were not a sinner—he therefore hates in that sinner what God also hates, that he would efface what the man has done and let free what God has made. Indeed, what man has done is sin, while what God has made is man himself. And when we say those two words, “man” and “sinner,” neither are said in vain.³⁸⁰ Therefore, reproach him for being a sinner, but he is to be pitied for being a man.³⁸¹ Indeed, you shall never liberate the man entirely, so long as you should persecute him as a sinner.

3. All manners of discipline is intent on this duty, just as it is fitting and in the interest of any governor, not only for a bishop who governs his people, but also for a pauper who governs his home,³⁸² a wealthy man who governs his family, a husband who governs his wife, a father who governs his young, a judge who governs his province, or a king who governs his nation.³⁸³ All of these, if they are good, certainly wish well upon those they rule and, according to the authority bestowed upon them by the Lord of all—he who governs even the governors³⁸⁴—take pains so that those very ones they govern might both remain human and perish as sinners.

They thus fulfill what is written: *Give alms and do not assist the sinner* (Sir 12:4), so that they should not wish to be well in him what is the sinner, *and return vengeance upon both the impious and the sinful* (Sir 12:4), in order that what constitutes the impious and the sinful in him might be effaced; *do good unto the humble man* (Sir 12:6), for the reason that he is humble, *and give not to the impious one*, for the reason that he is impious, *for the one most high hates sinners*

³⁷⁹On similar themes in Manichaean discussion, cf. *Adim.* 7.1; 8; 17; *Serm.* 110a.8.

³⁸⁰The trope of “man” and “sinner” as what distinguishes the man-made self (= *peccator*) from the God-made self (= *homo*) is a common trope in Augustine and is chief among the themes the editors have used to prove the authenticity of the sermon, comparing *Adim.* 7.5; *Enarrat. Ps.* 102.13; 139.2; *Tract. Ev. Jo.* 12.3; *Serm.* 4.20; 13.8; 22.7; 24.3—see Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann 2009, 203; Lambot 1956, 153; cf. Migne 1857, 1227–30, where the sermon is relegated to a section with sermons of uncertain identity, though the reason for rejecting its authenticity is not given. Additionally, cf. also *Serm.* 23A.1; 125.4; 379.4; *Enarrat. Ps.* 44.18; 100.5; *Tract. Ev. Jo.* 42.16; *Tract. ep. Jo.* 7.11. It is interesting to note that this rather Manichaean dualistic tendency on Augustine’s part to divide man from sinner within the individual is most often linked to Augustine’s expositions on John, with its Gnostic tendencies, and the Wisdom traditions of the Proverbs and Sirach.

³⁸¹Augustine here makes use of the implicit etymological connection between *miserere* (“to pity”) and *misericordia* (“alms”).

³⁸²One late manuscript (Paris, BN lat. 2030, s. XV, 180v–181r) in the parallel textual tradition gives the intriguing but doubtlessly wrong *dominum* (“lord”) here; thus, “for a pauper who governs his master.” While this reading would make sense in a general Christian context, it hardly makes sense in the context here; cf. Hill, 1990b, 201n4.

³⁸³On similar themes, cf. *Civ.* 2.19; *Gaud.* 1.19.20. Besides the rhythmic isocolon that opens this cap., the final clause *regi regenti gentem suam* (“a king who governs his nation”) rings with a striking alliterative pattern, interweaving “r,” “g,” “n,” “t,” and “m,” a shining example of Augustine’s rhetorical acumen.

³⁸⁴Cf. the phrase “king of kings” (VL *rex regum*; GNT/LXX ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων) in Ez 7:12; 2 Mac 13:4; Dan 2:37; 1 Tim 6:15; Rev 17:14; 19:16. VL parallels are attested in the NT citations; the phrase is also found in parallels to GNT/LXX and V.

and will return vengeance upon the impious (Sir 12:6–7); however, he, because they are not just sinful and impious but also human, causes His sun to rise upon the good and the bad and lets rain fall upon the righteous and the unrighteous (Matt 5:45). Thus, alms should be restricted from no man, impunity enjoyed by no sin.

4. For what do we accomplish with reproach, if we do not punish sins?³⁸⁵—And when anyone turns to God to repent, what else but to reproach and punish himself? For in no way do you err in the work of alms when you persecute in someone what even you wish he would mercifully³⁸⁶ persecute in your own self. Witness what the prophet proclaims about the preachers of the future kingdom of heaven: *The righteous will exalt in glory, they will rejoice upon their couches, exaltations of God in their throats and double-edged swords in either hand to strike vengeance upon the nations* (Ps 149:5–7). And, lest anyone should think that blood be shed by such swords and a slaughter of bodies made—as if opposing thoughts of such kind with the explanation, when he had said *to strike vengeance upon the nations* (Ps 149:7)—he has added what sort of vengeance: *Reproach*, he said, *of the nations* (Ps 149:7). This do the *swords in either hand* accomplish—i.e., they have been given for the authority of use.³⁸⁷

For the two swords are double edged with respect to the anguish of present times and the dread of future times. *Who is there*, the apostle said, *who can gladden me, except he who is saddened because of me?* (2 Cor 2:2) Behold, the anguish of present times. And *when I come*, he says, *I shall not show consideration. Or do you want to have proof of Christ*³⁸⁸, *the one who speaks in me?* (2 Cor 13:2–3). Behold, the dread of future times. In another place, he again points out the governance³⁸⁹ of his Lord among men: *For if we would not judge ourselves, we would not be judged by the Lord. When we are judged, we are censured by the Lord, lest we be condemned along with the world* (1 Cor 11:31–32).³⁹⁰ The anguish of present times exists in the

³⁸⁵The phrase here *nisi peccata punimus* (“if we do not punish sins”) recapitulates the ending of the previous cap., *nulli peccato impunitas relaxanda* (“impunity should be enjoyed by no sin”). This play between *peccato impunitas* and *peccata punimus* also seems to explain the otherwise awkward lack of parallelism at the end of cap. 3: *nulli homini . . . nulli peccato* (i.e., contrasting a man with a sin rather than a man with a sinner). In the alternate tradition, three manuscripts even correct *peccato* to the seemingly more parallel *peccatori*; Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann, 2009, 210.

³⁸⁶Here, again, *miseriquiditer* is used in the sense of “mercifully,” alongside the “work of alms” (*opera misericordiae*), a phrase unambiguously associated with the act of almsgiving; see Blaise 1954, s.v. *miseriquidia*.

³⁸⁷Similar wording suggests that Augustine is here referring back to the previous paragraph: “the authority bestowed upon them by the Lord of all (*impertitam ab universorum domino potestam*).”

³⁸⁸The editors suggest that the emendation here of *Christi* to *Christus* is “perhaps better” and would then read “*Or do you want to have proof of the one who speaks in me, Christ*” (Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann, 2009, 210). Alternatively, while *Christi* is rather out of place in the Latin text at the end of the sentence, perhaps one reason is that Augustine’s scriptural quotation directly mimics the syntax of the GNT: ἐπει δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ.

³⁸⁹The word used here is *regimen*, which clearly calls back to the notion in the previous cap. of *regi regenti gentem suam* (“a king who governs his nation”) and *qui etiam regentes regit* (“he who governs even the governors”).

³⁹⁰This is a curious paraphrase of the first verse which otherwise reads, “But if we judged ourselves, we would not be judged” (1 Cor 11:31, NRSV). The word *dominus* is not present here in V, nor is κύριος present in GNT. Augustine’s reading seems to be more absolute than the scriptural referent, suggesting that the scenario of judgement of man by man/self is unthinkable. This notion seems to play on Augustine’s reference in the next cap. to the general rule of *cum quisque sic pascit hominem quemlibet tamquam homo hominem* (“when anyone thus feeds whichever man, as a man a man”).

blow of reproach, the fear of future times in the threat of damnation. These are the double-edged swords, this persecution is due to the sinner, lest alms be denied to the man.

5. But it may seem strange and perhaps incredulous to those paying little attention, how even a sinner is assisted and fed on account of the fact that he is indeed a sinner. For it is one thing, when anyone feeds a man, because he has either thought or believed that the man is righteous, all while thinking on his reward, about which it is said: *Who accepts the righteous in the name of the righteous receives the reward of the righteous* (Matt 10:41). Another thing entirely, when anyone thus feeds whichever man, as a man a man, serving that general commandment where the Lord has said: *Whatever good you wish done unto you, do these yourself unto others* (Matt 7:12). Indeed, there are those who delight in the actual sins of the sinners, on account of which sins they supply them lavishly, so that you would not at all see that this sort of deed is opposite that of giving to the righteous because they are righteous.

For just as the righteous and the laudably pious hurry to render the service of kindness upon the servants of God,³⁹¹ by which sort they themselves are received into their eternal homes (cf. Luke 16:9), so do the sacrilegious and impious contrariwise seek the sorts of iniquities in men, and, toward the purchase, as it were, of such people,³⁹² they scatter their temporal goods and, accompanied with this sort, afterwards come into everlasting tortures. Between these two there lies some middle ground, where kindness is given from man to man, not because of righteousness or sin but because of fellowship in nature itself. This middle ground do the pious consciously use and the iniquitous themselves sometimes touch upon.

6. While, therefore, it is one thing to furnish the steward³⁹³ of the kingdom of the heavens with the necessities, as Onesiphorus to Paul (cf. 2 Tim 1:16); another to give alms³⁹⁴ to a beggar, as the one who sat at the Beautiful Gate (cf. Acts 3:2, 10),³⁹⁵ and another to reward shameful acts, as actors, charioteers, and gladiators enriched by the mad: the church exercises only the first and second kind of money-giving and does so often, on the other hand, condemning, rebuking, and chastising the one opposite the first and best.

³⁹¹Anoz takes “servants of God” here is a reference to Gen 50:17, referring to the Israelites in the OT (Ezra 5:11) and the Christians in the NT (1 Peter 2:16; Rev 7:3); Anoz 2010, 26n112. While these referents are certainly the true, Gen 50:17 need hardly, as Anoz argues, be the precise location on the basis that it is the only dative plural use of *servis* in the phrase *servis Dei*. As already shown in this text, Augustine is highly fluid in his use of scriptural quotations. Rather, it seems that Augustine is making reference to the general topos of Jews and Christians as “servants of God” without referring to one scriptural passage in particular. Alternatively, this phrase could have some thematic connection to the *dispensator* (“steward”) referred to twice in the next cap.

³⁹²Augustine seems to be playing on the notion of buying slaves in the phrase *quibus quodammodo emendis* (“toward the purchase, as it were, of such people”) in the context of sin, which contrasts with the pious form of servitude described in the preceding clause: *obsequium praebere Dei servis* (“to render service upon the servants of God”) with the structure *sicut . . . sic* (“just as . . . so . . .”).

³⁹³This word (*dispensator*) translates οἰκονόμος in 1 Cor 4:1, 2; Luke 12:42; Tit 1:7; 1 Pet 4:10. See esp. Tit 1:7 (VL *dispensator Dei*; GNT θεοῦ οἰκονόμος), the phrase used later in this same cap. The VL parallel was available only in Tit but is otherwise attested in V.

³⁹⁴The word used here for “alms” (*stips*, *-is*, f., though not attested in the nominative form) is used only 4 other times in Augustine’s works: *Ord.* 1.8; *Ep.* 261.1; *Civ.* 6.7; 18.54. All other instances except *Civ.* 6.7 (*de stipe templi*), which uses *stips* in a different context, refer to almsgiving to the beggars or the wretched and suggest a rather small amount.

³⁹⁵Cf. also *Serm. dom.* 2.6; *Civ.* 18.54.

Indeed, the indolent among us, those who scarcely break bread for the hungry Christ (cf. Matt 25:31–46),³⁹⁶ ought to be roused by this contrary deed, when the wealthier thespians³⁹⁷ hardly leave bread behind for their children. On the other hand, it is possible, on account of this middle ground where kindness is owed by one man to another, for a son of Gehenna, roused by some compassion, to feed a steward of God and equally for a son of the church to feed a gladiator, should he find one frail from hunger. Indeed, the former did not delight in righteousness, but was not able in any way to belittle the universal condition of mortality, nor did the latter assist a sinner, but rather did not deny another human alms.

7. The Lord speaks in this way on that first sort of good deed: *Who accepts the righteous in the name of the righteous receives the reward of the righteous, and who shall accept a prophet in the name of a prophet will receive the reward of a prophet, who shall give but a goblet of cold water to one of the least of these in the name of a disciple, truly, I say unto you, that one shall not lose his reward* (Matt 10:41–42), and on what I mentioned a little earlier:³⁹⁸ *Make for yourselves friends from the wealth of iniquity, so that they also would accepted you into eternal homes* (Luke 16:9), then there is also this: *Come, ye blessed by my Father, take hold of the kingdom which has been prepared for you from the beginning of the world, for I was hungry and you gave me eat, etc.* (Matt 25:34–35). But they said, *When did we see you hungry?* (Matt 25:37). To which he said, *What you have done for the least of these of mine, you have done for me* (Matt 25:40). Thus, about this sort of almsgiving—in which the affliction³⁹⁹ of no man is belittled, though no alms are owed to the sinner simply because he is a sinner—he admonished us, when he spoke about to the one who invited him along with the others: *When you give a feast, do not invite your friends, the sort by whom you could also be invited, but invite the lame, the blind, the crippled, the beggars, those who have not the means to give you recompense. But you will be given recompense at the resurrection of the righteous* (Luke 14:12–14).

From there, we are also able to return to the disciples, who thought about the custom of the Lord himself that he had ordered Judas, his traitor, to prepare something to give the poor on the day of the feast (for he had a purse on him) (cf. John 13:29), when he said to him: *Do quickly what you are doing* (John 13:27). For on what basis would they suspect this against him, if the Lord had never taught by also giving such sorts of alms? For, regarding this first sort of good works, in which anyone yields service to the righteous because of the merit of their righteousness, such submission is rather given to this kind than to the others. For whence even did that purse accumulate money except from offerings of submission? Also, quite clearly named in the Gospel are even certain pious women who, when they accompanied his circumnavigation with their servicing devotion, provided for him from their own resources (cf. Luke 8:2–3).

³⁹⁶This pericope is discussed again in the next cap.

³⁹⁷The phrase here, *theatrici largiores* (“wealthier thespians”), is corrected “with hesitation” to *theatrici largitores* (“theater sponsors”) in Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann, 2009, 205; 211 The sense would then be that this third kind of money-giving is bad because such money-givers leave no bread for their own children. The editors also suggest, with a similar sense, the emendation *theatricis largiores* (“those more generous toward thespians”). As with Anoz, 2010, 26–27n119, I see no reason why *theatrici largiores* is untenable here as an ironic statement. Indeed, the thespians are, in a way, said to be made “richer” (*largiores*) “by the mad” (*ab insanis . . . diatuntur*) earlier in the same cap.

³⁹⁸That is, about the righteous who are “received into their eternal homes” (*iusti et laudabili pietate praediti . . . ipsi recipiantur in tabernacula aeterna*) (cap. 5).

³⁹⁹Here again, Augustine make use of the etymological connection between *miseria* (“affliction”) and *miseriordia* (“almsgiving”).

8. From this, then, ought most importantly to be understood how one should not belittle alms-giving, which is devoted to all paupers by the law of kindness, since indeed the Lord lifted up the needs of the poor from His purse, which he filled with the wealth of others (cf. John 13:27, 29). But if anyone should perhaps say that neither those cripples and beggars whom the Lord ordered be invited (cf. Luke 14:12–14) nor those to whom he was wont to pay from his purse were sinners and that it does not thus follow that sinners are commanded by the Gospel texts to be assisted by the merciful⁴⁰⁰ or to be fed—that one should turn to what I have already mentioned earlier, because sinners certainly and criminals most of all are the ones who hate and persecute the church,⁴⁰¹ about whom it is nevertheless said: *Do good unto those who despise you* (Luke 6:27; cf. Mat 5:44), and this is built on by this example of God the Father, *who causes His sun to rise upon the good and the bad and lets rain fall upon the righteous and the unrighteous* (Matt 5:45).

Therefore, let us not assist sinners because they are sinners, but treat even them nevertheless, because they are also human, with human consideration. Let us persecute the proper iniquity in them,⁴⁰² let us have pity⁴⁰³ on the shared condition (i.e., of humanity), and, therefore, *let us do good tirelessly to all while we have time, especially to those at home in the faith* (Gal 6:9–10).

⁴⁰⁰Here, *misericors* (“the merciful”) is used adjectivally, while *suscipere* (“assisting”) is given as comparable to *pascere* (“feeding”). Mercy is thus tied concretely to the act of almsgiving.

⁴⁰¹Neither in the shorter text of Lambot’s edition nor here does Augustine actually seem to address the persecution of the church. Perhaps this refers instead to the persecution of the sinner in oneself discussed in cap. 4, but reference is not made to the golden rule until the next cap. and in a different context; there, it is even to Matt 7:12 as opposed to Luke 6:27 here. Additionally, no criminals are mentioned elsewhere in this sermon. Alternatively, and perhaps more likely, “what I have already mentioned earlier (*illud . . . quod iam superius commemoravi*)” refers to the citation of Matt 5:45 in cap. 3 and Matt 5:44 in cap. 2, with similar wording as the text of Luke 16:9 reintroduced from cap. 5 in cap. 7 with the words “on what I mentioned a little earlier (*illud . . . quiddam paulo ante commemoravi*).” In this case the *quia* (“because . . .”) clause introduces the reason why Augustine’s imaginary retorter should turn to (*attendat*) the Matthean passages mentioned earlier by Augustine. In this case, it is not necessary to assume that Augustine had sometime earlier mentioned the persecution of the church, as in Hill 1990b, 201n5, but rather that Augustine only now explains that “sinners certainly and criminals most of all (*utique peccatores et maxime scelerati*)” are the ones who “hate and persecute the church (*oderunt et persequuntur ecclesiam*).”

⁴⁰²Namely, the *peccator* (“sinner”) that exists in them alongside the *homo* (“man”); cf. cap. 2.

⁴⁰³Augustine’s final call to action, employing the hortatory subjunctive, is to have pity (*misereri*) on the unrighteous (*impii*)—here, the sinners (*peccatores*)—thus returning to the question posed in the beginning about whether alms (*misericiordiam*) should be given even to the unrighteous. All the connections between *misericordes* (“the merciful”), *miserere* (“having pity”), and *misericiordia* (“alms-giving”) fall into place with this final call: to pity (*miserere*) one’s fellow man necessitates being merciful (*misericors*) and thus giving alms (*misericiordia*) to all.

Appendix B. Manichaean Disputations in Augustine, Arranged by Source

The following table comprises all instances in Augustine's corpus which cites Manichaean disputations of OT vs. NT pericopes. The fourth column ("alleged contradiction") presents a summarized account of the contradiction allegedly presented by Augustine. Due to the question of the historicity of these arguments, I have included the word "alleged" to indicate that the authenticity of these disputations cannot always be entirely verified (see discussion in section 2.2 and 2.3.4). Similarly, references to OT and NT passages include only those Augustine explicitly claims are cited by Manichaeans. In compiling these sources, the Brepolis *Library of Latin Texts* was an invaluable source for searching through Augustine's corpus.⁴⁰⁴

In the endnotes to the table, I have listed all scholarship I am aware of that discuss the passages in Augustine's corpus that specifically relate the Manichaean practice of OT vs. NT disputations. Based on this survey of literature, it seems that *Serm.* 350F (see section 2.3.4.1) and *Serm.* 170.1–2 (see section 2.3.4.2) have not previously been used in relation to the discussion of Manichaean disputations.

Textⁱ	OT	NT	Alleged Contradiction
<i>Adim.</i> 1	Gen 1:1–5	John 1:10 Col 1:15–16	Was the Son present at the Creation (NT) or not (OT)? ⁱⁱ
<i>Adim.</i> 2.1	Gen 2:2	John 5:17	Did God rest on the seventh day of Creation (OT), or does he continue working even now (NT)? ⁱⁱⁱ
<i>Adim.</i> 3.1	Gen 2:18, 21–22, 24	Matt 19:29 Mark 10:29–30 Luke 18:29–30	Are we to leave our family for our wife (OT) or abandon both family and spouse for the kingdom of heaven (NT)? ^{iv}
<i>Adim.</i> 4	Gen 4:10–12	Matt 6:26, 34	If the earth was made barren after Cain's murder of Abel (OT), why do animals eat readily (NT)? ^v
<i>Adim.</i> 5.1	Gen 1:26	John 8:44 Matt 3:7; 23:33	How can man be made in God's image and likeness (OT), but non-believing Jews are fathered by the devil and vipers (NT)? ^{vi}
<i>Adim.</i> 6	Exod 20:12	Luke 9:59–60	Should one honor one's parents (OT) or prioritize their faith (NT)? ^{vii}

⁴⁰⁴Centre «Traditio Litterarum Occidentium» 2017.

<i>Adim. 7.1</i>	Exod 20:5	Matt 5:45, 48 Matt 18:22	Is sin inherited (OT) or are we to give forgiveness liberally (NT)? ^{viii}
<i>Adim. 8</i>	Exod 21:24	Matt 5:38–40	An eye for an eye (OT) or are we to give forgiveness liberally (NT)? ^{ix}
<i>Adim. 9.1</i>	(Gen 3:9–19; 4:6–15; 13:1–3, 7; etc)	John 1:18; 5:37–38	Is it only the Son who has seen God (NT), or did those in the OT also see God (OT)? ^x
<i>Adim. 10</i>	Exod 25:2–8	Matt 5:34–35 1 Tim 6:16	Does God reside in heaven/inaccessible light (NT) or in a little tabernacle (OT)? ^{xi}
<i>Adim. 11</i>	Exod 20:5; 34:14	John 17:25	Is God jealous (OT) or just (NT)? ^{xii}
<i>Adim. 12.1</i>	Deut 12:23	Matt 10:28 1 Cor 15:50	Is the soul part of the body (OT) or not (NT)? ^{xiii}
<i>Adim. 13.1</i>	Deut 4:23–24	Mark 10:17–18	Is God jealous (OT) or good (NT)? ^{xiv}
<i>Adim. 14.1</i>	Deut 12:15–16	Luke 21:34 Rom 14:21 1 Cor 10:21	Should we eat as we desire excepting blood (OT), or should we moderate our appetite (NT)? ^{xv}
<i>Adim. 15.1</i>	(Lev 11)	Matt 15:11	Do we become clean by what goes into our mouth (OT) or by what comes out (NT)? ^{xvi}
<i>Adim. 16.1</i>	Deut 5:12–15	Matt 23:15 Gal 4:10–11	Should we to observe the Sabbath (OT) or not (NT)? ^{xvii}
<i>Adim. 16.1–2</i>	Gen 17:9–14	Matt 23:15 1 Cor 7:18–19	Should we be circumcised (OT) or not (NT)? ^{xviii}
<i>Adim. 17.1</i>	Exod 23:22–24	Matt 5:44	Should we kill our enemies (OT) or love them (NT)? ^{xix}
<i>Adim. 18.1–2</i>	Deut 28:1, 3–4, 6	Matt 5:35; 16:24, 26; 8:38	Are the rewards of God spiritual (NT) or worldly (OT)? ^{xx}
<i>Adim. 19.1</i>	(1 Kgs 3:13) (Prov 6:11)	Matt 5:3 Luke 6:24	Does God make his people rich (OT) or poor (NT)? ^{xxi}
<i>Adim. 20.1–3</i>	Lev 26:3–10	Matt 10:9 Luke 12:20 1 Cor 14:33	Does God give worldly rewards (OT), or are all worldly things (except peace) in vain (NT)? ^{xxii}
<i>Adim. 21</i>	Deut 21:23	Matt 19:E21; 16:24	Does Moses's curse against those who hang

			from a tree (OT) apply to Jesus and martyrs hung at the cross (NT)? ^{xxxiii}
<i>Adim. 22</i>	Num 15:32–36	Matt 12:10–13	If Jesus abrogated the old law (NT), doesn't this mean that the old law was unnecessarily harsh (OT)? ^{xxxiv}
<i>Adim. 23</i>	Ps 127:2–4	Matt 19:12	Is our progeny the sign of the Lord's blessing (OT) or is celibacy (NT)? ^{xxxv}
<i>Adim. 24</i>	Prov 6:6, 8	Matt 6:34	Should we be frugal about our world things (OT) or not concern ourselves with them at all (NT)? ^{xxxvi}
<i>*Adim. 25</i>	Hos 9:14	Matt 22:30	Is the state of barrenness or celibacy a blessing (NT) or a curse (OT)? ^{xxxvii}
<i>Adim. 26</i>	Amos 3:3–6	Matt 7:17	Does evil originate from God (OT) or from evil itself (NT)? ^{xxxviii}
<i>Adim. 27</i>	Is 45:7	Matt 5:9	Does God create evils (OT), or are his followers peacemakers (NT)? ^{xxxix}
<i>Adim. 28.1</i>	Is 6:1–2	1 Tim 1:17	Is God visible (OT) or invisible (NT)? ^{xxx}
<i>*Enarrat. Ps. 145.13–14</i>	Ps 36:6	1 Cor 9:9	Does God nourish both man and animal (OT), or is man His only concern (NT)? ^{xxxxi}
<i>Faust. 14.1</i>	Deut 21:33	(Luke 22:43) Gal 3:13	Does Moses's curse against those who hang from a tree (OT) apply to Jesus and the penitent thief who were hung at the cross (NT)? ^{xxxii}
<i>Faust. 16.1, 6</i>	(Exod 20:8–1; 31:13–15)	John 5:17, 46	Is the Sabbath holy (OT) or not (NT)? ^{xxxiii}
<i>Faust. 18.2</i>	(Gen 17:9–14)	Matt 23:15	Is circumcision a mark of a believer (OT) or a sinner (NT)? ^{xxxiv}
<i>Faust. 18.2</i>	(Num 15:35)	(Matt 12:10–13; 23:15) (Gal 4:10–11)	Should the Sabbath be observed (OT) when Jesus did not do so (NT)? ^{xxxv}

<i>Faust.</i> 18.2	(Lev 1–7)	(Matt 9:13; 12:7)	Does God desire sacrifice (OT) or mercy only (NT)? ^{xxxvi}
<i>Faust.</i> 18.2	(Lev 11; 20:25) (Deut 14:8)	(Mark 7:13) (Matt 15:11)	Are certain animals unclean (OT), or does uncleanness come from one's own mouth (NT)? ^{xxxvii}
<i>Faust.</i> 32.5	(Deut 21:23)	(Matt 27:35) (Mark 15:24) (Luke 23:33) (John 19:18)	Does Moses's curse against those who hang from a tree (OT) apply to Jesus, who was hung at the cross (NT)? ^{xxxviii}
<i>Felic.</i> 2.10	Deut 21:23	Gal 3:13	Does Moses's curse against those who hang from a tree (OT) apply to Jesus, who was hung at the cross (NT)? ^{xxxix}
<i>Gen. Man.</i> 1.22.33	Gen 2:2–3	John 5:17	Did God rest on the seventh day of Creation (OT), or does He continue working even now (NT)? ^{xl}
<i>Gen. Man</i> 2.13.19	Gen 2:24	Eph 5:31–32	Is marriage a sacrament (NT) or not (OT)?
<i>Serm.</i> ^{xli} 1.1–3	::1	John 1:1–3	Did God create in the beginning (OT) or through the Word (NT)? ^{xlii}
* <i>Serm.</i> 2.2	Gen 22:1	???	Why should God need to test his people (OT)? ^{xliii}
<i>Serm.</i> 12.1–2	Job 1:6	Matt 6:8 John 10:7	How did Satan see God (OT) if only the holiest can (NT)? ^{xliv}
<i>Serm.</i> 50.1, 13	Hag 2:8	Luke 16:9 1 Tim 6:10	Inherent sinfulness of silver and gold. ^{xlv}
* <i>Serm.</i> 71.15	Deut 13:3	James 1:13	Does God tempt/test us (OT) or not (NT)? ^{xlvi}
* <i>Serm.</i> 82.5.8	Prov 10:10	Matt 18:15	Should censure be given publicly (OT) or privately (NT)? ^{xlvii}
* <i>Serm.</i> 110a.8 [= <i>S. Dolbeau</i> ^{xlviii} 17]	Exod 21:24	Matt 5:44	An eye for an eye (OT), or are we to give forgiveness liberally (NT)? ^{xlix}
* <i>Serm.</i> 152.6	(Exod 20)	Rom 7:12–13	How can the law Paul speaks of, which he calls holy (NT), refer to the law of the OT, which is bad? ^l

* <i>Serm.</i> 153.2	(Exod 20)	Rom 7:5	Paul accuses the OT law as being one of sin. ^{li}
<i>Serm.</i> 159a.6 [= <i>S. Dolbeau</i> 13 ^{liii}]	Exod 20:12	Luke 14:26	Should one honor one's parents (OT) or prioritize their faith (NT)? ^{liii}
* <i>Serm.</i> 170.1–2	(Exod 20)	Phil 3:6–9	Giving of one law in the OT and a second in the NT. Possible conflation here with Marcionites.
* <i>Serm.</i> 350f.1–2 [= <i>S. Erfurt</i> ^{liv} 4]	Sir 12:4, 6–7	Gal 6:9–10	Shun almsgiving to sinners (OT) or do good to all (NT)? ^{lv}
* <i>Serm.</i> 354a.11 [= <i>S. Dolbeau</i> 12 ^{lvi}]	(Isa 31:9 LXX) (Deut 25:5, 10)	1 Cor 7:29	Does one demonstrate one's faith by raising children into the faith (OT) or refraining from sex (NT)? ^{lvii}
<i>Serm. dom.</i> 2.9.32	Job 1:11 Isa 66:1	Matt 6:13 Matt 5:34–35	How could Satan speak to God (OT), if God resides in heaven (NT)? ^{lviii}
<i>Serm. Possidius</i> 32 ^{lix}	???	???	???

* Indicates passages in which association with Manichaean disputation is possible but uncertain or at least not explicit.

() Indicates implied passage.

ⁱCritical editions, corrigenda, and textual criticism of the following texts are too extensive to repeat here, but see the comprehensive list with notes compiled in Mayer 2010.

ⁱⁱBaker-Brian 2009, 191–92, 222–26; Van den Berg 2010, 160–61; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:177. See also Baker-Brian's table on pp. 135–136, which organizes Manichaean biblical contradictions in *Adim.* by thematic elements of behavior, theology, and anthropology. Misprints in this table seem to be repeated in Baker-Brian's other publications, for which see emendations below.

ⁱⁱⁱBaker-Brian 2009, 24, 227–32.

^{iv}Baker-Brian 2009, 87–88, 129, 232–38. Note that Baker-Brian's "Gen. 2.18–24" should be amended to "Gen 2:18, 21–22, 24" and the passages in Mark and Luke added.

^vBaker-Brian 2009, 239–45.

^{vi}Baker-Brian 2009, 133–134 188, 245–52; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:177.

^{vii}Baker-Brian 2009, 252–55.

^{viii}Baker-Brian 2003, 177–78; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:174–75.

^{ix}Baker-Brian 2009, 35–36, 56–57, 86, 167–70, 264–67; Van den Berg 2010, 162–63; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:180.

^xBaker-Brian 2009, 59, 267–73.

^{xi}Baker-Brian 2009, 273–76; Van den Berg 2010, 163; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:171.

^{xii}Baker-Brian 2009, 276–81.

^{xiii}Baker-Brian 2009, 134, 281–87; Van den Berg 2010, 163–66.

^{xiv}Baker-Brian 2009, 288–91; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:176.

^{xv}Baker-Brian 2009, 28, 291–99.

^{xvi}Baker-Brian 2009, 30, 1110–11, 299–303.

^{xvii}Baker-Brian 2009, 303, 306–9.

^{xviii}Baker-Brian 2009, 304–6.

^{xix}Baker-Brian 2009, 309–21; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:180. Brian-Baker’s inclusion of Acts 5:1–10 in his table, pp. 135–37, is almost certainly a typographical error, as he even discusses the rejection of Acts among Manichaeans referred to in *Adim.* 17.5 (pp. 318–20).

^{xx}Baker-Brian 2006, 75–78; Baker-Brian 2009, 322–26; Van den Berg 2010, 166. Note that Baker-Brian’s “Deut. 28. 1–6” should be emended to “Deut 28:1, 3–4, 6” and “Mt. 16. 24–26” emended to “Matt 16:24, 26” (Baker-Brian 2006, 76; Baker-Brian 2009, 136).

^{xxi}Baker-Brian 2006, 75–78; Baker-Brian 2009, 326–27.

^{xxii}Baker-Brian 2009, 328–32; Van den Berg 2010, 166; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:176.

^{xxiii}Baker-Brian 2009, 332–39; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:181.

^{xxiv}Baker-Brian 2009, 169, 339–341.

^{xxv}Baker-Brian 2009, 341–42.

^{xxvi}Baker-Brian 2009, 342–44. Note that Baker-Brian’s Prov. 6:6–8 should be emended to Prov. 6:6, 8.

^{xxvii}Baker-Brian 2009, 344–47; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:175.

^{xxviii}Baker-Brian 2009, 76, 347–50; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:174–75.

^{xxix}Baker-Brian 2009, 350–52; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:126–27.

^{xxx}Baker-Brian 2009, 352–54.

^{xxxi}Van den Berg 2010, 92–94. While the reference to Manichaeans here is not entirely explicit, Augustine’s reference to those who falsely allege disagreements between Old and New Testament (“sunt qui calumniantur, et dicant non sibi consonare ista duo Testamenta,” *Ennarrat.* 145.14) at least recalls Augustine’s anti-Manichaean rhetoric.

^{xxxii}BeDuhn 2013b, 2:181.

^{xxxiii}BeDuhn 2013b, 2:177.

^{xxxiv}Van den Berg 2010, 99–102. As Van den Berg notes, arguments given in *Faust.* 8.2 are not side-by-side disputations as are neatly given in *Adim.*, but the themes and structures of the argument bear striking resemblance to the whole of *Adim.* It is also curious to note that the other chapters of *Faust.*, though they mention at least 16 biblical passages or topics similar to those of *Adim* (see p. 97n186), do not lay out OT vs. NT disputations.

^{xxxv}Van den Berg 2010, 99–102.

^{xxxvi}Van den Berg 2010, 99–102.

^{xxxvii}Van den Berg 2010, 99–102.

^{xxxviii}Decret 1978a, 96; Decret 1978b, 74n28.

^{xxxix}Decret 1978a, 97; Decret 1978b, 74n28.

^{xl}Van den Berg 2010, 162; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:177.

^{xli}Numbering of the sermons follows the system in Verbraken 1976, 53–196 (which includes references to the dating, authenticity, and edition of each text, as well as approximations of where the sermon would have been given), updated now to reflect the discoveries of sermons since the publication of Verbraken’s work, for which see notes on *Serm.* Erfurt and *Serm.* Dolbeau below. This numbering system originally combined the *sermones ad populum* edited by the Benedictines of St. Maur in the seventeenth century, reprinted in *Patologia Latina* 38 and 39, with the additional sermons discovered in the eighteenth through the early twentieth century, the largest find of which include the 50 edited and published by Germain Morin: see Migne 1865; Migne 1845; Morin 1930. According to Verbraken’s estimate, some 8,000 sermon texts are known with Augustine’s name, of which only around 450 can be authenticated (Verbraken 1987, 106). Recent overviews of the history of Augustine’s sermons and their modern discoveries and publications can be found also in Weidmann 2012, 444–49; Brown 2000, 441–62. The following table sums up Verbraken’s system, updated with the sermons recently discovered:

No.	Topic of Sermon
1–50	On the OT
51–183	On the NT
184–272B	On the liturgical seasons
273–340A	On the saints
341–396	On miscellaneous topics

^{xlii}Baker-Brian 2009, 191–92, 195–202, 222–26; Decret 1978b, 72n14; Van den Berg 2010, 77–80; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:177.

^{xliii}Van den Berg 2010, 86–89. Van den Berg at least claims that this is an example of a Manichaean contradiction, but even he admits that “no quotation from the New Testament is mentioned which disagrees with anything in *Gen. 22*” (p. 88). While certain rhetorical strategies in *Serm. 2* are indeed “reminiscent” of *Adim.* (p. 86) and Van den Berg is likely right in attributing the invective here against Manichaeans, Van den Berg supplies little evidence to establish a convincing connection between *Adim.* and *Serm. 2*. More likely, this passage is an example of the general Manichaean rejection of the Old Testament (on which see sections 2.3.3 and 2.3.4.2), which need not tie this passage back to Adimantus.

^{xliiv}Baker-Brian 2009, 202–11; Van den Berg 2010, 84–85; BeDuhn 2013b, 2:173.

^{xlv}Baker-Brian 2006, 75–78; Baker-Brian 2009, 211–18; Van den Berg 2010, 85–86. Note that Baker-Brian’s “Haggia 2.9” (p. 76) should be emended to “Haggai 2:8.”

^{xlvi}Van den Berg 2010, 89–90.

^{xlvii}Van den Berg 2010, 90–92.

^{xlviii}This belongs to a set of texts discovered by François Dolbeau in 1990, found in a manuscript copied at Mainz ca. 1470 (Stadtbibliothek I 9), on which see Dolbeau 1993. Originally published individually, the texts have since been re-edited and numbered according to Verbraken’s system in Dolbeau 1996. For *Serm. Dolbeau 17*, see Dolbeau 1996, 140–47.

^{xlix}Van den Berg 2010, 81–82. Given the resemblance of this passage to that of *Adim. 8*, the more likely reference here is rather to Exod 21:24 than to the Deut 19:21 or Lev 24:20 of Dolbeau 1996, 147; Rotelle 1997, 101.

^lBardy 1950, 404n1; Decret 1978b, 172–173n14; cf. de Veer 1969, 243n20; Van den Berg 2010, 76n104. For some reason, de Veer and Van den Berg treat references to any sort of disputation as necessarily connected to Adimantus’s work. I am of the opinion that such disputations were a general Manichaean tactic, where Adimantus was the most visible user of the tool. Thus, I include *Serm. 152* and *153* in this list with the proviso that Augustine seems not to be addressing Manichaean disputations directly but rather to be calling them to mind as he works through problematic biblical passages.

^{li}Bardy 1950, 404n1; Decret 1978b, 173n14; cf. de Veer 1969, 243n20; Van den Berg 2010, 76n104.

^{lii}Dolbeau 1996, 90–99.

^{liii}Van den Berg 2010, 80–81. Dolbeau’s “Lk. 9:59f” should be emended to “Luke 14:26,” in Dolbeau 1996, 94.

^{liv}This belongs to a set of texts discovered by Isabella Schiller, Dorothea Weber, and Clemens Weidmann in 2007, found in an incomplete 12th-century manuscript of *Bibliotheca Amploniana* (MS Dep. Erf. CA. 12° 11), on which see Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann 2010. The editions of these texts are published in Dorothea Weber and Weidmann 2008; Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann 2009. For *Serm. Erfurt 4*, which is an enlarged version of *Serm. Lambot 28* (= *Serm. 164A*), see Schiller, Weber, and Weidmann 2009, 207–13.

^{lv}This disputation is not brought up directly by Manichaeans; rather, Augustine claims that some group that thinks similarly to the Manichaeans use the OT passage to claim that almsgiving need not be given to the unrighteous. To this, Augustine pits a NT passage, which he himself proposes might be construed as contradictory, but then goes on to show that they are, in fact, not contradictory passages. Due to the similarity in approach to the Manichaean disputations, I argue that Augustine is here appropriating the Manichaean method of disputations, or then that a Manichaean disputation is otherwise obfuscated here in Augustine’s sermon. See discussion in section 2.3.4.1, which also includes a brief discussion of Sirach in Augustine, and the commentary to the translation of this text in Appendix A.

^{lvi}Dolbeau 1996, 77–84.

^{lvii}Van den Berg 2010, 94–95. As in Van den Berg (p. 95), I do not think that this passage explicitly refers to a Manichaean disputation, but its rhetorical strategy is reminiscent of Augustine’s invectives and thus likely has its origin in Augustine’s anti-Manichaean writings. Cf. *Keph. 229.10–15*.

^{lviii}BeDuhn 2013b, 2:173.

^{lix}This sermon, given the title *de sacrificiis spiritualibus contra quos supra* (“On the spiritual sacrifices made against the Higher Ones”) has not yet been discovered but is given in Possidius’s *Elenchus* as Augustine sermon no. 32, one of the five Augustine explicitly delivered against Manichaeans; see Wilmart and Morin 1932, 167. Based on this title, one can imagine some connection to *Faust. 18.2*, where Lev 1–7 seem to be juxtaposed with Matt 9:13; 12:17, but this is impossible to prove until the sermon is discovered, assuming it still survives somewhere. Of the sermons Possidius claims Augustine delivered against Manichaeans, three have thus far been identified (no. 29 = *Serm. 1*; no. 30 = *Serm. 50*; no. 12 = *Serm. 12*), on which see de Veer 1969; Decret 1978b, 70–71n8.

Appendix C. Manichaean Disputations, Arranged by Theme

The following table presents the same passages presented in Appendix B, arranged this time by thematic similarities.

Theme	Text	OT	NT
On the Creation	<i>Adim.</i> 1	Gen 1:1–5	John 1:10 Col 1:15–16
	<i>Adim.</i> 2.1	Gen 2:2	John 5:17
	<i>Serm.</i> 1.1–3	Gen 1:1	John 1:1–3
Sexual or Dietary Continnence	<i>Adim.</i> 14.1	Deut 12:15–16	Luke 21:34 Rom 14:21 1 Cor 10:21
	<i>Adim.</i> 23	Ps 127:2–4	Matt 19:12
	* <i>Adim.</i> 25	Hos 9:14	Matt 22:30
	<i>Serm.</i> 354a.11	(Isa 31:9 LXX) (Deut 25:5, 10)	1 Cor 7:29
On Jews and Their Practices	<i>Adim.</i> 5.1	Gen 1:26	John 8:44 Matt 3:7; 23:33
	<i>Adim.</i> 16.1	Deut 5:12–15	Matt 23:15 Gal 4:10–11
	<i>Adim.</i> 16.1–2	Gen 17:9–14	Matt 23:15 1 Cor 7:18–19
	<i>Faust.</i> 16.1, 6	(Exod 20:8–1; 31:13–15)	John 5:17, 46
	<i>Faust.</i> 18.2	(Gen 17:9–14)	Matt 23:15
	<i>Faust.</i> 18.2	(Num 15:24)	(Matt 12:10–13; 23:15) (Gal 4:10–11)
	<i>Faust.</i> 18.2	(Lev 1–7)	(Matt 9:13) (Matt 12:7)
	<i>Gen. Man.</i> 1.22.33	Gen 2:2–3	John 5:17
Moses’s Curse vs. Crucifixion	<i>Adim.</i> 21	Deut 21:23	Matt 19:21; 16:24 (Luke 22:43) Gal 3:13
	<i>Faust.</i> 14.1	Deut 21:33	(Matt 27:35) (Mark 15:24) (Luke 23:33) (John 19:18)
	<i>Faust.</i> 32.5	(Deut 21:23)	(Matt 27:35) (Mark 15:24) (Luke 23:33) (John 19:18)
	<i>Felic.</i> 2.10	Deut 21:23	Gal 3:13
Parents vs. Faith	<i>Adim.</i> 6	Exod 20:12	Luke 9:59–60
	<i>Serm.</i> 159a.6	Exod 20:12	Luke 14:26
Revenge vs. Forgiveness or Kindness	<i>Adim.</i> 7.1	Exod 20:5	Matt 5:45, 48 Matt 18:22
	<i>Adim.</i> 8	Exod 21:24	Matt 5:38–40
	<i>Adim.</i> 17.1	Exod 23:22–24	Matt 5:44

	<i>Serm.</i> 110a.8	Exod 21:24	Matt 5:44
	* <i>Serm.</i> 350f.1–2	Sir 12:4–6	Gal 6:9–10
	<i>Serm.</i> 82.8	Prov 10:10	Matt 18:15
Visibility of God	<i>Adim.</i> 9.1	(Gen 3:9–19; 4:6–15; 13:1–3, 7; etc)	John 1:18; 5:37–38
	<i>Adim.</i> 10	Exod 25:2–8	Matt 5:34–35 1 Tim 6:16
	<i>Adim.</i> 28.1	Is 6:1–2	1 Tim 1:17
	<i>Serm.</i> 12.1–2	Job 1:6	Matt 6:8 John 10:7
	<i>Serm. dom.</i> 2.9.32	Job 1:11 Isa 66:1	Matt 6:13 Matt 5:34–35
Ill Character of OT God	<i>Adim.</i> 11	Exod 20:5; 34:14	John 17:25
	<i>Adim.</i> 13.1	Deut 4:23–24	Mark 10:17–18
	<i>Adim.</i> 22	Num 15:32–36	Matt 12:10–13
	* <i>Serm.</i> 2.2	Gen 22:1	???
	* <i>Serm.</i> 71.15	Deut 13:3	James 1:13
Cleanliness Within vs. Without	<i>Adim.</i> 15.1	(Lev 11)	Matt 15:11
	<i>Faust.</i> 18.2	(Lev 11; 20:25) (Deut 14:8)	(Mark 7:13) (Matt 15:11)
The Worldly vs. the Spiritual	<i>Adim.</i> 12.1	Deut 12:23	Matt 10:28 1 Cor 15:50
	<i>Adim.</i> 18.1–2	Deut 28:1, 3–4, 6	Matt 5:35; 16:24, 26; 8:38
	<i>Adim.</i> 19.1	(1 Kgs 3:13) (Prov 6:11)	Matt 5:3 Luke 6:24
	<i>Adim.</i> 20.1–3	Lev 26:3–10	Matt 10:9 Luke 12:20 1 Cor 14:33
	<i>Adim.</i> 24	Prov 6:6, 8	Matt 6:34
	<i>Serm.</i> 50.1, 13	Hag 2:8	Luke 16:9 1 Tim 6:10
Evil's Origin in OT God	<i>Adim.</i> 26	Amos 3:3–6	Matt 7:17
	<i>Adim.</i> 27	Is 45:7	Matt 5:9
Man vs. Animal	<i>Adim.</i> 4	Gen 4:10–12	Matt 6:26, 34
	* <i>Enarrat. Ps.</i> 145.13–14	Ps 36:6	1 Cor 9:9
On Marriage	<i>Adim.</i> 3.1	Gen 2:18, 21–22, 24	Matt 19:29 Mark 10:29–30 Luke 18:29–30
	<i>Gen. Man.</i> 2.13.19	Gen 2:24	Eph 5:31–32
OT vs. NT law	* <i>Serm.</i> 152.6	(Exod 20)	Rom 7:12–13
	* <i>Serm.</i> 153.2	(Exod 20)	Rom 7:5
	* <i>Serm.</i> 170.1–2	(Exod 20)	Phil 3:6–10

Bibliography

- Allberry, Charles Robert Cecil. 1938. *A Manichaeic Psalm-Book, Part II*. Stuttgart: Kolhammer.
- Andreas, Friedrich Carl, and Walter Bruno Henning. 1933. "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan II." *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*: 294–363.
- . 1934. "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan III." *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*: 848–912.
- Anoz, José. 2010. "Tres sermones nuevos sobre la limosna." *Augustinus* 55: 31–49.
- Asmussen, Jes Peter. 1965. *Xuāstvānift*. Copenhagen: Prostant.
- . 1975. *Manichaeic Literature: Representative Texts Chiefly from Middle Persian and Parthian Writings*. Delmar, N.Y: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints.
- Bagnall, Roger S. 1996. *Egypt in Late Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . , ed. 1997. *The Kellis Agricultural Account Book*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Baker-Brian, Nicholas. 2003. "'...quaedam Disputationes Adimanti' (Retr. l.xxii.1): Reading the Manichaeic Biblical Discordance in Augustine's *Contra Adimantum*." *Augustinian Studies* 34, no. 2: 175–96.
- . 2006. "Biblical Traditions and Their Transformation in Fourth Century Manichaeism." *Augustiniana* 56, no. 1–2: 63–80.
- . 2009. *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire: A Study of Augustine's Contra Adimantum*. Lewiston, N.Y: Edwin Mellen Press.
- . 2011. *Manichaeism: An Ancient Faith Rediscovered*. London: T & T Clark.
- . 2013. "Women in Augustine's Anti-Manichaeic Writings: Rumour, Rhetoric and Ritual." In Markus Vinzent, ed. *Studio Patristica: Papers Presented at the Sixteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 2011*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Bardy, Gustave. 1950. *Les Révisions, texte, traduction, notes*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- Bauer, Johannes B, ed. 1992. *De moribus ecclesiae et de moribus Manichaeorum*. CCL 90 Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky.
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian. 1831. *Das manichäische Religionssystem nach den Quellen neu untersucht und entwickelt*. Tübingen: Olander.
- Bayard, Dodge, ed. 1970. *The Fihrist of Al-Nadīm: A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Beard, Mary, John A. North, and S. R. F. Price. 1998. *Religions of Rome: A History*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beausobre, Isaac de. 1734. *Histoire Critique de Manichée et Du Manichéisme*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Bernard.
- . 1739. *Histoire Critique de Manichée et Du Manichéisme*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Bernard.
- BeDuhn, Jason. 2000. *The Manichaeic Body: In Discipline and Ritual*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . 2007. "Biblical Antitheses, Adda, and the *Acts of Archelaus*." In Jason BeDuhn and Paul Allan Mirecki, eds. *Frontiers of Faith: The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelaus*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2008. "The Domestic Setting of Manichaeic Cultic Association in Roman Late Antiquity." *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 10, no. 1: 259–71.
- . 2009. "Augustine Accused: Megalius, Manichaeism, and the Inception of the Confessions." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 17, no. 1: 85–124.

- . 2010. *Augustine's Manichaean Dilemma, 1: Conversion and Apostasy, 373–388 C.E.* Vol. 1. 3 vols. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 2013a. “‘Not to Depart from Christ’: Augustine between ‘Manichaean’ and ‘Catholic’ Christianity.” In Johannes Van Oort, ed. *Augustine and Manichaean Christianity: Selected Papers from the First South African Conference on Augustine of Hippo, University of Pretoria, 24–26 April 2012*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2013b. *Augustine's Manichaean Dilemma, Volume 2: Making a “Catholic” Self, 388–401 C.E.* Vol. 2. 3 vols. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- BeDuhn, Jason, and Geoffrey Harrison. 1997. “The Tebessa Codex: A Manichaean Treatise on Biblical Exegesis and Church Order.” In Paul Allan Mirecki and Jason BeDuhn, eds. *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*. Leiden: Brill.
- BeDuhn, Jason, and Greg Hodgins. 2017. “The Date of the Manichaean Codices from Medinet Madi, and Its Significance.” *Manichaeism East and West*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- BeDuhn, Jason, and Paul Allan Mirecki. 2007. “Placing the *Acts of Archelaus*.” In Jason BeDuhn and Paul Allan Mirecki, eds. *Frontiers of Faith: The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. 2013. “Saint Augustine’s Sermons 38–41 on the Book of Ben Sira.” In Steve Moyise, Joseph Verheyden, and Bart Koet, eds. *The Scriptures of Israel in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Leiden: Brill.
- Beeson, Charles, ed. 1906. *Hegemonius. Acta Archelai*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Bermejo-Rubio, Fernando. 2009. “Further Remarks on the Manichaean Nature of Εὐχη τῶν προβολῶν (P. Kell. Gr. 98).” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 168: 221–38.
- . 2013. “‘I Worship and Glorify’: Manichaean Liturgy and Piety in Kellis’ Prayer of the Emanations.” In April D. De Conick, Gregory Shaw, and John Douglas Turner, eds. *Practicing Gnosis: Ritual, Magic, Theurgy, and Liturgy in Nag Hammadi, Manichaean and Other Ancient Literature: Essays in Honor of Birger A. Pearson*. Leiden: Brill.
- Das Beuroner Vetus Latina-Institut. 1949. *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. 27 vols. Freiburg: Herder.
- Blaise, Albert. 1954. *Dictionnaire Latin-Français des auteurs Chrétiens*. Paris: Librairie des Méridiens.
- . 2013. *Die Bibel bei den Manichäern und verwandte Studien*. Edited by Peter Nagel and Siegfried Richter. Leiden: Brill.
- Bossuet, Jacques Bénigne, Nicolas-Philibert Hemey d’Auberive, and Augustin-Pierre-Paul Caron. 1816. *Œuvres complètes de Bossuet*. Vol. 19. Versailles: Lebel.
- Boyce, Mary. 1960. *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichaean Script in the German Turfan Collection*. Institut für Orientforschung 45. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin: Berlin.
- . , ed. 1975. *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian, and Parthian: Texts with Notes*. Leiden: Brill.
- Brinkmann, Alexander August, ed. 1895. *Contra Manichaei opiniones disputatio*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Brown, Peter. 1969. “The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire.” *Journal of Roman Studies* 59, no. 1/2: 92–103.
- . 1992. *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- . 2000. *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- . 2002. *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*. Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Bryder, Peter. 1985. *The Chinese Transformation of Manichaeism: A Study of Chinese Manichaean Terminology*. Löberöd: Bokförlaget.
- . 1992. “Transmission, Translation, Transformation: Problems Concerning the Spread of Manichaeism from One Culture to Another.” In Gernot Wiessner and Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, eds. *Studia Manichaica: II. Internationaler Kongress zum Manichäismus, 6.–10. August 1989, St. Augustin/Bonn*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1994. “The Zebra as a Chameleon: Manichaean Missionary Techniques.” In Holger Prießler and Hubert Michael Seiwert, eds. *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65. Geburtstag*. Marburg: Diagonal.
- Burleigh, John H. S., trans. 2006. *Augustine: Earlier Writings*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Burrus, Virginia. 1991. “The Heretical Woman as Symbol in Alexander, Athanasius, Epiphanius, and Jerome.” *The Harvard Theological Review* 84, no. 3: 229–48.
- Böhlig, Alexander. 1978. “Zur Vorstellung vom Lichtkreuz in Gnostizismus und Manichäismus.” In Barbara Aland, ed. *Gnosis: Festschr. für Hans Jonas*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Cameron, Averil. 2003. “How to Read Heresiology.” *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33, no. 3: 471–92.
- Catapanco, Giovanni. 2014. “L’uso delle citazioni bibliche nei sermoni Erfut 2, 3 e 4 di Agostino d’Ippona.” Padua: University of Padua.
- Catapano. 2012. *Sermoni Di Erfurt*. Marcianum.
- Centre «Traditio Litterarum Occidentium». 2017. “Library of Latin Texts, Series A.” At <http://www.clt.brepolis.net/Ita/>.
- Choat, Malcolm. 2006. *Belief and Cult in Fourth-Century Papyri*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Clackson, Sarah, Erica Hunter, Samuel N. C. Lieu, and Mark Vermes, eds. 1998. *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Clark, Larry, ed. 2013. *Uygur Manichaean Texts: Texts, Translations, Commentary. Vol. 2: Liturgical Texts*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Colditz, Iris. 2005. “Zur Adaption zoroastrischer Terminologie in Manis Šābuhragān.” In Dieter Weber, ed. *Language of Iran: Past and Present: Iranian Studies in memoriam David Neil MacKenzie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Courcelle, Pierre. 1968. *Recherches sur les confessions de saint Augustin*. Paris: Boccard.
- Coyle, J. Kevin. 1978. *Augustine’s De moribus ecclesiae Catholicae: A Study of the Work, Its Composition and Its Sources*. Fribourg: University Press.
- . 1991. “Mary Magdalene in Manichaeism?” *Le Muséon* 104: 39–55.
- . 2001. “What Did Augustine Know about Manichaeism When He Wrote His Two Treatises *De Moribus*.” In Johannes Van Oort, Otto Wermelinger, and Gregor Wurst, eds. *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2003. “Saint Augustine’s Manichaean Legacy.” *Augustinian Studies* 34: 1–22.
- . 2008a. “Good Tree, Bad Tree: The Matthean/Lukan Paradigm in Manichaeism and Its Opponents.” In Lorenzo DiTomasso and Lucian Turcescu, eds. *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montreal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11–13 October 2006*. Leiden: Brill.

- . 2008b. “The Gospel of Thomas in Manichaeism?” In Louis Painchaud, ed. *Colloque International “L’Évangile selon Thomas et les textes de Nag Hammadi”*: Québec, 29–31 mai 2003. Québec: Presse de l’Université Laval.
- . 2009a. “Women and Manichaeism’s Mission to The Roman Empire.” *Manichaeism and Its Legacy*. Brill.
- . 2009b. “Anti-Manichean Works.” Edited by Allan D. Fitzgerald and John C. Cavadini *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- . 2009c. “Healing and the ‘Physician’ in Manichaeism.” In *Manichaeism and Its Legacy*. Leiden: Brill.
- Crum, Walter E. 1939. *A Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- de Blois, François. 2003. “Manes’ ‘Twin’ in Iranian and Non-Iranian Texts.” *Religious Themes and Texts of Pre-Islamic Iran and Central Asia: Studies in Honour of Professor Gherardo Gnoli*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- . 2005. “New Light on the Sources of the Manichaean Apostle of Light.” In Aloïs van Tongerloo and Luigi Cirillo, eds. *Il Manicheismo: nuove prospettive della ricerca: Quinto congresso internazionale di studi sul Manicheismo, atti: dipartimento di studi asiatici, Università degli studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”, Napoli, 2–8 settembre 2001*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.
- de Veer, Albert C. 1969. “La date des sermons I, XII et L de saint Augustin.” *Revue d’Études Augustiniennes et Patristiques* 15, no. 3–4: 241–46.
- Decret, François. 1978a. *L’Afrique Manichéenne (IV e–Ve Siècles), Étude historique et doctrinale, Tome I: Texte*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.
- . 1978b. *L’Afrique Manichéenne (IV e–Ve Siècles), Étude historique et doctrinale, Tome II: Notes*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.
- . 1986. “Adimantus.” *Augustinus-Lexikon: Augustine’s Works and Critical Editions*. Basel: Schwabe.
- . 2002a. “Felicem Manicheum (Contra —).” *Augustinus-Lexikon: Augustine’s Works and Critical Editions*. Basel: Schwabe.
- . 2002b. “Felix Manicheus.” *Augustinus-Lexikon: Augustine’s Works and Critical Editions*. Basel: Schwabe.
- Decret, François, and Johannes Van Oort, eds. 2004. *Acta contra Fortunatum Manichaeum*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Derda, Tomasz, and Ewa Wipszycka. 1994. “L’emploi Des Titres *Abba, Apa* et *Papas* dans l’Égypte Byzantine.” *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 24: 23–56.
- Dickey, Eleanor. 2014. “A Catalogue of Works Attributed to the Grammarian Herodian.” *Classical Philology* 109, no. 4: 325–45.
- Dolbeau, François. 1993. “Les sermons de saint Augustin découverts à Mayence. Un premier bilan.” *Comptes rendus des séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 137, no. 1: 153–71.
- . , ed. 1994. “Sermons inédits de saint Augustin prêchés en 397 (5^{ème} série) (à suivre).” *Revue Bénédictine* 104, no. 1–2: 34–76.
- . , ed. 1996. *Augustin d’Hippone, Vingt-six sermons au peuple d’Afrique. Retrouvés à Mayence*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 147. Paris: Institut d’Études Augustiniennes.

- Durkin-Meisterernst, Desmond, and Nicholas Sims-Williams, eds. 2004. *Dictionary of Manichaeic Texts, Vol. 3, Pt. 1: Texts from Central Asia and China Dictionary of Manichaeic Middle Persian and Parthian*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Falkenberg, René. 2016. “The Old and New Human Being.” In Eve-Marie Becker, Jan Dietrich, and Bo Kristian Holm, eds. *“What Is Human?”: Theological Encounters with Anthropology*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Feldmann, Erich. 1987. *Die “Epistula Fundamenti” der nordafrikanischen Manichäer: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*. Altenberge: Oros.
- Flügel, Gustav Leberecht. 1862. *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- . , ed. 1871. *Kitâb al-Fihrist*. Leipzig: Vogel.
- Foster, Paul. 2015. “Christology and Soteriology in Apocryphal Gospels.” In Andrew F. Gregory, C. M. Tuckett, Tobias Nicklas, and Jozef Verheyden, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Apocrypha*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Franzmann, Majella. 2003. *Jesus in the Manichaeic Writings*. London: T & T Clark.
- . 2005. “The Syriac-Coptic Bilinguals from Ismant el-Kharab (Roman Kellis): Translation Process and Manichaeic Missionary Practices.” In Aloïs van Tongerloo and Luigi Cirillo, eds. *Il Manicheismo: nuove prospettive della Ricerca*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 2013. “Augustine’s View of Manichaeic Almsgiving and Almsgiving by the Manichaeic Community at Kellis.” *Harvard Theological Studies* 69, no. 1: 1–5.
- Funk, Wolf-Peter. 1997. “The Reconstruction of the Manichaeic *Kephalaia*.” In Paul Allan Mirecki and Jason BeDuhn, eds. *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaeic Sources*. Leiden: Brill.
- . , ed. 2000. *Kephalaia I: Zweite Hälfte, Lieferung 15/16*. Berlin: Kolhammer.
- . 2002. “‘Einer aus tausend, zwei aus zehntausend’: Zitate aus dem Thomas–Evangelium.” In Hans-Gebhard Bethge, Stephen Emmel, Karen L. King, and Imke Schletterer, eds. *For the Children, Perfect Instruction: Studies in Honor of Hans-Martin Schenke*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2009. “Mani’s Account of Other Religions According to the Coptic *Synaxeis* Codex.” In Jason BeDuhn, ed. *New Light on Manichaeism: Papers from the Sixth International Congress on Manichaeism*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gardner, Iain, trans. 1995. *The Kephalaia of the Teacher: The Edited Coptic Manichaeic Texts in Translation with Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1997a. “Personal Letters from the Manichaeic Community at Kellis.” In Luigi Cirillo and Aloïs van Tongerloo, eds. *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi “Manicheismo e oriente Cristiano antico.”* Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 1997b. “The Manichaeic Community at Kellis: A Progress Report.” In Paul Allan Mirecki and Jason BeDuhn, eds. *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaeic Sources*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2000. “‘He has gone to the monastery ...’” In R. E. Emmerick, Werner Sundermann, and Peter Zieme, eds. *Studia Manichaica: IV. Internationaler Kongress zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. juli 1997*. Berlin: Akademie.
- . 2006. “A Letter from the Teacher: Some Comments on Letter-Writing and the Manichaeic Community of IVth Century Egypt.” In Louis Painchaud and Paul-Hubert Poirer, eds. *Coptica – Gnostica – Manichaica: Mélanges offerts à Wolf-Peter Funk*. Quebec: Les presses de l’université laval.

- . 2007. “Mani’s Letter to Marcellus: Fact and Fiction in the Acta Archelai Revisited.” In Jason BeDuhn and Paul Allan Mirecki, eds. *Frontiers of Faith: The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelus*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2011a. “‘With a Pure Heart and a Truthful Tongue’: The Recovery of the Text of the Manichaean Daily Prayers.” *Journal of Late Antiquity* 4, no. 1: 79–99.
- . 2011b. “Manichaean Ritual Practice at Ancient Kellis: A New Understanding of the Meaning and Function of the So-Called *Prayer of the Emanations*.” In Jacob Albert Van den Berg, Annemaré Kotzé, Tobias Nicklas, and Maddaleine Scopello, eds. *In Search of Truth: Augustine, Manichaeism and Other Gnosticism: Studies for Johannes van Oort at Sixty*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2013. “Once More on Mani’s Epistles and Manichaean Letter-Writing.” *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 17, no. 2: 291–314.
- . 2015. “An Introduction to the Chester Beatty *Kephalaia* Codex.” In Iain Gardner, Jason BeDuhn, and Paul Dilley, eds. *Mani at the Court of the Persian Kings: Studies on the Chester Beatty Kephalaia Codex*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gardner, Iain, Anthony Alcock, and Wolf-Peter Funk, eds. 1999. *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis I*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- . , eds. 2014. *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis II*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Gardner, Iain, and Malcolm Choat, eds. 1996. *Kellis Literary Texts I*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- . , eds. 2007. *Kellis Literary Texts II*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Gardner, Iain, and Samuel N. C. Lieu. 1996. “From Narmouthis (Medinet Madi) to Kellis (Ismant El-Kharab): Manichaean Documents from Roman Egypt.” *The Journal of Roman Studies* 86: 146–69.
- . , eds. 2004. *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner, Iain, Paul Allan Mirecki, and Anthony Alcock. 1997. “Magical Spell, Manichaean Letter.” In Paul Allan Mirecki and Jason BeDuhn, eds. *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gardner, Iain, Alanna Nobbs, and Malcolm Choat. 2000. “P. Harr. 107: Is This Another Greek Manichaean Letter?” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 131: 118–24.
- Gardner, Iain, and Leyla Rasouli-Narimani. 2017. “Patīg and Pattikios in the Manichaean Sources.” In Samuel N.C Lieu, ed. *Manichaeism East and West*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Gasparro, Giulia Sfameni. 2000. “Addas-Adimantus unus ex discipulis Manichaei: For the History of Manichaeism in the West.” In R. E. Emmerick, Werner Sundermann, and Peter Zieme, eds. *Studia Manichaica: IV. Internationaler Kongress zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Gathercole, Simon J. 2014. *The Gospel of Thomas: Introduction and Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Goehring, James E. 1988. “Libertine or Liberated: Women in the So-Called Libertine Gnostic Communities.” In Karen L. King, ed. *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Goldstein, Ronnie, and Guy G Stroumsa. 2007. “The Greek and Jewish Origins of Docetism: A New Proposal.” *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 10, no. 3: 423–41.
- Grosso, Matteo. 2012. *Detti segreti: Il Vangelo di Tommaso nell’antichità*. Acireale: Bonanno.
- Gulácsi, Zsuzsanna. 2015. *Mani’s Pictures: The Didactic Images of the Manichaeans from Sassanian Mesopotamia to Uygur Central Asia and Tang-Ming China*. Leiden: Brill.

- Haloun, Gustav, and Walter Bruno Henning. 1952. "The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light." *Asia Major, New Series* 3: 184–212.
- Hammerschmidt, Ernst. 1958. "Das Thomasevangelium und die Manichäer." *Oriens Christianus* 46: 120–23.
- Harnack, Adolf von. 1898. "Der pseudoaugustinische Traktat contra Novatianum." *Abhandlungen Alexander von Oettingen zum siebzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*. Munich: Beck.
- . 1921. *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Henning, Walter Bruno. 1944. "Bráhma." *Transactions of the Philosophical Society*: 108–18.
- Henrichs, Albert. 1973. "Mani and the Babylonian Baptists: A Historical Confrontation." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 77: 23–59.
- . 1979. "The Cologne Mani Codex Reconsidered." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 83: 339–67.
- Henrichs, Albert, and Ludwig Koenen. 1975. "Der Kölner Mani-Codex (P. Colon. Inv. Nr. 4780) Περὶ Τῆς Γέννης Τοῦ Σώματος Αὐτοῦ: Edition Der Seiten 1–72." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 19: 1–85.
- . 1978. "Der Kölner Mani-Kodex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780), Περὶ τῆς γέννης τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, Edition der Seiten 72,8–99,9." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 32: 87–199.
- . 1981. "Der Kölner Mani-Codex (P. Colon. Inv. Nr. 4780) Περὶ Τῆς Γέννης Τοῦ Σώματος Αὐτοῦ: Edition Der Seiten 99,10–120." *Zeitschrift Für Papyrologie Und Epigraphik* 44: 201–318.
- . 1982. "Der Kölner Mani-Codex (P. Colon. Inv. Nr. 4780) Περὶ Τῆς Γέννης Τοῦ Σώματος Αὐτοῦ: Edition Der Seiten 122–192." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 48: 1–59.
- Henry, René, ed. 1960. *Photius, Bibliothèque*. Vol. 2. 8 vols. Paris: Les belles lettres.
- Hespel, Robert, and René Draguet, trans. 1982. *Livre des scolies (recension de Séert), II: Mimrè VI–XI*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Leuven: Peeters.
- Heuser, Manfred, and Hans-Joachim Klimkeit. 1998. *Studies in Manichaean Literature and Art*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hill, Edmund, ed. 1990a. *Sermons, (51–94) on the Old Testament*. Translated by John E. Rotelle. The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century III/3. Brooklyn, N.Y.: New City Press.
- . , ed. 1990b. *Sermons (148–183) on the New Testament*. Translated by John E. Rotelle. The Works of Saint Augustine III/5. Brooklyn: New City Press.
- . , ed. 1990c. *Sermons, (230–272B) on the Liturgical Seasons*. Translated by John E. Rotelle. The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century III/7. Brooklyn, N.Y.: New City Press.
- . , ed. 1990d. *Sermons, (341–400) on Various Subjects*. Translated by John E. Rotelle. The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century III/10. Brooklyn, N.Y.: New City Press.
- Holl, Karl, Christian-Friedrich Collatz, and Marc Bergermann, eds. 2013. *Epiphanius I: Ancoratus und Panarion haer. 1–33*. 2nd ed. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Holl, Karl, and Jürgen Dummer, eds. 1980. *Epiphanius II: Panarion (Haereses 34–46)*. Berlin: Akademie.

- . , eds. 1985. *Epiphanius III: Panarion (Haereses 65–80). De fide*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Hope, Colin A. 1985. “Dakhleh Oasis Project: Report on the 1986 Excavations at Ismant El-Gharab.” *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 15: 114–25.
- . 1991. “The 1991 Excavations at Ismant El-Kharab in the Dakhleh Oasis.” *Bulletin of the Australian Centre for Egyptology* 2: 41–50.
- . 1999. “The Archaeological Context.” In Iain Gardner, Anthony Alcock, and Wolf-Peter Funk, eds. *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis I*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Hope, Colin A, Olaf E Kaper, and Gill Bowen. 1989. “Dakhleh Oasis Project: Ismant El-Kharab 1991–92.” *Journal of the Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 19: 1–26.
- . 1992. “Excavations at Ismant El-Kharab – 1992.” *Bulletin of the Australian Centre for Egyptology* 3: 41–49.
- Hope, Colin A, and Klaas Anthony Worp. 2006. “Miniature Codices from Kellis.” *Mnemosyne* 59, no. 2: 226–58.
- Hunter, David G. 2007. *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Jovinianist Controversy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hutter, Manfred. 2000. “Manichaeism in Iran in the Fourth Century.” *Studia Manichaica, IV. Internationaler Kongress Zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Jackson, Abraham J. 1932. *Researches in Manichaeism with Special Reference to the Turfan Fragments*. New York: AMS.
- Kaatz, Kevin. 2005. “Augustine and Manichaean Cosmogony.” In Aloïs van Tongerloo and Luigi Cirillo, eds. *Il manicheismo: nuove prospettive della ricerca: quinto congresso internazionale di studi sul Manicheismo, atti: dipartimento di studi asiatici, Università degli studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”, Napoli, 2–8 settembre 2001*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.
- Kaestli, Jean-Daniel. 1977. “L’utilisation des actes apocryphes des apôtres dans le manichéisme.” In Martin Krause, ed. *Gnosis and Gnosticism: Papers Read at the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies*. Leiden: Brill.
- Khosroyev, Alexander. 2005. “Zu einem manichäischen (?) Gebet.” In Aloïs van Tongerloo and Luigi Cirillo, eds. *Il Manicheismo: nuove prospettive della Ricerca*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- King, Karen L. 2008. “Social and Theological Effects of Heresiological Discourse.” In Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin, eds. *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Kinzig, Wolfram. 2012. “Ambrosiaster.” In Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow, eds. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kirchner, Roderich. 2007. “Elocutio: Latin Prose Style.” In William J. Dominik and Jon Hall, eds. *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Klimkeit, Hans-Joachim. 1982a. “Vom Wesen manichäischer Kunst: Friedrich Wilhelm Kantzenbach zum 50. Geburtstag.” *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 34, no. 3: 195–219.
- . 1982b. *Manichaean Art and Calligraphy*. Leiden: Brill.
- . , ed. 1993. *Gnosis on the Silk Road: Gnostic Texts from Central Asia*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Koenen, Ludwig. 1978. “Augustine and Manichaeism in Light of the Cologne Mani Codex.” *Illinois Classical Studies* 3: 154–95.

- . 1983. “Manichäische Mission und Klöster in Ägypten.” *Das Römisch-Byzantische Ägypten. Akten des internationalen Symposions 26.–30. September 1978 in Trier*. Mainz: Zabern.
- Koenen, Ludwig, and Albert Henrichs. 1970. “Ein Griechischer Mani-Codex (P. Colon. Inv. Nr. 4780).” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 5: 97–216.
- Koenen, Ludwig, and Cornelia Römer, eds. 1988. *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex über das Werden seines Leibes*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Kósa, Gábor. 2011. “The Protagonist-Catalogues of the Apocryphal Acts of Apostles in the Coptic Manichaica — a Re-assessment of the Evidence.” In Ulrich Luft, Eszter Bechtold, András Gulyás, and Andrea Hasznos, eds. *From Illahun to Djeme: Papers Presented in Honour of Ulrich Luft*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- . 2013. “A kaméleon-misszió — a Manicheus térítés technikái.” *Conversio. Az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Bölcsészettudományi Karán 2011. Szeptember 22–23, An Tartott Vallástudományi Konferencia Előadásai*. Budapest: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem Bölcsészettudományi Kar, Vallástudomány Központ.
- Kotzé, Annemaré. 2008. “The ‘Anti-Manichaean’ Passage in *Confessions* 3 and Its ‘Manichaean Audience.’” *Vigiliae Christianae* 62, no. 2: 187–200.
- . 2011. “Protreptic, Paranetic and Augustine’s *Confessions*.” In Jacob Albert Van den Berg, Annemaré Kotzé, Tobias Nicklas, and Maddaleine Scopello, eds. *In Search of Truth: Augustine, Manichaeism and Other Gnosticism, Studies for Johannes van Oort at Sixty*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kristionat, Jessica. 2013. *Zwischen Selbstverständlichkeit und Schweigen: Die Rolle der Frau im frühen Manichäismus*. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike.
- Lagarde, Paul Anthony. 1859. *Titi Bostreni quae ex opere contra Manichaeos edito in codice Hamburgensi servata sunt*. Berlin: Hertz.
- Lambot, Cyrille, ed. 1956. “Sermon sur l’amône à restituer à saint Augustine.” *Revue Bénédictine* 66, no. 3–4: 149–58.
- Layton, Bentley, ed. 1989. “The Gospel According to Thomas.” *The Coptic Gnostic Library — A Complete Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2011. *A Coptic Grammar with Chrestomathy and Glossary, Sahidic Dialect*. 3rd ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Leurini, Claudia. 2013. *The Manichaean Church: An Essay Mainly Based on the Texts from Central Asia*. Roma: Scienze e lettere, ISMEO.
- Lieu, Judith. 2015. *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Lieu, Samuel N. C. 1987. “Chinese Manichaeism – Transformation or Translation?” *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 39, no. 1: 337–41.
- . 1988. “Sources on the Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire.” *A Green Leaf: Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1992. *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 1994a. “Fact and Fiction in the Acta Archelai.” *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1994b. “Some Themes in Later Roman Anti-Manichaean Polemics.” *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*. Leiden: Brill.

- . 1994c. “Manichaean Studies in the Electronic Age: A Database of Manichaean Texts.” In Holger Prießler and Hubert Michael Seiwert, eds. *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65. Geburtstag*. Marburg: Diagonal.
- . 1994d. “From Mesopotamia to the Roman East: The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Eastern Roman Empire.” *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1998a. “Manichaean Art and Texts from the Silk Road.” *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1998b. “Precept and Practice in Manichaean Monasticism.” *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2006. “‘My Church is Superior...’: Mani’s Missionary Statement in Coptic and Middle Persian.” In Louis Painchaud and Paul-Hubert Poirer, eds. *Coptica – Gnostica – Manichaica: Mélanges offerts à Wolf-Peter Funk*. Quebec: Les presses de l’université laval.
- . 2015. “The Diffusion, Persecution and Transformation of Manichaeism in Late Antiquity and Pre-Modern China.” In Arietta Papaconstantinou, ed. *Conversion in Late Antiquity: Christianity, Islam, and Beyond: Papers from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Sawyer Seminar, University of Oxford, 2009–2010*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- . 2017. “Manichaeism East and West (Presidential Address).” In Samuel N. C. Lieu, ed. *Manichaeism East and West*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Lim, Richard. 1989. “Unity and Diversity Among Western Manichaeans: A Reconsideration of Mani’s *sancta ecclesia*.” *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 35: 231–50.
- . 1992. “Manichaeans and Public Disputation in Late Antiquity.” *Recherches Augustiniennes et Patristiques* 26: 233–72.
- . 1995. *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2008. “The Nomen Manichaeorum and Its Uses in Late Antiquity.” In Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin, eds. *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Luttikhuisen, Gerard P. 1985. *The Revelation of Elchasai: Investigations into the Evidence for a Mesopotamian Jewish Apocalypse of the Second Century and Its Reception by Judeo-Christian Propagandists*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- MacKenzie, David Neil. 1979. “Mani’s ‘Šābuhragān.’” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 42, no. 3: 500–534.
- . 1980. “Mani’s ‘Šābuhragān’ II.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 43, no. 2: 288–310.
- Maher, John P. 1979. “Saint Augustine and Manichean Cosmogony.” *Augustinian Studies* 10: 91–104.
- Marjanen, Antti. 1996. *The Woman Jesus Loved: Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents*. Leiden: Brill.
- Mayer, Cornelius Petrus. 1974. *Die Zeichen in der geistigen Entwicklung und in der Theologie des jungen Augustinus. II Teil, Die Anti-Manichäische Epoche*. Vol. 2. Würzburg: Augustinus.
- . , ed. 2010. *Augustinus-Lexikon: Augustine’s Works and Critical Editions*. Vol. 3. Basel: Schwabe.

- Migne, Jacques-Paul, ed. 1845. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini, Hipponensis episcopi, opera omnia*. PL 39. Paris: Migne.
- . , ed. 1857. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini, Hipponensis episcopi, opera omnia*. PL 40. Paris: Migne.
- . , ed. 1865. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini, Hipponensis episcopi, opera omnia*. PL 38. Paris: Migne.
- Morin, Germain, ed. 1930. *Miscellanea Agostiniana: Testi e studi: Sancti Augustini sermones post Maurinos reperti*. Vol. 1. Rome: Tipografia poliglotta Vaticana.
- Moss, Jennifer Sheridan. 2012. “Women in Late Antique Egypt.” In Sharon L James and Sheil Dillon, eds. *A Companion to Women in the Ancient World*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mutzenbecher, Almut, ed. 1984. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini retractationum libri II*. CCSL 57. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Nagel, Peter. 1973. “Die apokryphen Apostelakten des 2. und 3. Jahrhunderts in der manichäischen Literatur: Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach den christlichen Elementen in Manichäismus.” In Karl-Wolfgang Trögen, ed. *Gnosis und Neues Testament*. Berlin: Guttenslohor.
- . 1980. *Die Thomaspsalmen des koptisch-manichäischen Psalmenbuches*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Nyberg, Henrik Samuel. 1935. “Forschungen Über Den Manichäismus.” *Zeitschrift für Die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 34: 70–91.
- O’Donnell, James Joseph, ed. 1992. *Confessions*. Vol. 2. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- O’Meara, John J. 1954. *The Young Augustine: An Introduction to the Confessions of St. Augustine*. London: Longman.
- Omont, Henri. 1918. “Fragments d’un très ancien manuscrit latin provenant de l’Afrique du Nord.” *Comptes rendus des séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 4: 241–50.
- Ort, L.J.R. 1967. *Mani: A Religio-Historical Description of His Personality*. Leiden: Brill.
- Panaino, Antonio. 2004. “Strategies of Manichaean Religious Propaganda.” In Desmond Durkin-Meisterenst, ed. *Turfan Revisited: The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Papaconstantinou, Arietta, and Sarah Clackson, eds. 2010. “Greek or Coptic? Bilingualism in the Papyri.” *The Multilingual Experience in Egypt, from the Ptolemies to the Abbasids*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Partoens, Gert, ed. 2008. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini sermones in epistolas apostolicas*. CCSL 41Ba. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Pascal, Blaise. 1963. *Œuvres complètes*. Edited by Louis Lafuma. Vol. 4. Paris: Éditions Seuil.
- Pedersen, Nils Arne. 1993. “Some Comments on the Relationship between Marcionism and Manichaeism.” In Per Bilde, Helge Kjær Nielsen, and Jørgen Podemann Sørensen, eds. *Apocryphon Severini Presented to Søren Giversen*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- . 1996. *Studies in the Sermon on the Great War: Investigations of a Manichaean-Coptic Text from the Fourth Century*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- . 2004. *Demonstrative Proof in Defence of God: A Study of Titus of Bostra’s Contra Manichaeos: The Work’s Sources, Aims, and Relation to Its Contemporary Theology*. Leiden: Brill.

- . , ed. 2006. *Manichaeen Homilies: With a Number of Hitherto Unpublished Fragments*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 2012. “Die Manichäer in ihrer Umwelt.” In Christoph Marksches and Johannes Van Oort, eds. *Zugänge Zur Gnosis: Akten Zur Tagung Der Patristischen Arbeitsgemeinschaft Vom 02.–05.01.2011*.
- . 2013. “Manichaeen Self-designations in the Western Tradition.” In Johannes Oort, ed. *Augustine and Manichaeen Christianity*. Brill.
- Pedersen, Nils Arne, René Falkenberg, Claudia Leurini, and John Møller Larsen, eds. 2017. *The Old Testament in Manichaeen Tradition: The Sources in Syriac, Greek, Coptic, Middle Persian, Parthian, Sogdian, New Persian, and Arabic*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Pettipiece, Timothy. 2009. *Pentadic Redaction in the Manichaeen Kephalaia*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2013. “Coptic Answers to Manichaeen Questions: The Erotapokritic Nature of the Kephalaia.” In Marie-Pierre Bussières, ed. *La littérature des questions et réponses dans l’Antiquité profane et chrétienne: de l’enseignement à l’exégèse: actes du séminaire sur le genre des questions et réponses tenu à Ottawa les 27 et 28 septembre 2009*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Polotsky, Hans Jakob. 1937. *Manichäische Homilien*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Polotsky, Hans Jakob, and Alexander Böhlig. 1940. *Kephalaia, 1. Hälfte (Lieferung 1–10)*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- . 1966. *Kephalaia, 2. Hälfte (Lieferung 1–10)*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Puech, Henri-Charles. 1949. *Le manichéisme: son fondateur, son doctrine*. Paris: Civilisations du Sud.
- . 1979. “Catharisme médiéval et Bogomilisme.” *Sur le manichéisme et autres essais*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Ramsey, Boniface, ed. 2006. *The Manichean Debate*. Translated by Roland Teske. The Works of Saint Augustine I/19. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press.
- . , ed. 2007. *The Answer to Faustus, a Manichean*. Translated by Roland Teske. The Works of Saint Augustine I/20. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press.
- Ratzinger, Joseph. 1967. “Review of A. Adam, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*.” *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 10: 217–22.
- Reeves, John C. 1996. *Heralds of That Good Realm*. Leiden: Brill.
- Richter, Siegfried. 1994. *Exegetisch-literarkritische Untersuchungen von Herakleidespsalmen des koptisch-manichäischen Psalmenbuches*. Altenberge: Oros.
- Ries, Julien. 1957. *Introduction aux études manichéennes: 4 siècles de recherches*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Bruges: Publications universitaires de Louvain.
- . 1959. *Introduction aux études manichéennes: 4 siècles de recherches*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Bruges: Publications universitaires de Louvain.
- . 1977. “Commandements de la justice et vie missionnaire dans l’église de Mani.” In Martin Krause, ed. *Gnosis and Gnosticism: Papers Read at the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies (Oxford, September 8th–13th 1975)*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1988. *Les études manichéennes des controverses de la Réforme aux découvertes du XXe siècle*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Centre d’histoire des religions.
- . 1994. “Jésus la Splendeur, Jesus patibilis, Jésus historique dans les textes manichéens occidentaux.” In Holger Prießler and Hubert Michael Seiwert, eds. *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65. Geburtstag*. Marburg: Diagonal.

- Roberts, Colin H, ed. 1938. *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*. Vol. 3. Manchester: University Press.
- Robinson, James M. 1992. "The Fate of the Manichaean Codices of Medinat Madi 1929–1989." In Gernot Wiessner and Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, eds. *Studia Manichaica: II. Internationaler Kongress zum Manichäismus, 6.–10. August 1989*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Römer, Cornelia Eva. 1994. *Manis frühe Missionsreisen nach der Kölner Manibigraphie textkritischer Kommentar und Erläuterungen zu p. 121 – p. 192 des Kölner Mani-Kodex*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Rose, Eugen. 1979. *Die manichäische Christologie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rotelle, John E., ed. 1997. *Newly Discovered Sermons*. Translated by Edmund Hill. The Works of Saint Augustine III/11. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press.
- . , ed. 2007. *Arianism and Other Heresies*. Translated by Roland J. Teske. 2nd ed. The Works of Saint Augustine I/18. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press.
- . , ed. 2008. *The Confessions*. Translated by Maria Boulding. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press.
- Säve-Söderbergh, Torgny. 1949. *Studies in the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells.
- Scher, Addai, ed. 1912. *Liber scholiorum*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Paris: Carolus Poussielgue.
- Schiller, Isabella, Dorothea Weber, and Clemens Weidmann, eds. 2009. "Sechs neue Augustinuspredigten: Teil 2 mit Edition dreier Sermones zum Thema Almosen." *Wiener Studien* 122: 171–213.
- . 2010. "Die neuen Erfurter Augustinuspredigten." In Josef Pilvousek and Josef Römelt, eds. *Die Bibliothek des Amplonius Rating de Berka und ihre verborgenen Schätze. Anmerkungen zur Wiederentdeckung „Erfurter“ Augustinus-Predigten*. Würzburg: Echter.
- Schmidt, Carl. 1933. *Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten: Originalschriften des Mani und seiner Schüler*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, in Kommission bei W. de Gruyter.
- . , ed. 1978a. *Pistis Sophia*. Translated by Violet MacDermot. Leiden: Brill.
- . , ed. 1978b. *The Books of Jeu and the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex*. Translated by Violet Macdermot. Leiden: Brill.
- Scibona, Concetta Giuffré. 2001. "How Monotheistic Is Mani's Dualism?: Once More on Monotheism and Dualism in Manichaean Gnosis." *Numen* 48, no. 4: 444–67.
- Scopello, Madeleine. 2001. "Femmes et propagande dans le manichéisme." *Connaissance des Pères de l'Eglise* 83: 35–44.
- . 2005a. "Les passionarias du manichéisme: le rôle des femmes dans la propagande." *Religions et histoires* 3: 44–47.
- . 2005b. *Femme, gnose et manichéisme: de l'espace mythique au territoire du réel*. Leiden: Brill.
- Shisa-Halevy, Ariel. 2002. "An Emerging New Dialect of Coptic." *Orientalia: Nova Series* 71, no. 3: 298–308.
- Sims-Williams, Nicholas. 1985. "The Manichaean Commandments: A Survey of the Sources." *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*. Leiden: Brill.
- Slusser, Michael. 1981. "Docetism: A Historical Definition." *The Second Century: A Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1, no. 3: 163–72.

- Söderberg, Hans. 1949. *La religion des cathares. Étude sur le gnosticisme de la basse antiquité et du moyen âge*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells.
- Stausberg, Michael. 2000. "Pierre Bayle (1647–1706) und die Erfindung des europäischen Neomanichäismus." In R. E. Emmerick, Werner Sundermann, and Peter Zieme, eds. *Studia Manichaica: IV. Internationaler Kongress zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Stein, Markus, ed. 1998. *Codex Thevestinus: Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterungen*. Opladen: Westdeutscher.
- . 2002. *Manichaica Latina: Manichaei epistula fundamenti*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Stroumsa, Guy G. 1984. *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology*. Leiden: Brill.
- Stroumsa, Guy G. 2000. "Isaac de Beausobre Revisited: The Birth of Manichaean Studies." In R. E. Emmerick, Werner Sundermann, and Peter Zieme, eds. *Studia Manichaica: IV. Internationaler Kongress zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Sundermann, Werner. 1968. "Christliche Evangelientexte in der Überlieferung der iranischmanichäischen Literatur." *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 14: 386–405.
- . 1981. *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- . 1986a. "Mani, India and the Manichaean Religion." *South Asian Studies* 2, no. 1: 11–19.
- . 1986b. "Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer I." *Altorientalische Forschungen* 13, no. 1–2.
- . 1986c. "Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer II." *Altorientalische Forschungen* 13, no. 1–2.
- . 1987. "Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer III." *Altorientalische Forschungen* 14, no. 1–2.
- . 1993. "Cosmogony and Cosmology III, in Manicheism." *Encyclopedia Iranica* VI, no. 3: 310–15.
- . 1996. "Iranian Manichaean Texts in Chinese Remake: Translation and Transformation." In Alfredo Cadonna and Lionello Lanciotti, eds. *Cina e Iran: De Alessandro Magno alla dinastia Tang*. Florence: Olschki.
- . 2000. "Geschichte, Stand und Aufgaben der Turfanforschung, die Turfanexpeditionen und ihre Ergebnisse." *Akademie-Journal* 2: 12–17.
- . 2004. "Turfan Expeditions." *Encyclopedia Iranica (Online Edition)*. At <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/turfan-expeditions-2>.
- . 2009. "Manichaeism iv. Missionary Activity and Technique." *Encyclopedia Iranica (Online Edition)*. At <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/manicheism-iv-missionary-activity-and-technique->.
- Takao, Moriyasu. 2000. "On the Uighur *čxšapt ay* and the Spreading of Manichaeism into South China." In R. E. Emmerick, Werner Sundermann, and Peter Zieme, eds. *Studia Manichaica: IV. Internationaler Kongress zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.–18. Juli 1997*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Tardieu, Michel. 1997 (= 1981). *Que sais-je? Le Manichéisme*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- . 1982. "Les Manichéens en Egypte." *Bulletin de la Société française d'Égyptologie* 94: 5–19.

- . 1986. “Archelaus.” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 1987. “Principes de l’exégèse manichéenne du Nouveau Testament.” *Les règles de l’interprétation*. Paris: Cerf.
- . 1988. “La diffusion du bouddhisme dans l’Empire Kouchan, l’Iran et la Chine d’après un Kephalaion manichéen inédit.” *Studia Iranica* 17, no. 2: 153–82.
- Thiele, Walter, ed. 2005a. *Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)*. Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 11/2, 1. Lieferung Freiburg: Herder.
- . , ed. 2005b. *Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)*. Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 11/2, 2. Lieferung Freiburg: Herder.
- Thomassen, Einar. 2004. “Orthodoxy and Heresy in Second-Century Rome.” *Harvard Theological Review* 97, no. 3: 241–56.
- Tongerloo, Aloïs van. 1984. “Buddhist Indian Terminology in the Manichaean Uyghur and Middle Iranian Texts.” In Wojciech Skalmowski and Aloïs van Tongerloo, eds. *Middle Iranian Studies: Proceedings of the International Symposium Organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982*. Leuven: Uitgeverij Press.
- Tubach, Jürgen, and Mohsen Zakeri. 2001. “Mani’s Name.” In Johannes Van Oort, Otto Wermelinger, and Gregor Wurst, eds. *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West: Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaean Studies*. Leiden: Brill.
- Utas, Bo. 1985. “Mānistān and Xānaqāh.” In H.W. Bailey, A.D.H. Bivar, J. Duchesne-Guillemin, and J.R. Hinnells, eds. *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Van den Berg, Jacob Albert. 2010. *Biblical Argument in Manichaean Missionary Practice: The Case of Adimantus and Augustine*. Leiden: Brill.
- Van Lindt, Paul. 1992. *The Names of Manichaean Mythological Figures: A Comparative Study on Terminology in the Coptic Sources*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Van Oort, Johannes. 1996. *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine: The Rediscovery of Manichaeism and Its Influence on Western Christianity*. Tbilisi: Academy of Sciences of Georgia.
- . 1997. “Manichaeism and Anti-Manichaeism in Augustine’s *Confessions*.” In Luigi Cirillo, ed. *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi “Manicheismo e oriente Cristiano antico”: Arcavacata di Rende, Amantea, 31 agosto – 5 settembre 1993*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 2006. “Augustine and Manichaeism: New Discoveries, New Perspectives.” *Verbum et ecclesia* 27, no. 2: 709–28.
- . 2008. “The Young Augustine’s Knowledge of Manichaeism: An Analysis of the *Confessiones* and Some Other Relevant Texts.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 62, no. 5: 441–66.
- . 2010. “Manichaean Christians in Augustine’s Life and Work.” *Church History and Religious Culture* 90, no. 4: 505–46.
- . 2012. “Augustine and the Books of the Manichaeans.” In Mark Vessey, ed. *A Companion to Augustine*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- . 2015a. “Manichaeism in Augustine’s Sermons: The Case of Sermo 182.” *Journal of Early Christian History* 5, no. 1: 144–57.
- . 2015b. “Manichaean Women in Augustine’s Life and Works.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 69, no. 3: 312–26.

- . 2016a. “‘Human Semen Eucharist’ Among the Manichaeans?: The Testimony of Augustine Reconsidered in Context.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 70, no. 2: 193–216.
- . 2016b. “Another Case of Human Semen Eucharist Among the Manichaeans?: Notes on the ‘Ceremony of the Fig’ in Cyril of Jerusalem’s Catechesis VI.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 70, no. 4: 430–40.
- . 2017. “Manichaean Women in a Pseudo-Augustinian Testimony: An Analysis of the North African Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 71, no. 1: 85–94.
- VanderHout, Michael P.J., Ernest Evans, Johannes B Bauer, Roel Vander Plaetse, S. Dominic Ruegg, Marie Vianney O’Reilly, and Clemens Beukers, eds. 1969. *De fide rerum invisibilium; Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide et spe et caritate; De catechizandis rudibus; Sermo ad catechumenos de symbolo; Sermo de disciplina christiana; De utilitate ieiunii; Sermo de excidio urbis Romae; De haeresibus*. CCSL 46. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Varga, Lucie. 1939. “Les Cathares sont-ils des Néomanichéens ou des Néognostiques.” *Revue de l’histoire des religions* 120: 175–93.
- Verbraken, Pierre-Patrick. 1976. *Études critiques sur les sermons authentiques de saint Augustin*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- . 1987. “Saint Augustine’s Sermons: Why and How to Read Them Today.” *Augustinian Heritage* 33: 105–16.
- Verheijen, Lucas, ed. 1981. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini confessionum libri XIII*. CCSL 27. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Vermes, Mark, trans. 2001. *Hegemonius: Acta Archelai*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Villey, André. 1994. *Psaumes des errants: écrits manichéens du Fayyūm*. Paris: Cerf.
- Vogels, Heinrich Joseph, ed. 1969. *Ambrosistri qui dicitur commentarius in epistulas Paulinas, pars III*. CSEL 81.3. Vienna: Hölderlin-Pichler-Tempsky.
- Weber, Dorothea, and Clemens Weidmann, eds. 2008. “Sechs neue Augustinuspredigten: Teil I mit Edition dreier Sermones.” *Wiener Studien* 121: 227–84.
- Weidmann, Clemens. 2012. “Augustine’s Works in Circulation.” In Mark Vessey and Shelley Reid, eds. *A Companion to Augustine*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Weiskotten, Herbert T. 1919. “Sancti Augustini Vita Scripta a Possidio Episcopo.” Dissertation, Princeton: Princeton University.
- Widengren, Geo. 1961. *Mani und der Manichäismus*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Williams, Frank, trans. 2009. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book I (Sects 1–46)*. Leiden: Brill.
- . , trans. 2013. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Books II and III. De Fide*. Leiden: Brill.
- Williams, Michael A. 1996. *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Wilmart, Andre, and Germain Morin, eds. 1932. “Operum s. Augustini elenchus a Possidio eiusdem discipulo Calamensi episcopo digestus.” *Miscellanea Agostiniana*. Rome: Typographie Vaticane.
- Worp, Klaas Anthony, ed. 1995. *Greek Papyri from Kellis: I (P. Kell. I Gr. 1–90)*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- . , ed. 2004. *Greek Ostraca from Kellis: O. Kellis, Nos. 1–293*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

- Worp, Klaas Anthony, and Albert Rijksbaron, eds. 1997. *The Kellis Isocrates Codex*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Zimmer, Stefan. 2004. "Die Bedeutung der Turfanfunde für die Indogermanistik." In Desmond Durkin-Meisterenst, ed. *Turfan Revisited: The First Century of Research into the Arts and Culture of the Silk Road*. Berlin: Riemer.
- Zycha, Joseph, ed. 1891. *De utilitate credendi, De duabus animabus, Contra Fortunatum Manichaeum, Contra Adimantum, Contra epistulam fundamenti, Contra Faustum Manichaeum*. CSEL 25/1. Vienna: Tempsky.
- . , ed. 1892. *Sancti Aureli Augustini contra Felicem, De natura boni, Epistula Secundini contra Secundinum accedunt, Evodii De fide contra Manichaeos*. CSEL 25/2. Vienna: Tempsky.
- . 1900. *Sancti Aureli Augustini De Fide et symbolo, De fide et operibus, De agone Christiano, De continentia, De bono coniugali, De sancta virginitate, De bono viduitatis, De adulterinis coniugiis, Lib. II De medacio contra mendacium, De opere monachorum, De divinatione daemonum, De cura pro mortuis gerenda, De patientia*. CSEL 41. Vienna: Tempsky.