

Biblical Argument
in Manichaean Missionary Practice

Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies

Editors

Johannes van Oort & Einar Thomassen

Editorial Board

J.D. BeDuhn – A.D. DeConick – W.-P. Funk
I. Gardner – S.N.C. Lieu – A. Marjanen
P. Nagel – L. Painchaud – B.A. Pearson
N.A. Pedersen – S.G. Richter – J.M. Robinson
M. Scopello – J.D. Turner – G. Wurst

VOLUME 70



A painting of St. Augustine in the Petrus and Paulus church in Loppersum (c. 1500 CE). Photograph: Regnerus Steensma & Justin Kroesen, Institute for Liturgical Studies (University of Groningen)

Biblical Argument
in Manichaean Missionary
Practice:

The Case of Adimantus and Augustine

by

Jacob Albert van den Berg



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2010

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Berg, Jacob Albert van den, 1975-

Biblical argument in Manichaean missionary practice : the case of Adimantus and Augustine
/ by Jacob Albert van den Verg.

p. cm. – (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies, ISSN 0929-2470 ; v. 70)

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 978-90-04-18034-5 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Augustine, Saint, Bishop of Hippo. *Contra Adimantum*. 2. Manichaeism. 3. Bible--Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title.

BR65.A62132B47 2009

239'.1--dc22

2009046089

ISSN 0929-2470

ISBN 978 90 04 18034 5

Copyright 2010 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface	IX
List of abbreviations	XI
Chapter One. Introduction	1
1. Augustine, Manichaeism and Holy Scripture	1
2. Purpose	4
3. Outline of the study	5
4. Relevance	10
Chapter Two. Adimantus: a Manichaean missionary.....	11
A. Adimantus' identity.....	11
1. Augustine on Adimantus	11
2. The argument from the Greek Abjuration Formulae	12
3. The different regions of Adimantus' activity	16
4. The relationship between the names 'Adimantus' and 'Addas'	19
5. Adimantus = Pappos?.....	21
B. Adimantus' biography	23
1. Adimantus' background	23
2. Adimantus as a member of Mani's church	25
3. Adimantus' missionary journeys	27
4. Mani's missionary precepts and Adimantus	40
5. Adimantus' missionary activities	45
C. Provisional conclusions.....	47
Chapter Three. Adimantus' <i>Disputationes</i> : a reconstruction	49
A. Introduction	49
B. Augustine's acquaintance with the <i>Disputationes</i>	51
1. The years of Augustine's priesthood	51
2. The Manichaean years	54
C. <i>Disputationes</i> refuted in <i>Contra Adimantum</i>	62
1. The structure of <i>Contra Adimantum</i>	62
2. Double answers	67
3. (Parts of) sermons in <i>Contra Adimantum</i>	69
4. <i>Contra Adimantum</i> : preliminary conclusion.....	70
5. Adimantus' <i>Disputationes</i> in <i>Contra Adimantum</i>	71

D. <i>Disputationes</i> disproved in sermons.....	75
1. Introduction.....	75
2. Sermons discussing disputations also refuted in <i>Contra Adimantum</i>	77
3. Sermons discussing disputations not mentioned in <i>Contra Adimantum</i>	83
E. The <i>Disputationes</i> in other works of Augustine.....	95
1. Introduction.....	95
2. <i>Contra Faustum</i>	96
3. <i>De Genesi adversus Manichaeos</i>	102
4. <i>De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim</i>	104
F. Adimantus' <i>Disputationes</i> : a reconstruction of its contents	104
 Chapter Four. Analysis of the <i>Disputationes</i> : its method, contents, and purposes.....	123
A. Introduction.....	123
B. Bible texts.....	125
1. Method and limitations.....	125
2. The Old Testament quotations.....	126
3. The New Testament quotations.....	131
C. Exegetical methods of the <i>Disputationes</i>	138
1. The methodological application of 'antitheses'.....	138
2. The literal sense.....	144
3. Did Adimantus ignore the context?.....	145
D. Contents of the <i>Disputationes</i>	150
1. Subjects of the <i>Disputationes</i>	150
2. Arguments quoted in full.....	160
E. Evaluation.....	167
1. The form of the <i>Disputationes</i>	167
2. The target group of the <i>Disputationes</i>	168
3. The relevance of the Old Testament to Adimantus.....	168
4. The importance attached to the New Testament.....	174
 Chapter Five. The literary context of the <i>Disputationes</i>	177
A. Introduction.....	177
1. Relevance.....	177
2. Method.....	179
3. The <i>Contra Faustum</i> and the <i>Capitula</i>	181
B. Writings against the <i>superstitio</i> of the Jews.....	184

C. Writings against the deceit of the ‘semi-christiani’	194
1. Faustus’ introduction to his <i>Capitula</i>	194
2. Adimantus’ fame as ‘Paraclete’	195
3. Adimantus’ criticism of Christ’s genealogies	196
4. Adimantus’ criticism of positive references to the Hebrew Bible	197
5. Concluding remarks	198
D. Other works	200
1. The <i>Modion</i>	200
2. Adimantus on the Manichaean myth	203
3. The <i>Kephalia</i>	208
E. Evaluation	211
 Chapter Six. Conclusions and suggestions for further research	 215
 Bibliography	 221
Indices	233
1. Index of persons	233
2. Index of Bible texts	236

PREFACE

A project like this is never the result of merely the efforts and knowledge of the one whose name is mentioned on the cover. The fact that I was able to write this book presupposes many good circumstances, as well as helpful and encouraging persons. Having finished this book, I gladly and thankfully mention them.

The first person I want to mention is my supervisor Prof. dr. J. van Oort. This book would never have been written without his specialist and accurate knowledge from which I greatly profited ever since my study at the University of Utrecht. Van Oort time and again stimulated me to work precisely and he gave many advices, both with regard to the content and to the presentation. Thanks to his great experience as editor of many scientific publications, I also learned what it takes to make a manuscript ready for publication. In Van Oort, I further thank the scholarly tradition of the study of the Early Church and of the Gnosis, which flourished at the University of Utrecht during many years, as well as the scholarly tradition of the study of Augustine at the Radboud University Nijmegen.

Prof. dr. D.A.T. Müller, Prof. dr. P.J.A. Nissen, and Prof. dr. H.B.G. Teule thoroughly read the manuscript in their quality as members of the Doctoral Thesis Committee. I thank them for their readiness to read, and to comment on, what I wrote. For this edition in the series Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, I profited from the learned remarks of Dr. Vincent Hunink and Dr. Madeleine Scopello.

Drs. Hilary Staples and her father Dr. Peter Staples were of great help in correcting the English of this book. I am very grateful for their assistance, which certainly was to my advantage. Drs. Lucy van 't Slot gave her comment on a first draft of the translation of the Latin texts, which helped me to understand the Latin texts.

Many persons in my environment encouraged me to continue with the study. Among them were my good friend minister ir. Wim Teekens, who regrettably passed away for almost four years, and his wife Nelly Teekens. In the last stage of this project, I regularly had stimulating discussions on *i.a.* the Gnosis with Prof. dr. G.H. van Kooten, which certainly helped me to proceed. I further want to mention the members of the parishes of Dorkwerd and Stedum c.a., who were always

interested in the study of their minister. All of these contacts gave an important impetus to the work.

The ‘Johan van Drongelen Stichting’, the ‘Stichting: Fonds, legaat “Ad Pias Causas” gemaakt door Pieter Boelen’, as well as the ‘Ridderlijke Duitse Orde, Balije van Utrecht’ generously contributed to the costs of this dissertation, for which I am very grateful.

A fine family with a loving wife and healthy children certainly is a good environment for studying. I am grateful for the support of Annemieke, Marijke, Lisette, Daan and Thijmen. Above all, I am thankful to God, who gifted me with the talents necessary for study and who shaped the circumstances in which I was able to develop those talents.

Stedum/Groningen, February/June 2009
Jacob Albert van den Berg

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AF	Altorientalische Forschungen
AL	Augustinus-Lexikon
AOH	Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae
AMS	Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum, ed. P. Bedjan, 7 vols. (Paris 1890–1897)
ARAM	ARAM Periodical, published by the ARAM Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies
AS	Augustinian studies
BA	Bibliothèque Augustinienne, Oeuvres de Saint Augustin, Paris
CCL	Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina
CFM	Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
CMC	Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis
HSCP	Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
JA	Journal Asiatique
JbAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
JEH	Journal of Ecclesiastical History
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
MA	Miscellanea Agostiniana. Testi e studi pubblicati a cura dell'ordine eremitano di s. Agostino nel XV centenario dalla morte del santo dottore, 1–2, Roma 1930–1931
MIO	Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung
MSN	Manichaean Studies Newsletter
NHC	Nag Hammadi Codices
NT	Novum Testamentum
NTT	Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift
OrChrAn	Orientalia Christiana Analecta
PL	Patriologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina, accurate J.-P. Migne
RA	Recherches Augustiniennes
REA	Revue des Études Augustiniennes
RB	Revue bénédictine de critique, d'histoire et de littérature religieuses

RGG	Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart
RMAL	Revue du moyen-âge latin
SecCent	The Second Century. A Journal of Early Christian Studies
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
TRE	Theologische Realenzyklopädie
VC	Vigiliae Christianae. A Review of Early Christian Life and Language
ZKG	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik
ZRG	Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1. Augustine, Manichaeism and Holy Scripture

Augustine of Hippo is one of the most influential persons in the history of the Christian Church and even in the development of Western civilisation. If we want to understand him properly, we must examine the influences that shaped his theological and philosophical ideas.

One of those influences is 'Manichaeism'. From his nineteenth year onwards, and for nine years at least, Augustine was one of the adherents of the religion of Mani. Furthermore, he dedicated no less than one-third of his literary output to the refutation of the teachings of his former co-religionists. This means that Manichaeism must be treated as a highly important and, to a certain extent, even a determining factor in Augustine's life and work.¹

The days when Manichaeism could be treated as a Persian religion are gone. The discovery in 1969 and the subsequent publication of the Cologne Mani Codex,² as well as the archaeological findings in Kellis during the last decade of the twentieth century,³ have provided scholars

¹ Cf. J. van Oort, *Mani, Manichaeism & Augustine. The Rediscovery of Manichaeism & Its Influence on Western Christianity. Lectures delivered at the State University of Tbilisi & the K. Kekelidze Institute of Manuscripts of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, Tbilisi, Georgia, 26–29 September, 1995*, Tbilisi 1996, especially 39–53; idem, *Augustinus' Confessiones. Gnostische en christelijke spiritualiteit in een diepzinnig document*, Turnhout, 2002; idem, 'Van Vergilius en Mani tot de Catholica: Augustinus' oorspronkelijke spiritualiteit', in: P. van Geest & J. van Oort (eds.), *Augustiniana Neerlandica. Aspecten van Augustinus' spiritualiteit en haar doorwerking*, Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA 2005, 11–29.

² First edition with commentary: A. Henrichs & L. Koenen, *ZPE* 5 (1970) 97–216; *ZPE* 19 (1975) 1–85; *ZPE* 32 (1978) 87–199; *ZPE* 44 (1981) 210–318; *ZPE* 48 (1982) 1–59 and C.E. Römer, *Manis frühe Missionsreisen nach der Kölner Manibigraphie. Textkritischer Kommentar und Erläuterungen zu p. 121–p. 192 des Kölner Mani-Kodex*, Opladen 1994. See for an overview of the various editions and subsequent publications: J. van Oort, 'The Study of the Cologne Mani Codex 1970–1994', *MSN* 13 (1996) 22–30.

³ For a preliminary account of the Manichaean findings in Kellis, see e.g. I. Gardner, 'Personal Letters from the Manichaean Community at Kellis', in: L. Cirillo & A. Van Tongerloo (eds.), *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi 'Manicheismo e Oriente*

with decisive evidence about the nature and origins of Manichaeism. The *CMC* demonstrated the undoubted Jewish-Christian background of Mani. This fact means that the ‘Persian’ origin of his teachings is now virtually impossible to maintain.⁴ The recent discoveries in Kellis confirmed that, in essence, Manichaeism should be treated as a Christian religion.⁵ Partly due to the recent discoveries, the earlier discovery of Manichaean texts in Egypt (in which ‘Christian’ elements undoubtedly abound)⁶ have obviously attracted fresh scholarly interest. This gave a new impetus to the sometimes rather hotly debated question of the origins of Manichaeism.⁷ A year before the first preliminary publication of the *CMC*, Peter Brown had already observed that it was ‘increasingly difficult to represent Manichaeism as a development of Iranian religion.’⁸ Nowadays, leading students of Manichaeism certainly consider this religion, at least as far as its origins and first manifestations are concerned, as a species of Gnostic Christianity.⁹

Because Manichaeism must be treated as a Gnostic-Christian religion (or, more precisely, a Gnostic-Christian Church),¹⁰ the intriguing question about the similarities and dissimilarities between Catholic Chris-

Cristiano Antico, Leuven 1997, 77–94; on the archaeological context, see e.g. C.A. Hope *et al.*, ‘Three Seasons of Excavation at Ismant el-Gharab in the Dakleh Oasis, Egypt’, *Mediterranean Archaeology* 1 (1988) 160–177, and *idem*, ‘The Archaeological Context of the Discovery of Leaves from a Manichaean Codex’, *ZPE* 117 (1997) 156–169.

⁴ See e.g. J. van Oort, ‘Manichaeism. Its Sources and Influences on Western Christianity’, in: R. van de Broek & W.J. Hanegraaff (eds.), *Gnosis and Hermeticism from Antiquity to Modern Times*, New York 1998, 37–51.

⁵ See e.g. I. Gardner, ‘Personal Letters’, 89.

⁶ As is the case in the ‘Psalms to Jesus’ in the Manichaean *Psalmbook*, among others.

⁷ For a good overview of the discoveries in Egypt and developments in the debate among students of Manichaeism, see I. Gardner & S.N.C. Lieu, ‘From Narmouthis (Medinet Madi) to Kellis (Ismant El-Kharab): Manichaean Documents from Roman Egypt’, *JRS* 86 (1996) 146–169.

⁸ P. Brown, ‘The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire’, *JRS* 59 (1969) 92–103, reprinted in: P. Brown, *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine*, London 1972, 94–118, especially 96: ‘The general reassessment of the nature of Manichaeism, followed by the discovery of the Coptic Manichaean documents in the Fayyûm in Egypt [,] has made it increasingly difficult to represent Manichaeism as a development of Iranian religion.’

⁹ See e.g. J. van Oort, *Mani, Manichaeism & Augustine*, Tbilisi 1996; N.A. Pedersen, *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-Boston 2004, 6–13.

¹⁰ Cf. J. van Oort, ‘The Paraclete Mani as the Apostle of Jesus Christ and the Origins of a New Christian Church’, in: A. Hilhorst (ed.), *The Apostolic Age in Patristic Thought*, Leiden-Boston 2004, 139–157.

tianity and the new Church of Mani arises. A crucial issue at this juncture is the importance of the Bible in Manichaeism. Although Mani constructed his own sevenfold canon¹¹ (in which biblical elements have an important place),¹² Manichaeans, in the East as well as in the West, were also well acquainted with many texts and traditions of the Bible. Accordingly, they quoted regularly from the Bible and gave their opinions on its contents. The following examples may suffice to give a first impression: in Eastern Manichaean texts, the 16th chapter of the Gospel of John on the promised Paraclete is quoted;¹³ in Kellis, among the Manichaean texts, a Coptic papyrus leaf containing *Rom.* 2:9–29 has been found;¹⁴ the *Capitula* of bishop Faustus, a prominent Manichaean in Augustine's days and world, deals mainly with questions about the Bible;¹⁵ and, for instance, it was to an important degree the exegetical arguments of the Manichaeans which attracted Augustine to the Manichaean Church and made him decide to become a member.¹⁶

As might be expected, the Manichaeans' exegetical stance had a considerable impact on the Catholic Christian exegesis of Holy Scripture, as was particularly the case with Augustine himself. Consequently, in order to get a better understanding of Manichaeism as an essential factor in Augustine's life and thinking, it is of importance to study the Manichaeans' use and interpretation of the Bible. This subject is still open to investigation and further discussion: some pioneering work has already been done, but many questions still remain to be answered, especially in regard to the Old Testament.¹⁷

¹¹ See e.g. J. van Oort, 'The Emergence of Gnostic-Manichaean Christianity as a Case of Religious Identity in the Making', in J. Frishman *et al.* (eds.), *Religious Identity and the Problem of Historical Foundation*, Leiden-Boston 2004, 275–285 (283).

¹² For instance in his *Letters*. See e.g. I. Gardner, 'The Reconstruction of Mani's *Epistles* from Three Coptic Codices (Ismant el-Kharab and Medinet Madi)', in: P. Mirecki & J. BeDuhn (eds.), *The Light and the Darkness. Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, Leiden-Boston-Cologne 2001, 93–104.

¹³ W. Sundermann, 'Der Paraklet in der ostmanichäischen Überlieferung', in: P. Bryder (ed.), *Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism*, Lund 1988, 201–212.

¹⁴ I. Gardner, *Kellis Literary Texts*, I, Oxford 1996, 81–90.

¹⁵ Augustine refuted Faustus' *Capitula* in his *Contra Faustum* (CSEL 25,1:251–797). See esp. Ch. V, Part A, section 3. *The Contra Faustum and the Capitula*.

¹⁶ See *i.a. conf.* 3,5,9 – 3,6,10 (27: 30, 9 – 32, 43) and *conf.* 3,7,13 – 3,8,16 (CCL 27: 33, 17 – 36, 4). Cf. also E. Feldmann, 'Der Übertritt Augustins zu den Manichäern', in: A. Van Tongerloo & J. van Oort (eds.), *The Manichaean NOYΣ*, Leuven 1995, 103–128. See Ch. III, Part B, section 2. *The Manichaean years*.

¹⁷ A. Böhlig (*Die Bibel bei den Manichäern*, Dr theol. thesis, Münster 1947) was one of the first who explicitly dealt with this subject. A more recent study on the Manichaeans

2. Purpose

The purpose of this dissertation is to contribute to the study of the theme ‘The Bible among the Manichaeans’. This will be done by means of an examination of the use, the assessment and the interpretation of the Bible by one of the key figures in Mani’s Church, namely the Manichaean ‘missionary’ Adimantus.

Two reasons were important when I chose to take a closer look at Adimantus. The first was my interest in Augustine. During my study of theology at the university, my enthusiasm to study Augustine was particularly fostered by a new dimension: i.e. Manichaeism. It was due to the courses of Prof. Dr. J. van Oort that I first became aware of the manifold influence of Manichaeism on Augustine’s intellectual and spiritual development. This dimension became more and more fascinating, particularly because I found it intriguing to discover that a ‘sect’, which—in any case at first sight—seemed rather strange to me, had exerted any influence at all upon the most important Father of the Western Church. In other words: through Augustine, my interest in Manichaeism increased. Furthermore, since the very beginning of my studies, I have had a certain predilection for biblical exegesis and its history. The manifold interpretations of biblical texts, their varied backgrounds, motives and purposes, still fascinate me. These two preferences had all the signs of coming together in a study of the exegetical treatise called *Disputationes* which was written by the Manichaean Adimantus, and its refutation by Augustine in *Contra Adimantum Manichaei discipulum*. The result of my research can be found in this book.

In his *Disputationes*, the contents of which are preserved for the most part in the refutation of Augustine, Adimantus listed at least thirty ‘antitheses’ (so-called) between the Old and the New Testament. Augustine’s *Contra Adimantum* testifies to this and for that reason—although the book is rather brief—it is undoubtedly a work of considerable and even unique importance. Its importance is at least twofold. First, *Contra Adimantum* contains the authentic words of a Manichaean and therefore it should be valued as an access point which conducts us to a Manichaean

use of the Bible is e.g., H.-J. Klimkeit, ‘Der Gebrauch Heiliger Schriften im Manichäismus’, in: G. Schöllgen und C. Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann*, Münster 1996, 191–199 (191f.).

primary source that deals with Holy Scripture. Second, its title calls Adimantus a 'disciple of Mani', which could even mean: one of Mani's twelve 'apostles'.¹⁸

The principal aim of this book is to reconstruct the subject-matter of Adimantus' *Disputationes*; which is a prime source for our knowledge of Manichaean biblical exegesis. The second aim of this book is to examine Adimantus' views on the Scriptures. Questions which are dealt with in this context include: Were the contradictions between the Old and the New Testament only intended to demonstrate the inconsistencies in Catholic Christian belief? Or did Adimantus have other aims in mind as well? And how much authority did Adimantus attribute to the New Testament? A related question is on the origins of Adimantus' assessment of Holy Scripture and also on the sources of the methods that he used when he interpreted the Bible. By means of these researches, we also hope to arrive at a better understanding of the exegetical arguments that first attracted and later troubled Augustine.

3. *Outline of the study*

In the first chapter which follows this introduction, we start by giving an account of what can be mentioned about Adimantus himself. Our examination of the life and work of Adimantus takes as its point of departure the writings of Augustine. In the extensive corpus of Augustine's writings, the proper noun 'Adimantus' is found nearly forty times.¹⁹ However, more than half of Augustine's references to Adimantus are in *Contra Adimantum*.²⁰ Furthermore, Augustine also mentions Adimantus in the *Retractationes*²¹ and, for instance, in *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum*.²² In *Contra Faustum*, both Faustus and Augustine refer to Adimantus.²³

¹⁸ See Ch. II, Part A, section 2. *Adimantus as a member of Mani's Church*.

¹⁹ According to Cetedoc, *Library of Christian Latin Texts*, CLCLT-2, Lovanii 1994.

²⁰ The proper name 'Adimantus' is found in the title of the work and further in *c. Adim.* 12 (twice), 13 (3 times), 14 (once), 15 (3 times), 17 (once), 18 (once), 21 (once), 24 (once), 25 (once), 26 (twice), 27 (twice) and 28 (twice).

²¹ *retr.* 1, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 63, 2).

²² *c. adu. leg.* II, 12, 42 (CCL 49: 131, 1320 ff.).

²³ Faustus: *c. Faust.* 1, 2 (CSEL 25, 1: 252, 2) and Augustine e.g.: 6, 6 (CSEL 25, 1: 292, 26).

Augustine provides us with two important biographical details. The first is his description of Adimantus as ‘a disciple of Mani’.²⁴ The second is Augustine’s identification of Adimantus as the disciple of Mani, called Addas.²⁵ This identification seems to be very important, because Addas is well known in both Manichaean and anti-Manichaean writings: namely as one of the first missionaries of Mani. Amongst the ranks of the scholars of Manichaeism, however, there is no agreement on the question of whether or not Augustine is right in his identification of Adimantus with Addas. Drijvers²⁶ does not accept it; Decret²⁷ cannot make up his mind; Merkelbach²⁸ and Tubach²⁹ maintain that this identification is indeed correct. Therefore, the first sections of the second chapter will consider the reliability or otherwise of Augustine’s claim. In order to assess the value of Augustine’s statement, we make use of the information provided by some of the Greek *Formulae* for the renunciation of Manichaeism.³⁰ In this dissertation, we shall argue that Augustine was indeed right to identify Adimantus as the disciple of Mani called Addas.

In the second part of chapter II, the source material on Addas will be discussed. The name of Addas was as widespread as Manichaeism itself. The relevant sources provide us with a veritable treasure trove of information about Addas which enables us to discuss Addas’ origins, his background, and the precise date when he became an adherent of Mani’s religion. Furthermore, we can examine the issue of Addas’ rank in the Manichaean hierarchy. Manichaean sources from the Silk Road are of special importance here, because they provide a number of useful details about the dates and the destinations of Addas’ missionary

²⁴ *retr.* 1, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 63, 1–2) and *c. adu. leg.* II, 12, 42 (CCL 49: 131, 1320 ff.).

²⁵ *c. adu. leg.* II, 12, 42 (CCL 49: 131, 1320 ff.).

²⁶ H.J.W. Drijvers, ‘Addai und Mani. Christentum und Manichäismus im dritten Jahrhundert in Syrien’, *OrChrAn* 221 (1983) 171–185 (176).

²⁷ F. Decret, ‘Adimantus’, *AL* I, 94 f.

²⁸ R. Merkelbach, ‘Manichaica (1–3)’, *ZPE* 56 (1984) 52 and ‘Manichaica (5–6)’, *ZPE* 58 (1985) 57.

²⁹ J. Tubach, ‘Nochmals Addas-Adeimantos’, *ZPE* 106 (1995) 165–174.

³⁰ These texts are all included in the collection of Manichaean texts edited by A. Adam, *Texte zum Manichäismus*, Berlin 1969² (1954¹), 93–103; see as well: G. Ficker, ‘Eine Sammlung von Abschwörungsformeln’, *ZKG* 27 (1906) 443–464, and with commentary and translation: S.N.C. Lieu, ‘An Early Byzantine Formula for the Renunciation of Manichaeism—The “Capita VII contra Manichaeos” of (Zacharias of Mitylene). Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary’, in: idem, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*, Leiden-New York-Cologne 1999² (1994¹), 203–305.

journeys.³¹ We shall also discuss the conclusions on the subject of the chronology and destinations of Addas' journeys proposed by modern authors.³² Furthermore, these sources make mention of the injunctions Mani gave to his missionaries and their activities and the fruits of their labours which are praised. The personal letters of Manichaean origin recently discovered at Kellis³³ provide us with further information about Manichaean missionary activities in fourth-century Egypt. By way of comparison between the Egyptian sources and those from the Silk Road, we try to produce a description of the life of a Manichaean missionary. The historical and biographical account of Adimantus will provide us with important indications for our interpretation of his exegetical writings.

Chapter III includes a reconstruction of the *Disputationes*. After the introduction, we examine first when and why Augustine started to refute the *Disputationes*. This examination of the historical context of Augustine's encounter with the *Disputationes* is certainly relevant, because it sheds important light on the 'Sitz im Leben' of the *Disputationes* and its form. Besides, it also sheds more light on the origin and pervasiveness of Augustine's acquaintance with the contents of the *Disputationes*.

³¹ E.g. M2, ed. F.C. Andreas & W. Henning, 'Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan' II, *SPAW* (Ph.Hist.Kl.), Berlin 1933, 301 f. and M. Boyce, *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian. Texts with Notes*, Leiden 1975, 39f.; M216, ed. Andreas & Henning, 'Mitteliranische Manichaica', 301 and W. Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*, Berlin 1981, 26 f.; and 13941=T II K&14285=T II D. 136 and M 18220 = T. M. 389 a, ed. Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte*, 34–36 and 42.

³² L. Koenen, 'Manichäische Mission und Klöster in Ägypten', in: G. Grimm et al. (eds.), *Das römisch-byzantinische Ägypten*, Mainz 1983, 93–108; S.N.C. Lieu & D.A.S. Montserrat, 'From Mesopotamia to the Roman East—The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Eastern Roman Empire', in: S.N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*, Leiden-New York-Cologne 1999², 22–131; G. Stroumsa, 'Monachisme et Marranisme chez les Manichéens d'Égypte', *Numen* 29 (1982) 184–201; W. Sundermann, 'Zur frühen missionarischen Wirksamkeit Manis', *AOH* 24 (1971) 79–125; *idem*, 'Iranische Lebensbeschreibungen Manis', *AO* 36 (1974) 125–149; *idem*, 'Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer', I, II, III, *AF* 13 (1986) 40–92, 13 (1986) 239–317 and 14 (1987) 41–107; M. Tardieu, 'Les Manichéens en Égypte', *Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie*, 94 (1982) 5–19; J. Vergote, 'Coptica. Het Manichaeisme in Egypte', *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 9 (1944) 77–83; *idem*, 'L'Expansion du Manichéisme en Égypte', in: C. Laga et al. (eds.), *After Chalcedon. Studies in Theology and Church History offered to Professor Albert Van Roey for his Seventieth Birthday*, Leuven 1985, 471–478.

³³ Ed. I. Gardner, *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis*, I, Oxford 1999.

In part C of chapter III we present a new analysis of *Contra Adimantum* in order to reconstruct the subject-matter and methods of Adimantus' writing. Here, Augustine's *Contra Adimantum* will be discussed as the main source for what we know about the *Disputationes*. *Contra Adimantum* can be interpreted as a kind of 'opus imperfectum'. To be sure, Augustine does not put it quite like that, but in his *Retractationes* he does say that he did not refute *all* the contradictions collected by Adimantus: some of them remained undiscussed because of other urgent activities; whilst others he deems to have been adequately commented on in some of his earlier sermons.³⁴ Apart from this testimony of Augustine, the fact that his writing does not have an introduction or a conclusion seems to indicate its rather unfinished state. Only a few of the earlier studies have discussed Augustine's *Contra Adimantum* in detail. Most important in this context are Decret's well-known volumes on Manichaeism in Roman North Africa.³⁵ Apart from this study, Decret also dealt with *Contra Adimantum* in the *Augustinus-Lexikon*.³⁶ Earlier in the twentieth century, *Contra Adimantum* had already been discussed by Prosper Alfaric in his *L'Évolution intellectuelle de saint Augustin*.³⁷ In part D, some sermons of Augustine will be analysed with the same end in view.³⁸ With the help of CD-ROM searches,³⁹ several other sermons and writings of Augustine in which he deals with those contradictions of Adimantus have also been found and will be analysed as well.

The chapter is concluded with a reconstruction of the *Disputationes*. Its Latin text, derived from Augustine's writings and sermons, and an English translation are presented in two parallel columns.

Chapter IV is dedicated to an extensive analysis of the results of our reconstruction of the *Disputationes*. In part B of this fourth chapter, we analyse Adimantus' quotations from Bible texts per se. Among other things, we also examine whether Adimantus changed the wording of the quotations in order to substantiate his own views. In part C, the exeget-

³⁴ *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 63 f., 2–13).

³⁵ *L'Afrique manichéenne (IVe–Ve siècles). Étude historique et doctrinale*, 2 tomes, Paris 1987. *Contra Adimantum* is discussed in Vol. I, 93–105 (with notes in Vol. II, 69–78).

³⁶ 'Adimantum Manichei discipulum (Contra—)', *AL* I, 90–94.

³⁷ Paris 1918, particularly 185 f.

³⁸ Some of these sermons have already been brought up for discussion in other studies, namely the sermons 1, 12 and 50 by A.C. de Veer, 'Sermons I, XII et L d'Augustin', *REA* 15 (1969) 241–246. Cf. also Decret, *L'Afrique*, t. 2, 72 f.

³⁹ See above, n. 20.

ical methods are discussed, especially with respect to the question of what those methods can tell us about Adimantus' assessment of Holy Scripture. Thereafter, in part D, we can explore the subjects that Adimantus chose in order to buttress his points of view and, apart from that, we discuss those arguments of Adimantus which Augustine quoted in full. In several previous studies, Marcion's *Antitheses* is mentioned as an important source for Adimantus' *Disputationes*, both as regards the method and the subject-matter.⁴⁰ In Part C and D, we consider the probability and the import of the Marcionite influence on Adimantus and its consequences for Adimantus' opinions on Scripture. The chapter is concluded with a brief evaluation of the form of the *Disputationes* and Adimantus' aims when he wrote the work. Moreover, we draw conclusions about Adimantus' assessment of both the Old and the New Testament.

In chapter V we attempt to get an overview of the contents of Adimantus' other works in order to improve our understanding of his exegetical views. First the Manichaean bishop Faustus, who declared himself to be a student of Adimantus,⁴¹ is of importance. By examining Faustus' *Capitula*, a writing quoted by Augustine in his *Contra Faustum*, we will be able to discover the traces of some other (exegetical) works of Adimantus. Another worthwhile source, which is useful to evaluate and extend our discoveries from Faustus' *Capitula*, is Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos*,⁴² because this author, too, seems to have quoted from the writings of Adimantus.⁴³ In our examination, we can trace writings of Adimantus on the Jewish Scriptures per se, on the New Testament, and also on the Manichaean myth of the creation of humans. Furthermore, we discuss the possibility that Adimantus was the redactor of the *Kephalaia*.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ See e.g. Lieu, 'Formula', 198; Merkelbach, 'Manichaica (1–3)', 51 and Tubach, 'Nochmals Addas-Adeimantos', 170.

⁴¹ c. *Faust.* 1, 2 (CSEL 25,1: 252, 1 f.).

⁴² Titus of Bostra, *Contra Manichaeos*. Ed. P. de Lagarde, *Titus Bostrenus. Syriace et graece*, Wiesbaden 1967³.

⁴³ See Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 251 and G. Sfameni Gasparro, 'Addas-Adimantus unus ex discipulis Manichaei: for the History of Manichaeism in the West', in: Ronald E. Emmerick et al. (eds.), *Studia Manichaica* IV, Berlin 2000, 546–599.

⁴⁴ See M. Tardieu, 'Principes de l'exégèse Manichéenne du Nouveau Testament', in: idem, *Les règles de l'interprétation*, Paris 1987, 123–146 (134) and cautiously W.-P. Funk, 'The reconstruction of the Manichaean *Kephalaia*', in: P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn (eds.),

In chapter VI we summarise and evaluate the results of our researches and make some suggestions for further research.

In this study all translations of Latin and other texts are made up by the author, unless indicated otherwise. Here, in particular, the skill of Hilary and Peter Staples was of great help. The titles of Augustine's works have been abbreviated in accordance with the convention of the *Augustinus-Lexikon*.⁴⁵

4. *Relevance*

Apart from its historical-scientific value, the significance of this book may be the topicality of the questions already raised by Adimantus. The relevance of the Old Testament is still under discussion, both in hermeneutics and homiletics. Adimantus' questions about the relationship between the Old and the New Testament invite us to reflect on our own position. Besides, the disagreement between Augustine and Adimantus demonstrates the abiding importance of firmly-grounded exegesis and a thorough consideration of the contexts of texts before making use of them in any argument.

Emerging from Darkness. Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997, 143–159 (154). Cf. as well T. Pettipiece, *Pentadic Redaction in the Manichaean Kephalaia*, Leiden-Boston (2009).

⁴⁵ C. Mayer *et al.* (edd.), *Augustinus-Lexikon*, vol. I, Basel 1986–1994, XLII–XLV.

CHAPTER TWO

ADIMANTUS: A MANICHAEAN MISSIONARY

A. *Adimantus' identity*

1. *Augustine on Adimantus*

Augustine's acquaintance with Manichaeism, together with his purpose to refute the opinions of his former co-religionists, has resulted in an extensive anti-Manichaean oeuvre. Oftentimes this wide-ranging corpus of Augustinian writings demonstrates unique knowledge of Manichaeism. It should be valued, therefore, in Manichaean studies, since it sometimes turns out to hold pivotal information.

This is already the case with Augustine's remarks on Adimantus as a person. Without his references to Adimantus, any attempt to give an account of the life and career of the author of the *Disputationes* that provoked Hippo's bishop to write the *Contra Adimantum*, is impeded by a serious lack of data. Other sources, Manichaean as well as anti-Manichaean, give us only a few biographical facts about the proper name 'Adimantus'. From those other relevant writings, one can only derive the epithet 'disciple of Mani'¹ (which might mean that Adimantus belonged to the twelve prime original adherents of Mani)² and the fact that he was sent by Mani as a missionary.³

Although Augustine does not tell very much about Adimantus' life, one of his remarks is of major importance, as it seems to unveil crucial information about the identity of Adimantus. Referring to Adimantus' *Disputationes*, Augustine says, in a subordinate clause, that the Manichaean's proper name is reported to be 'Addas'.⁴ From other sources we

¹ See the discussion on the Greek Abjuration Formulae in section 2. *The argument from the Greek Abjuration Formulae*.

² See Part B, section 2. *Adimantus as a member of Mani's church*.

³ See below pp. 13 ff.

⁴ *c. adu. leg.* II, 12, 42 (CCL 49: 131, 1320 ff.): 'iam illud aliud, quod in eodem codice scribi coeperat, Adimanti opus est, illius discipuli Manichaei, qui proprio nomine Addas dictus est.'

know that this proper name 'Addas' belonged to one of Mani's most important missionaries, and that it was as widespread as Manichaeism itself.⁵ Therefore, if Adimantus is indeed to be identified with Addas, we may take into account a considerable amount of source material in order to reconstruct the *curriculum vitae* of the author of the *Disputationes*.

Augustine's remark on Adimantus' identity as being Addas has been treated with suspicion both by ancient and modern scholars. Isaac de Beausobre, rightly considered to be the founding father of the study of Manichaeism,⁶ claimed that Augustine mistakenly identified Adimantus with Mani's missionary Addas.⁷ More recently, the reliability of the identification of Adimantus with Addas has been called into question by Han Drijvers⁸ and François Decret.⁹

In the scholarly discussion, two kinds of arguments have been brought up. The first has to do with the Greek Abjuration Formulae, the second with the different regions in which Addas *sive* Adimantus could have been carried out his missionary work. In the next paragraphs, these arguments will be discussed.

2. *The argument from the Greek Abjuration Formulae*

At face value, the doubts voiced by De Beausobre and others about Augustine's identification of Adimantus with Addas seem to be well founded. In fact, the only sources in which both names appear alongside each other are some Greek Abjuration Formulae; there, however, they do not seem to be equated. These 'abjuration formulae' originated in the Byzantine period, when authorities unleashed a vigorous campaign

⁵ See below, Part B.

⁶ On De Beausobre, see J. van Oort, 'Würdiging Isaac de Beausobres (1659–1738)', in: R.E. Emmerick *et al.* (eds.), *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin 14.-18. Juli 1997*, Berlin 2000, 658–666. See also G.G. Stroumsa, 'Isaac de Beausobre Revisited: The Birth of Manichaean Studies', *ibidem*, 601–612.

⁷ I. de Beausobre, *Histoire critique de Maniché et du Manichéisme*, I, Amsterdam 1734 (reprint New York & London 1984), 433: '... l'erreur de St. Augustin, qui a confondu Adas avec Adimante.' (The spelling of Adimantus' other name differs. In scholarly studies and text editions one finds Adas, Addas, Adda, Adday, Addai and A-to. These differences stem from the various languages of the ancient sources: Sogdian, Parthian, Greek, etc. For the convenience of the reader, we normally use the spelling 'Addas'.)

⁸ H.J.W. Drijvers, 'Addai und Mani. Christentum und Manichäismus im dritten Jahrhundert in Syrien', *OrChrAn* 221 (1983) 171–185 (176).

⁹ F. Decret, 'Adimantus', *AL*, vol. I, 94f.

against ‘heresies’.¹⁰ Three of these tractates were dedicated to the abandonment of Manichaeism: the so-called *Short Formula for the Renunciation of Manichaeism*, the *Long Formula for the Renunciation of Manichaeism* and the *Seven Chapters against the Manichaeans*. The *Short Formula* was probably written in the middle of the fifth century,¹¹ while the *Long Formula* originated sometime between the middle of the ninth and the beginning of the eleventh century.¹² In the first half of the sixth century, Zacharias of Mytilene may have written the *Seven Chapters*.¹³ Samuel Lieu supposes that, due to the many verbal agreements, the *Long Formula* depends substantially on the *Seven Chapters*.¹⁴

In view of the fact that the identification of Adimantus and Addas is highly significant, the references to both names in the *Formulae* deserve to be quoted in full. In the so-called *Short Greek Formula of Renunciation*, both names occur once:

Ἔτι ἀναθεματίζω ... καὶ Ἄδδαντον καὶ Ἀδίμαντον, ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ὁ αὐτὸς ὁ δυσσεβῆς Μάνης εἰς διάφορα κλίματα.¹⁵

Further I anathematize ... and Addantos and Adimantos, who was sent by the wicked Mani himself to the various regions (of the world).

The author of the *Seven Chapters* mentions Addas and Adeimantos three times. The first time is in Chapter 2, in a list of Mani’s disciples:

Ἀναθεματίζω τοὺς Μανιχαίου μαθητάς, | Ἄδδαν καὶ Ἀδείμαντον, Θωμάν, Ζαροῦαν καὶ Γαβριάβιον καὶ | Πάαπιν, Βαραίην καὶ Σαλμαῖον καὶ Ἰνναῖον καὶ τοὺς λοιπούς ...

I anathematize the disciples of Manichaeus, Addas and Adeimantos, Thomas, Zarouas and Gabriabios en Paapis, Baraies and Salmaios and Innaios and the rest ...¹⁶

¹⁰ S.N.C. Lieu, ‘An Early Byzantine Formula for the Renunciation of Manichaeism—The “Capita VII contra Manichaeos” of (Zacharias of Mitylene). Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary’, in: idem, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1999², 210 f.

¹¹ Cf. G. Ficker, ‘Eine Sammlung von Abschwörungsformeln’, *ZKG* 27 (1906) 443–464 (448); Lieu, ‘Formula’, 215. Without any further argumentation, Drijvers, ‘Addai und Mani’, 176 dates the text to the sixth century.

¹² Cf. Lieu, ‘Formula’, 217 and Drijvers, ‘Addai und Mani’, 176.

¹³ Cf. Lieu, ‘Formula’, 220–223. Lieu is not sure about Zacharias’ authorship. He is sure, however, about the date, as no reference has been made to the Paulicians in the *Seven Chapters*.

¹⁴ Lieu, ‘Formula’, 225.

¹⁵ A. Adam, *Texte zum Manichäismus*, Berlin 1969² (1954¹), 94, l. 35 ff.

¹⁶ Text and translation: Lieu, ‘Formula’, 236.

Besides, in a subsequent list of books, mention is made of a work written against the Hebrew Bible. Both Addas and Adeimantos are identified as its author:

Ἀναθεματίζω πάσας τὰς μανιχαϊκὰς βίβλους ... καὶ τὴν κατὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προφητῶν Ἀδδᾶ καὶ Ἀδεϊμάντου συγγραφὴν ...

I anathematize all the Manichaeian books ... and that which refutes the Law and the holy Moses and the other prophets composed by Adda and Adeimantos ...¹⁷

In addition, both names are being mentioned in the fourth Chapter in which the incarnation of Christ is discussed. Addas and Adeimantos, along with Manichaeus, are anathematized because of their denial of the incarnation:

οὐκ ἐπαισχυνθέντα ἐνναμηνιαῖον χρόνον οἰκῆσαι μόρια, ἅπερ αὐτὸς ἀνυβρίστως ἐδημιούργησεν, κἂν διαρρήγνυνται ὁ Μανιχαῖος καὶ οἱ τούτου μαθηταί, Ἀδδᾶς καὶ Ἀδεϊμάντος, σὺν Ἑλλήσι καὶ Ἰουδαίοις ἀπιστοῦντες τῷ μυστηρίῳ τῆς θείας ἑναν θρωπίσεως ...

He was not ashamed to dwell for nine months in her womb which he fashioned (in a manner which was) undefiled—even if Manichaeus and his disciples Addas and Adeimantos, who along with the Pagans and the Jews do not believe in the mystery of the holy incarnation explode with fury!—...¹⁸

The *Long Formula* mentions Addas and Adeimantos twice. In the first instance, they are called the joint authors of a Manichaeian writing:

Ἀναθεματίζω ... καὶ τὴν γεγραμμένην Ἀδα καὶ Ἀδεϊμάντω, κατὰ Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προφητῶν ...¹⁹

I anathematize ... and the writing by Adas and Adeimantos, against Moses and the other prophets.

The second time that both names occur together is in the enumeration of Mani's disciples which follows: '(Ἀδάν), Ἀδεϊμάντον'.²⁰

¹⁷ Lieu, 'Formula', 236.

¹⁸ Lieu, 'Formula', 242.

¹⁹ Adam, *Texte*, 100, l. 128–136.

²⁰ Adam, *Texte*, 101, l. 155. The reading (Ἀδάν) is an improvement of the original text reading Ἀδάμ. This is a plausible correction because the names of Adam and Adeimantos never jointly occur; cf. F.C. Andreas and W. Henning, 'Mitteliranische Manichaica' II, *SPAW* (Ph.Hs.Kl.) (1933) 301 n. 2: '... (ibid. B falsch Ἀδάμ)'. See also Merkelbach, 'Manichaica (1–3)', *ZPE* 56 (1984) 53 and Lieu, 'Formula', 237. Moreover, in the *Seven Chapters* Ad(d)as occurs in combination with Adeimantos and not with Adam (see. n. 16).

As the authors of the *Formulae* seem to consider the names 'Addas' and 'Adeimantos' as referring to two different persons, the quotations just given do not support Augustine's opinion on Adimantus. It was for this reason, that Han Drijvers questioned the accuracy of Augustine's remark.²¹

Concerning the text of the *Short Formula*, the oldest of the extant *Formulae*, there is room for some remarks that may substantially affect the argument. At the beginning of the 20th century, Gerhard Ficker published an improvement of the *Short Formula* as given in Migne's edition.²² Migne mainly based his edition on the *Euchologion sive rituale Graecorum* that had been published by a certain Jacques Goar (Venice 1730).²³ Goar's edition, however, contains several mistakes, which were subsequently reprinted by Migne. Ficker, however, corrected Goar's rendering of the *Short Formula* in several passages. One of these *loci* is the above-mentioned phrase about Addas and Adeimantos.²⁴ According to Ficker, the preferred reading should be Ἀδδᾶν τὸν καὶ Ἀδείμαντον instead of Ἀδδαντον καὶ Ἀδείμαντον, because Goar had missed an important word-division marker. After this correction, the phrase even *supports* Augustine's observation because it now reads: 'Addas, who is also called Adeimantos'. This explains why Ficker claimed that Augustine was correct in his identification.²⁵

In the past decades, some scholars have followed Ficker's emendation. Reinhold Merkelbach discussed the reading of Migne in two brief studies. In the first one, he makes the proposal to read Ἀδδᾶν τὸν καὶ Ἀδείμαντον. His main argument to support this correction is the fact that both names occur side by side in the *Long Greek Formula*.²⁶ In his second

²¹ Drijvers, 'Addai und Mani', 176: 'Es scheint zweifelhaft, ob Addai mit Adeimantos identisch war, der vor dem Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts in Afrika proconsularis missionierte, obwohl Augustinus letztgenannten mit Adda gleichsetzt. Die kleine griechische Abschwörungsformel (6. Jh.) unterscheidet zwischen beiden. ... Die grosse griechische Abschwörungsformel (9. Jh.) erwähnt Adda noch als einen der hervorragendsten manichäischen Schriftsteller nebst Adeimantos.'

²² A. Adam, however, has simply reproduced Migne's rendering in his (rightly famous) collection of Manichaean sources.

²³ Cf. Lieu, 'Formula', 213 and Ficker, 'Abschwörungsformeln', 446.

²⁴ Cf. n. 15.

²⁵ Ficker, 'Abschwörungsformeln', 446 f.

²⁶ Merkelbach, 'Manichaica (1-3)', 52: 'Es ist klar, dass hier die Worttrennung geändert werden muss; (...) Die Namen Adās und Adeimantos kommen auch in der grossen griechischen Abschwörungsformeln zweimal neben einander vor ...'. The Long Greek Formula of Renunciation is discussed above; see nn. 19 and 20.

article, Merkelbach mentions Ficker's correction of Migne's text in support of his own position. Jürgen Tubach, who once again discussed the problem of the names 'Adimantus' and 'Addas', also adopted the view that Migne's rendering must be corrected.²⁷

Ficker's reading seems to be the best indeed. It is quite well imaginable that originally a small mistake (in this case: a wrong word-division) was made. Apart from that, Ficker's rendering of the text makes better grammatical sense. In the phrase ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ὁ αὐτὸς ὁ δυσσεβῆς Μάνης εἰς διάφορα κλίματα the relative pronoun ὃν (whom) is singular and refers to one person. This makes Ficker's proposal by far the most probable.

On the subject of the *Seven Chapters*, we must conclude that its author was not well informed about Adimantus and Addas, because he suggests that two persons wrote a book 'against Moses and the other prophets'. Evidently the book against which Augustine wrote is meant here. The occurrence of Adeimantos in close connection with a book directed against the Old Testament admits no other conclusion. As a consequence, this reference to Adimantus and Addas seems to support Augustine's remark rather than undermining it,²⁸ for it closely connects Adimantus as well as Addas to the *Disputationes*. The other two instances in which both names are mentioned, demonstrate that the names 'Addas' and 'Adimantus' were closely associated in the *Seven Chapters*: they do not appear independently of each other. The same goes for the references to both names in the *Long Formula*. Hence the occurrence of the names 'Addas' and 'Adeimantos' in the Greek abjuration formula does support rather than undermine Augustine's opinion on the identity of Adimantus.

3. *The different regions of Adimantus' activity*

The apparent difference about the regions with which both names are associated, is of importance for the discussion. In the earlier literature on the subject, this problem even plays a major role. De Beausobre gives as one of the main reasons for his doubts about the truth of Augustine's remark on Adimantus /Addas that, according to the *Acta Arch-*

²⁷ J. Tubach, 'Nochmals Addas-Adeimantos', *ZPE* 106 (1995) 170–174 (171).

²⁸ Cf. also Lieu, 'Formula', 264.

elai,²⁹ Addas was sent to the East, the North and to Scythia, whereas Adimantus filled such a prominent role in Roman Africa, that he must have been the apostle of the west of the Roman Empire.³⁰ De Beausobre quoted from the so-called *anathema Prosperi*³¹ and from Augustine's *Contra Faustum* to support his stance on Adimantus' influence in the Roman West.

Prosper Alfaric reached other conclusions than De Beausobre. In his *L'Évolution intellectuelle de saint Augustin*,³² Alfaric briefly discusses Augustine's claim that Adimantus is Mani's disciple Addas. Alfaric merely claims, without attaching any importance to the fact that a certain Addas seems to be known in the East and a certain Adimantus in the West, that Adimantus and Addas are the same person, who should be regarded as one of the twelve apostles of Mani.³³ In his later work *Les écritures manichéennes*,³⁴ Alfaric elaborated his line of reasoning, paying more attention to the geographical difficulty. Here, he claims that the *Acta Archelai* which purports that Addas was sent to the East must be considered as being legendary, because of its tendency to use famous Christian names.³⁵ For this reason, Alfaric whole-heartedly accepted Augustine's identification of Addas with Adimantus.³⁶

François Chatillon also believed that Augustine's opinion on Addas and Adimantus is correct. He referred to the fact that the Middle Persian fragment M2³⁷ tells that Addas had been sent as a missionary to the West. In this way, Addas cannot have been the missionary of the East or the North as is stated in the *Acta Archelai*. According to Chatillon, influence of Addas to the regions west of Alexandria is well imaginable and thus the identification of Adimantus and Addas may be accepted.³⁸

²⁹ Hegemonius, *Acta Archelai (The Acts of Archelaus)*. Translated by Mark Vermes with an introduction and commentary by Samuel N.C. Lieu with the assistance of Kevin Kaatz, Lovanii 2001.

³⁰ Cf. n. 7.

³¹ See below n. 156 for the text.

³² P. Alfaric, *L'Évolution intellectuelle de saint Augustin*, I, Paris 1918.

³³ Alfaric, *Évolution*, 81 f., esp. n. 6.

³⁴ P. Alfaric, *Les écritures manichéennes*, I, *Vue générale*, Paris 1918; II, *Étude analytique*, Paris 1919.

³⁵ Alfaric, *Écritures*, I, 56; II, 96 f.

³⁶ Alfaric, *Écritures*, II, 104: 'D'après Augustin, Addas était aussi connu sous le nom d'Adimante. Cette affirmation très nette d'un esprit avisé, qui a beaucoup lu et étudié les écrits manichéens, est d'un grand poids et il n'y a aucune raison de la mettre en doute.'

³⁷ See n. 108.

³⁸ F. Chatillon, 'Adimantus Manichaei discipulus', *RMAL* 10 (1954) 198 and 202 f.

More recently, François Decret has approached the problem Addas/Adimantus from another point of view, namely the development of Manichaeism in Roman Africa. Albeit cautiously, he does accept the identification of both names in *L'Afrique manichéenne*.³⁹ Decret considers Adimantus' fame among the African Manichaeans to be an important indication. He therefore puts forward the hypothesis, already suggested by De Beausobre, that Adimantus might have worked in Africa as a missionary. However, several years later, Decret turns out to be no longer sure whether the Addas whom Augustine identified with Adimantus, is the same person as the Addas who was sent by Mani to the Roman East. Although Decret does not elaborate his argument, his remarks suggest that he, still accepting the hypothesis that Adimantus worked as a missionary in Roman Africa, introduces another Addas because of the fact that Manichaean sources indicate that Addas only reached Alexandria.⁴⁰ Decret's reasoning has some apparent weaknesses. Apart from the fact that only one Addas was known to be a disciple of Mani, the hypothesis of any activity of Adimantus in Africa has no documentary support. Besides, the thus supposed limitation of Addas' activities up to Alexandria deserves much closer attention.⁴¹ For the moment it may suffice to say that there is no reason to distrust Augustine's remark, as there is neither any proof that Adimantus was in fact in Roman Africa, nor that Addas was never there.

Apart from his already mentioned argument concerning the *Greek Formulae of Renunciation*, Drijvers put forward a geographical argument against Augustine's remark on Addas and Adimantus. He suggests that Addas particularly worked in Syria, because Titus of Bostra wrote some books against Addas' works, while Adimantus was known in Roman Africa.⁴² However, the fact that Titus discussed Addas' writings is no serious reason to distrust Augustine in this case, as it is not automatically followed by the conclusion that Addas had his primary area of activity in Syria. Other sources mention activities of Addas elsewhere as well. A more extensive discussion of the possible range of Addas' missionary activities will be presented below.⁴³ For the time being, it may suffice to conclude that there is no geographical reason to distrust August-

³⁹ Decret, *L'Afrique manichéenne*, I, Paris 1987, 174 f.

⁴⁰ Decret, 'Adimantus', *AL*, I, 94 f.

⁴¹ See Part B, section 3. *Adimantus' missionary journeys*.

⁴² Drijvers, 'Addai und Mani', 176.

⁴³ See Part B, section 3. *Adimantus' missionary journeys*.

tine's remark. In view of the fact that the Greek abjuration formulae even confirm Augustine's identification of Adimantus with Addas, we may provisionally accept Augustine's rendering as being completely trustworthy.

4. *The relationship between the names 'Adimantus' and 'Addas'*

Because Adimantus could well be identified with Addas alias Adda(i) we now need to discuss the relationship between the names. Merkelbach has proposed two possibilities. The first option (and Merkelbach has a slight preference for this first one) is that 'Addas' could well be a shortened form of 'Adeimantos': in which case, the shortening of the name may have caused the doubling of the letter 'd'. However, Merkelbach correctly claims that 'Addas' was a common name, which makes it less probable that 'Addas' could be regarded as an abbreviation of 'Adeimantos'. The second possibility proposed by Merkelbach is the other way round: Adeimantos could well be a Greek form of Addas.⁴⁴

In fact, neither proposed solution does solve the problem. The first option is not very plausible because the name 'Adeimantos' is not found in early Manichaean sources, whereas 'Addas' is certainly mentioned.⁴⁵ Hence, it is very illogical to consider the later name as the original one. The second possibility is also unlikely, because the names 'Addas' and 'Adeimantos' differ too much from each other to suppose that 'Addas' became 'Adeimantos' in Greek.

Prosper Alfaric observed, however, that 'Adeimantos' could well have been an epithet of Addas given by his followers.⁴⁶ Recently, Jürgen Tubach has drawn the same conclusion, when he stated that Adeimantos cannot have been anything other than an honorary title, because Adeimantos means 'fearless'. The interpretation of the Old Testament by Addas had pleased the Gnostics living in Egypt. Thus, it is probable that Addas received his honorary title there. Moreover, Manichaean sources testify to the aggressive manner in which he debated.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Merkelbach, 'Manichaica (1–3)', 52. Cf. also S.N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*, Tübingen 1992², 92.

⁴⁵ E.g. in the *Cologne Mani Codex*. See n. 88.

⁴⁶ Alfaric, *Écritures*, II, 104.

⁴⁷ Tubach, 'Nochmals Addas-Adeimantos', 172–174. For the Manichaean sources, see below the Part B, section 3. *Adimantus' missionary journeys*.

The solution proposed by Alfaric and Tubach has the advantage of being both natural and uncomplicated. Besides, the characterization of Addas as 'fearless' corresponds to Augustine's statement in the *Contra Adimantum*:

Adimantus, one of the disciples of Manichaeus, whom they commemorate as a great teacher of their sect, has even ventured (*ausus est*) to taunt the people of Israel. He has ventured (*ausus est*) then to taunt the Jewish people that, according to their view, which maintains that blood is the soul, the souls of their parents have partly been devoured by snakes, partly consumed by fire, partly dehydrated in the deserts and the most rough places of the mountains.⁴⁸

Both the repetition of the verb *ausus esse* and the indicated content of the argument of Adimantus demonstrate his fearless and aggressive style of disputation. In addition, the use of nicknames may have been a common practice among the Manichaeans. Tubach, in his study on the names of Mani's disciples, discusses the name of Abizachias. According to Tubach, 'Abizachias' is not a proper name, but an honorary title, meaning 'servant of the pure'.⁴⁹ Therefore, the combination of the names 'Adeimantos' and 'Addas' may be compared to, for example, the double name 'Johannes Chrysostomus'.

It is quite possible that Augustine found the combination 'Addas Adimantus' in the codex that induced him to write his *Contra Adimantum*.⁵⁰ Just as we say 'Chrysostomus' for 'Johannes Chrysostomus', Augustine will have used the sole name 'Adimantus', which may also have been a common usage of the African Manichaeans themselves.⁵¹

⁴⁸ *c. Adim.* 12 (CSEL 25,1: 139, 8–15): 'quod etiam insultare ausus est populo Israhel Adimantus unus ex discipulis Manichaei, quem magnum doctorem illius sectae commemorant. insultare ergo ausus est populo Iudaeorum, quod secundum eorum intellectum, quo existimant sanguinem esse animam, parentum ipsorum animae, partim a serpentibus deuoratae, partim igni consumptae, partim in desertis atque asperrimis montium locis arefactae sint.'

⁴⁹ J. Tubach, 'Die Namen von Mani's Jüngern und ihre Herkunft', in: L. Cirillo and A. Van Tongerloo (eds.), *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi 'Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico'*, Lovanii-Neapoli 1997, 375–393 (378 f.).

⁵⁰ Cf. Decret, *L'Afrique*, I, 174 and 'Adimantus', 94 f.

⁵¹ Cf. *c. Faust.* 2, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 251,22–252,2): 'Satis superque in lucem iam traductis erroribus ac Iudaicae superstitionis simul et semichristianorum abunde detecta fallacia a doctissimo scilicet et solo nobis post beatum patrem nostrum Manichaeum studendo Adimanto'. See Ch. III, Part B, section 2. *The Manichaean years* as regards to the question when Augustine learned about Addas/Adimantus.

5. *Adimantus* = *Pappos*?

Apart from the two main names of 'Adimantus' and 'Addas', a third one occurs in relation to the same person: the name Pap(p)os.⁵² Pappos is mentioned by Alexander of Lycopolis as the first missionary who brought the teachings of Mani to Egypt.⁵³ William Seston therefore assumed that Pappos must have been the same person as Addas, about whom Manichaean sources say that he was the first Manichaean missionary to arrive in Egypt.⁵⁴ Carl Schmidt and Hans Jakob Polotsky, however, construe Alexander of Lycopolis' remark in another way: Alexander could have meant that Pappos was the first to teach Mani's doctrine in his academy: rather than throughout the whole of Egypt. This interpretation of the information given by Alexander disposes of any reason to identify Addas with Pappos.⁵⁵

Modern students of Manichaeism, such as Michel Tardieu,⁵⁶ Guy Stroumsa⁵⁷ and Alexander Villey,⁵⁸ have disputed Seston's opinion. The arguments of Tardieu and Stroumsa are based on their views on the spread of Manichaeism in Egypt. In the next section, we will see that their opinions are untenable.⁵⁹ Hence they do not weaken Seston's claim. Villey adduces another reason to reject the claim that Addas and Pappos could be one and the same person. At first sight, his argument seems to be convincing. He refers to the praises that the Manichaean *Psalm 34* addresses to Addas *and* Pappos. In the fragmentary line 12 of this Psalm, they are mentioned in the same breath without any further identification.⁶⁰ However, Villey merely quotes from Allberry's edition of the Manichaean Psalm-Book,⁶¹ which meantime has turned out to contain many

⁵² There is some confusion concerning the spelling of this name. Alexander of Lycopolis (cf. n. 53) rendered his name as *Papos*, but this name is not found elsewhere. C. Schmidt and H.J. Polotsky, 'Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten', *SPAW* 1 (1933) 14–16 conclude with convincing arguments that *Papos* is *Pappos*.

⁵³ A. Villey, *Alexandre de Lycopolis, 'Contre la doctrine de Mani'*, Paris 1985, 58.

⁵⁴ W. Seston, 'L'Égypte manichéenne', *Chronique d'Égypte* 14 (1939), 362–372 (365).

⁵⁵ Schmidt & Polotsky, 'Mani-Fund', 14–16.

⁵⁶ M. Tardieu, 'Les Manichéens en Égypte', *Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie* 94 (1982) 5–19 (11 f.).

⁵⁷ G.G. Stroumsa, 'Manichéisme et Marranisme chez les Manichéens d'Égypte', *Numen* 29 (1982) 184–201 (188).

⁵⁸ Villey, *Alexandre de Lycopolis*, 108–114.

⁵⁹ See Part B, section 3. *Adimantus' missionary journeys*.

⁶⁰ Villey, *Alexandre de Lycopolis*, 110, nn. 47 and 49.

⁶¹ C.R.C. Allberry (ed.), *A Manichaean Psalm-Book, Part II*, Stuttgart 1938.

inadequacies.⁶² According to the new critical edition of Gregor Wurst, one should not read ‘Pappos’ but ‘Patticios’.⁶³ Therefore, none of the arguments used by Tardieu, Stroumsa and Villey, rule out Seston’s suggestion about Pappos.

There are, on the contrary, four arguments which seem to support this. The first is Seston’s own argument. On the assumption that Manichaeism arrived in Egypt from the south—on which see below⁶⁴—it is quite possible that Addas was the first missionary to proclaim Mani’s teachings in Egypt. The opinion of Schmidt and Polotsky, mentioned above, is quite artificial. In fact, Addas could very well have been the missionary Pappos mentioned by Alexander.

The second point in favour of Seston’s hypothesis is the origin of the proper name ‘Pappos’. Schmidt and Polotsky already proposed the possibility that ‘Papos’ might have been a Greek version of a proper name.⁶⁵ The Greek noun *πάππος* means ‘daddy’. Therefore, ‘Pappos’ might have been the translation of the name ‘Addas’, as ‘father’ is a possible meaning of the Hebrew noun *ádôn*,⁶⁶ from which ‘Addas’ has probably been derived.⁶⁷ The Manichaean missionaries were proficient in many languages,⁶⁸ and thus it is quite plausible that Addas or his followers ‘translated’ his name into ‘Pappos’ when Greek-speaking people were in view.

Moreover, and as a third argument, we could say that Alexander of Lycopolis called Pappos an exegete.⁶⁹ The description ‘exegete’ fits Adimantus very well.

Finally, the course of Pappos’ life is also of considerable interest. Our fragmentary knowledge of his career has some interesting points of resemblance with what is known about the *curriculum vitae* of Addas. As we have already seen, both ‘persons’ are said to have been in Egypt in

⁶² Cf. W.-P. Funk, ‘The Reconstruction of the Manichaean *Kephalaia*’, in: P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn (eds.), *Emerging from Darkness. Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, 143–155 (esp. 148).

⁶³ G. Wurst (ed.), *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library; Psalm-book, Part II, Fasc. 1* (CFM, Series Coptica 1), Turnhout 1996, 86.

⁶⁴ See Part B, section 3. *Adimantus’ missionary journeys*.

⁶⁵ Schmidt & Polotsky, ‘Manifund’, 15 f.

⁶⁶ Cf. L. Koehler & W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, Leiden 1985, 10 f.

⁶⁷ Cf. Tubach, ‘Namen’, 392.

⁶⁸ See Part B, section 4. *Mani’s missionary precepts and Adimantus*.

⁶⁹ Villey, *Alexandre de Lycopolis*, 58.

the same period. Furthermore, a letter from Mani to Sisinnios tells that Pappos had been in Mesopotamia⁷⁰ and from several sources on Addas' life we know that he spent some time in Mesopotamia.⁷¹ Unfortunately, Mani's original letter to Sisinnios seems to be lost.⁷² So we now depend on the description of it by Schmidt and Polotsky. On the basis of their (fragmentary) description, we are entitled to conclude that Pappos must have been an independent thinker who reached his own conclusions. For, in the presumably lost letter, Mani replies to Sisinnios' complaint about Pappos, Aurades and Sarthion, who, according to Sisinnios, did not preach the doctrines in the right way in Mesopotamia. This description fits Addas (whose epithet is *Adeimantos*) quite well.

After all, nothing can be said with certainty about the question Pappos-Addas because all the evidence is circumstantial. The forthcoming publication of Mani's *Letters* by Wolf-Peter Funk and Iain Gardner might shed further light on this problem.⁷³

B. *Adimantus'* biography

1. *Adimantus'* background

As we have seen, the designation 'Adimantus' was an epithet in praise of Mani's disciple Addas. We now will further investigate the identity of this follower of Mani. Although the Manichaean sources do not provide us with clear indications about Addas' background, his name itself does. As indicated above, Tubach's study of the names of Mani's disciples demonstrates the likely Hebrew or Aramaic origin of Addas' name,⁷⁴ and this seems to be a reliable indication of Addas' cultural origin. If the proper name 'Addas' is indeed a Hebrew name, then Addas himself might have stemmed from a Jewish or Jewish Christian milieu. This is possible as it runs parallel to Mani's own roots.⁷⁵ Besides, from

⁷⁰ Schmidt & Polotsky, 'Mani-Fund', 16.

⁷¹ See the Part B, section 3. *Adimantus'* missionary journeys.

⁷² I. Gardner, 'The Reconstruction of Mani's *Epistles* from Three Coptic Codices (IsmantEl-Kharab and Medinet Madi)', in: P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn (eds.), *The Light and the Darkness. Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, Leiden-Boston-Köln, 2001, 93-104 (97).

⁷³ See Gardner, 'Reconstruction', 97 ff.

⁷⁴ See n. 49.

⁷⁵ The CMC has provided students of Manichaeism with decisive evidence concerning the religious background of Mani. Cf. among others J. van Oort, *Mani, Manichaeism*

this background we may understand Addas' radical rejection of the Old Testament in his *Disputationes*.

The possible Aramaic origin of Addas' name gives cause to consider the probability that Addas was a Marcionite prior to his joining the church of Mani, since Marcion was very influential in those areas where Syriac was spoken. At times, even the majority of Christianity in those Syriac speaking regions may have belonged to Marcion's church.⁷⁶ In addition, both the goal and the method of Addas' *Disputationes* have much in common with Marcion's *Antitheses*, as William Frend has indicated in his groundbreaking study of the Gnostic-Manichaean tradition in Roman-Africa.⁷⁷ On the basis of a brief list of analogies, Frend arrived at the conclusion that Addas in his *Disputationes* depended largely on Marcion's *Antitheses*.⁷⁸ Meanwhile, many scholars have shared Frend's position, such as Reinhold Merkelbach,⁷⁹ Johannes van Oort,⁸⁰ Winrich Löhr⁸¹ and Jürgen Tubach.⁸² All have assumed that Marcion's *Antitheses* influenced Adimantus' *Disputationes*. This opinion easily led to the supposition that Addas was a Marcionite before he became a Manichaean, as for instance Samuel Lieu has put it.⁸³ Although—as we will suggest later on in this study—Frend is too conclusive in his argument, Addas has indeed much in common with Marcion.⁸⁴ Therefore, Marcionitism may well have been an important formative factor in Addas' life.

✠ *Augustine*, Tbilisi 1996, 11 f.; with regard to a possible Jewish (and Jewish Christian) background for Adimantus see further Ch. IV, Part E, section 3. *The relevance of the Old Testament for Adimantus*.

⁷⁶ Cf. W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, Philadelphia 1985, 217.

⁷⁷ W.H.C. Frend, 'The Gnostic-Manichaean Tradition in Roman North Africa', *JEH* 4 (1953) 13–26.

⁷⁸ Frend, 'Gnostic-Manichaean tradition', 20.

⁷⁹ Merkelbach, 'Manichaica (1–3)', 51–53.

⁸⁰ J. van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon: A Study into Augustine's City of God and the Sources of his Doctrine of the Two Cities*, Leiden-New York-Copenhagen—Köln 1991, 38.

⁸¹ W.A. Löhr, 'Die Auslegung des Gesetzes bei Markion, den Gnostikern und den Manichäern', in: G. Schöllgen & C. Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann*, Münster 1996, 77–95 (89).

⁸² Tubach, 'Nochmals Addas-Ademantus', 170–174.

⁸³ Lieu, 'Formula', 270: 'The work of Adimantus seems to have been modelled on the *Antitheses* of Marcion in that both tried to deny the authority of the Old Testament by citing apparently contradictory passages from the New Testament'; idem, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*, 92: 'The method which he adopts is undoubtedly borrowed from Marcion's *Antitheses* which was refuted by Tertullian. It is not improbable that Addas was a Marcionite prior to his joining the new sect of Mani.'

⁸⁴ See Ch. IV, Part C and D.

Furthermore, Tubach mentioned the possibility that Addas did originate from Palmyra, since Mani chose Addas to proclaim his teachings in the East of the Roman Empire. On his missionary journeys, Addas visited Palmyra at least twice.⁸⁵ According to Tubach, Addas' parents might have been merchants who as commercial travellers also visited the Sassanian Empire.⁸⁶

2. *Adimantus as a member of Mani's church*

The *Cologne Mani Codex* provides us with crucial information as regards the occasion on which Addas first encountered Mani. In a very fragmentary text, Addas is mentioned:

<p>πάλιν [... ..] α β ε [... ..] Ἄδδὰ[v] ἄνδρα[..... ..] <small>(8) μου.⁸⁷</small></p>	<p>Addas</p>	<p>a man</p>
<p>again. of my ...</p>		

The passage almost immediately follows the account of Mani's arrival in the palace of King Shâpûr I. So it is quite likely that Addas was in the palace in Seleukia-Ctesiphon. Addas is designated here as 'a man of my (election?)', without any title. We may therefore assume that the first time Addas encountered Mani was on the occasion of Mani's visit to Shâpûr's palace.⁸⁸ From the text of the *Cologne Mani Codex* we can derive that, by then, Mani was 25 years, and that Shâpûr's father had just died.⁸⁹ Therefore, Addas seems to have been one of the first disciples of Mani.

In a Parthian (M216) and in a Sogdian text (13941/14285), both of which will be discussed below,⁹⁰ some indications concerning Addas' ranking

⁸⁵ See p. 36.

⁸⁶ Tubach, 'Namen', 391 f.

⁸⁷ L. Koenen und C. Römer (eds.), *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex. Über das Werden seines Leibes. Kritische Edition aufgrund der von A. Henrichs und L. Koenen besorgten Erstedition*, Opladen 1988, 112 ff.

⁸⁸ Cf. C. Römer, *Manis frühe Missionsreisen nach der Kölner Manibigraphie; Textkritischer Kommentar und Erläuterungen zu p. 121–p. 192 des Kölner Mani-Kodex*, Opladen 1994, 159 f.

⁸⁹ Koenen & Römer, *Mani-Kodex*, 113. Shâpûr's accession to the throne probably was in 241 CE; cf. S.N.C. Lieu and D.A.S. Montserrat, 'From Mesopotamia to the Roman East—The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Eastern Roman Empire', in: S.N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1999², 22–131 (24).

⁹⁰ See nn. 110 and 114 respectively.

in the Manichaean hierarchy are given.⁹¹ According to these texts, in the first year of their mission to the Roman East, Patticius was in authority and had the title of Teacher ('mwcg/mwz"k'), Addas was called a Bishop ('spsg/'βt'δ'n), and a certain Mani (not the founder of the religion, but another person bearing the same name) is referred to as a Scribe (dbyr) and an Abbot (m'ny-st'nδ'r'k). The Manichaean hierarchy seems to have consisted of five levels: 1) the Teachers, 2) the Bishops, 3) the Presbyters, 4) the Elect, 5) the Hearers. Mani and his direct successor, the so-called ἄρχηγός or 'princeps', was at the top of these five levels. The number of the Elect and Hearers was not limited, but the three specific levels of Elect had their fixed number. Mani chose 12 Teachers or Apostles, like Jesus chose his 12 disciples. Besides, parallel to the 72 Apostles Jesus sent out,⁹² Mani is said to have established his 72 Bishops. Moreover, there were 360 Presbyteroi, a number probably based on common astrological lore.⁹³

Both in Latin⁹⁴ and in Greek sources⁹⁵ Adimantus is reported to have been a (direct) disciple of Mani, which might mean that Adimantus was one of the Twelve and, therefore, a Teacher c.q. Apostle. In the Parthian and Sogdian texts that relate the beginning of the mission this title is not applied to Addas.⁹⁶ Nevertheless, there is good reason to claim that Addas was one of the Twelve, because the Middle Iranian text M2⁹⁷ and the Sogdian text 13941/14285⁹⁸ relate that Patticius the Teacher returned to Mani after a year, after which Addas was burdened with the authority of the Western mission. This makes it quite plausible that Addas obtained

⁹¹ Concerning the Manichaean hierarchy, see especially J. van Oort, 'The Emergence of Gnostic-Manichaean Christianity as a Case of Religious Identity in the Making', in J. Frishman *et al.* (eds.), *Religious Identity and the Problem of Historical Foundation*, Leiden-Boston 2004, 275–285.

⁹² In the canonical tradition, 70 men were sent out, but in Tatian's *Diatessaron*, which was probably known among the Manichaeans (see below, pp. 132 f.), the number of 72 is given. Cf. e.g. Van Oort, *Mani, Manichaeism & Augustine*, 15.

⁹³ Cf. L. Koenen, 'Manichäische Mission und Klöster in Ägypten', in: G. Grimm *et al.* (eds.), *Das römisch-byzantinische Ägypten*, Mainz 1983, 93–108 (99); Van Oort, *Mani, Manichaeism & Augustine*, 15; H.J. Polotsky, 'Manichäismus', in: G. Widengren (ed.), *Der Manichäismus*, Darmstadt 1977, 101–144 (131 f.); M. Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, Paris 1981, 73–79.

⁹⁴ Augustine, *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 63 f., 1–6).

⁹⁵ See n. 16.

⁹⁶ See nn. 110 and 114.

⁹⁷ See n. 108.

⁹⁸ See n. 114.

the title of Teacher later, namely after the return of Patticius to Mani. The assumption that Addas ultimately became a Teacher is all the more likely, because of the great influence of Addas/Adimantus on the Manichaeans in the West.⁹⁹

3. *Adimantus' missionary journeys*

Among the Coptic Manichaean sources from Medinet Madi, a so-called *Acta Apostolorum Manichaeorum* was found, which described the history of the diffusion of Mani's teachings. These *Acta* were acquired by Carl Schmidt in Egypt in 1931. Schmidt's and Polotsky's provisional description of the contents of these *Acta* gives reason to suppose a close resemblance with the contents of the *Cologne Mani Codex*.¹⁰⁰ Unfortunately, the *Acts* got nearly completely lost during the Second World War: only seven or eight leaves are reported to have survived and these have not been edited and translated as yet.¹⁰¹ Another important source of Manichaean missionary activities, namely Mani's *Letters*, seems to have shared the same fate: merely some not yet published fragments seem to have been left. In Kellis, parts of the *Epistles* of Mani were found as well, but they have not yet been published either.¹⁰² Hence, in order to obtain information about the history of Manichaean mission, we depend largely on the *Cologne Mani Codex* for the early years and, especially with regard to our subject, on Manichaean texts found along the Silk Road.¹⁰³ The Silk Road sources may stem from the sixth century and later,¹⁰⁴ but Werner Sundermann has arrived at the conclusion that much of its contents originally stemmed from the Mesopotamian Manichaean

⁹⁹ See pp. 38 f.

¹⁰⁰ Schmidt & Polotsky, 'Mani-Fund', 7 and 27–30.

¹⁰¹ See J.M. Robinson, 'The Fate of the Manichaean Codices of Medinet Madi 1929–1989', in: G. Wießner and H.-J. Klimkeit (eds.), *Studia Manichaica. II. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus*, 6.–10. August 1989, St. Augustin/Bonn, Wiesbaden 1992, 19–62 (51–55) and I.M.F. Gardner and S.N.C. Lieu, 'From Marmouthis (Medinet Madi) to Kellis (Ismant el-Kharab): Manichaean Documents from Roman Egypt', *JRS* (1996) 146–169 (153 f.).

¹⁰² Cf. Gardner, 'Reconstruction', 93–95; Gardner & Lieu, 'From Marmouthis to Kellis', 151 and Robinson, 'The Fate of the Manichaean Codices', 55–57.

¹⁰³ For a translation with a short introduction, see H.-J. Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic texts from Central Asia*, New York 1993.

¹⁰⁴ Sundermann states that the texts give no indication about their date or author, see his 'Zur frühen missionarischen Wirksamkeit Manis', *AOH* 24 (1971) 79–125 (81). However, Tardieu, 'Les Manichéens en Égypte', 5, dates the text M2 to the sixth century.

community at the close of the third or the beginning of the fourth century.¹⁰⁵ As regards its genre, many of these texts must be classified as sermons.¹⁰⁶

Addas plays a major role in these texts: they present us with a missionary who is active and very successful. Five fragments are worth quoting in full. The first is the Middle Iranian text M2.¹⁰⁷ This text gives a summary of the activities of the Manichaean missionaries in the Roman Empire:

“... become familiar with the writings!” They went to the Roman Empire (and) saw many doctrinal disputes with the religions. Many Elect and Hearers were chosen. Pattīg was there for one year. (Then) he returned (and appeared) before the Apostle. Hereafter the Lord sent three scribes, the *Gospel* and two other writings to Addâ. He gave the order: “Do not take it farther, but stay there like a merchant who collects a treasure.” Addâ laboured very hard in these areas, founded many monasteries, chose many Elect and Hearers, composed writings and made wisdom his weapon. He opposed the “dogma’s” with these (writings), (and) in everything, he acquitted himself well. He subdued and enchained the “dogma’s”. He came as far as Alexandria. He chose Nafšâ for the Religion. Many wonders and miracles were wrought in those lands. The Religion of the Apostle was advanced in the Roman Empire.¹⁰⁸

A fragmentary Parthian text (M216),¹⁰⁹ which also deals with the missionaries who were sent to the Roman East, tells almost the same story, but with some details added:

And when the Apostle (i.e. Mani) was (in) Vêh-Ardashîr, he sent from there [Pattīg] the Teacher, Addâ the Bishop, [and M]ani the scribe to Rome.

¹⁰⁵ W. Sundermann, ‘Kirchengeschichtliche Literatur der Manichäer’ II (= ‘KGLM’ II), *AoF* 13 (1986) 267 f.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Sundermann, ‘Kirchengeschichtliche Literatur der Manichäer’ I (‘KGLM’ I), *AoF* 13 (1986) 66–68.

¹⁰⁷ First published by F.C. Andreas and W. Henning, ‘Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan’ II, *SPAW* 1933, 301 f.

¹⁰⁸ M2 I: šwd hynd ’w hrwm. dyd ws hmwg phyk’r ’bg dyn’n. prhyd wcydg’n ’wd nywšg’n wcyd. ptyg yk s’r ’nwh bwd. ’bc ’md pyš prystg. ps xwd’wn šh dbyr, ’wnglywn, ’ny dw nbyg, ’w d’ prystyd. prmđ kw ’wrwn m’ ’wr, ’ny ’nwh pt’y, nys’n ’y w’crg’n ky gnz hrwbyd. d’ pd ’wyn šhr’n ws rnz bwrđ. nšst’ ws m’nyst’n’n, wcyd prhyd wcydg’n ’wd nywšg’n. kyrd nbyg’n ’wd whyy hs’xt’ zyn. pdyrg qyš’n rpt. ’bg ’wyš’n pd hrwtys bwxt. sr’xšnynd ’wd ndrxt’ w qyš’n. d’ ’w ’lxsyndrgyrd md. nps’ ’w dyn wcyd. prhyd wđymwštyh ’wd wrc pd ’wyn šhr’n qyrd. wpr’yhyšt dyn ’y prystg pd hrwm. Transliteration M. Boyce, *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian. Texts with Notes*, Leiden 1975, 39 f. Translation J.P. Asmussen, *Manichaean Literature*, New York 1975, 21.

¹⁰⁹ First (partly) published by Andreas & Henning, ‘Mitteliranische Manichaica’ II, 301 n. 2.

[And] four instructions [] to [] there [] from [] who gathers [a treasure]. [And Addâ founded] many mon[asteries. And he elected many l[ord]s(?). [And he composed ...] and the writings of Light. [And] (he grasped) (?) [wisdom for] the refutation of the dogmas. In many [ways] he made and fashioned them [as weapon] against all the dogmas. And he defeated the teachings and put them all to shame like somebody who [wielded] a powerful weapon/M216a:/ [and] defeated [the enem]ies. [And he advanced the community of the Elect of the Apo]stle [of the Light in the Roman Empi]re.¹¹⁰

Although the texts have hagiographic tendencies with respect to their description of Addas' success, it is worth mentioning that the phrase 'put them all to shame' seems to have inverse parallels in Augustine's rebuttal of Addas' teachings in *Contra Adimantum*. Augustine often uses words like *calumniari* (= to slander) and *insultare* (= to insult) to designate the teachings of Adimantus.¹¹¹

In a Sogdian text, part of a more extensive version of this story can be found.¹¹² The text relates instructions of Mani before sending his missionaries to the Roman Empire. This text is less well known than the two already quoted.¹¹³ Its content, however, is important for the dating of the mission, while it makes mention of Mani's *Treasure of Life*:

[Mani said], "... in the western [regions] ... on this earth, a blessed [place?] has been prepared for it (the new religion?), so that this good deed (message?) may be received in glory. And be very learned and well versed in it (the message), wise and proficient in the languages in every place, wherever you go. And if you do as I commanded you, then the

¹¹⁰ M216c R/9—V/13: [oo]oo 'wd kd fryštg | ['nd](r) w(hy) 'rdhšyr bwd o 'b'w | [ptyg] (')mwcg o 'd' 'spsg | ['wd m](')ny dbyr oo 'w (f)rw m | [fršwd oo '](w)d cf'r 'bdys | 'w[] | 'wwd[] | 'f[] | '(c)[] | '[m]w (rd)y(d) oo (') [+ 1/2] | ws m'n(y)[st'n 6-8] | [w]s (x)[wd'y]n [+ 1/2] | 'wd nb(yg)n (rw)š(n o)[3-4 g](ryf)[t pd] | pswx (c)y dyn'n p(d) ws g(w)[ng zyn] | qyrd 'wd wyr'št pdy (c h)[rwyn] | dyn'n oo 'wš hrwyn '(m)[wg jd(?)] | 'wd šrmjd kyrd 'hyn(d o)[o cw'gwn] | qyc ky zyn hynz'(w)[r d'ryd o-3] |. M216a R1 - 3: ['wd dw](š)mny 'stwbyd o u | [7-10 w]jydyft cy fryštg | [3-6 frw](m) oo oo]. Transliteration and combination of M216c with M216a, W. Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*, Berlin 1981, 26f. Translation based on M216c: Lieu, 'Diffusion of Manichaeism', 26f. and Sundermann, *Texte*, 26; M216a: Sundermann, *Texte*, 26 and M. Boyce, *A Word-List of Manichaeism Middle Persian and Parthian*, Leiden 1977.

¹¹¹ E.g. c. *Adim.* 2,1; 3,1 etc.

¹¹² This and the other two Sogdian texts were first published by W. Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte*, Berlin 1981.

¹¹³ E.g. Lieu, 'Diffusion of Manichaeism', does not mention it.

Church will now spread in these places through your teaching, and your pains and labours will be blessed. And so I com[mand] you: first, take of nothing more (than you need); you should [rather remain in] poverty and [blessedness], which is the foundation of all bliss.” And second, he spoke of association with women and he [gave] exhaustive instruction (concerning this matter). Third, he said: “[Do not] extend(?) [your stay] at one place, but rather ...” [Fourth], “... the community of the elect, ... the others ...” [Fifth] ...

When the Apostle had [given] (these) com[mandments], he gave them the *Treasure of Living* together with [other] books.

And Pattîg, the Teacher, one of the Twelve, Addâ the Bishop and Mani, the Abbot, went forth with the other brethren and reached the Western places. And they had many doctrinal disputes ... with the adherents of (other) religions and with the Roman ... And they selected many Elect and many [auditor]s in these places. And Pattîg [the Teacher] was in the Roman Empire for one year, but in the second [year] he returned and came to Sûristân to the Apostle.

And Mâr Addâ wrote a letter to the Lord (saying), “The Commandment ...”¹¹⁴

In another Sogdian text we find information about Addas as well. This text relates a discussion of Addas with unknown people. At the end of the passage, a summary of the efforts and results of Addas is given:

¹¹⁴ 13941=T II K and 14285=T II D. 136: [](šy)r(t)[4-6] | pw[16-19](. pry-wyd pr xwrtx-’yz | cykt (’) [wk’kt cywy](d) pyd’r p’rZY ZKn dywyd z-’yh | ”bry-t’k (m)[2-3](.) pcp’nh w’nkx xcy ’YKZY ywn’k | šyr’krty’kh pr mz-’yxy’kh ptc’g-t’k wb’y rty | prz-r nyx ZY ptb’y-st’y-t ’skwd’ pry-wy-d z-yrt | ZY prw’stw’xš’y-t wy’kh’kwts’r ZY šwd’skwn | rtkd m’yd kwnd’ c’nkx ZY-bn [p]š’tw d’ (r’m) rty | nwkr pr ’šm’xw prb’r ZKh dynh pr’y-w’y d | wy’kt brdg’y-t k’m rtgn r’kh ZY k’r(h) | prtry’kh bwtk’m rtbn ’yw w’nkx ’pš(t)[y’m škwn] | ’sk’tryk ”d’cw n’ p’cxšd(t’) rt(p)[yšt prw] | dš’twch p(rnx)wnt’ky’kh [šk](w)’d [’ky]ty | xcy sry ZKn s’tw (prnxwnt’k)[y’](kh) r(tyd[b](t)[y](k) | (cnn) ’yncmy-nch wryy-d w’b ZY prb’y’r ng-t’k | [2-4](.) [1-2](..wy)d ’št(’)yk w’nkx ZY pr ’yw ’wt’(k)[3-5] | [14-16](p)tb’y-n’t’y d rtpy-št [4-6] | [+ ½](d.d)[4-6] | [4-6 ’]rt’wy’(k)[h] | p’r’ykt pr wy’k pr(’) [18-21](.) | c’nkx ZK br’y’y-štk ZKwh ’pš[t’w’nh ’pš](t)(t)? | d’rt ršn ZKwh sm’tyx’ M [p’r’y](k)t np’yky | nb’nt d’br rtxw pty mwz-”k [c]nn XII-nw | ’yw ”t’ bt’d’n ZY m’ny m’ny-st’nd’r’k M ’nytt | br’t’rty wy’t’rnt Z(Y p)r(’)g-t’nt mrxw kw xwrtx’yz | cy(k)’(w)t’kt rš(n) (’)krtyg-rbprb’r’nxwhhch ZY [6-8] dy-wyšn dy-n’yky ZY M br’wm’yky | [9-11](nyw) rty g-rb dynd’rt ZY g-rb | [ng-’wš’k](t pry-wyd) ’wt’kt wcy-t’nt rtxw pty | [mwz’k’](y)w srd (Z)Kwy br’wmy škw’z rtp’ts’r | db[tyk srd 2-4]’[zw’](s)ty ZY kw swrstn ”g-t | ZKn (br’)[yš](tk) p(t)[’yc](y) rtxw mr’t’ pr pws’t’k | [k](w) bg-w (s’r) ptškw’t d’(rt w’n)kw ZY prm’nh | [4-6]t(y) ZKn bg-(y) ZKw pt(c)wš(.. wy) [2-3](.) [5-7] | [5-7](.)z-g-’rt pr(m’nh)[12-15]|. Transliteration Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte*, 34-36; translation: Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road*, 203.

... “Which riding-animal is faster than the wind?” Mâr Addâ gave as an answer to them; “I have good thought [...] conscience, whose [way of life] (?) ... is faster [than the wind]. And I have [a religion (?)] the radiance of which is [brighter] than the sun. And I have (as) provisions divine profit (?). I have [divine (?)] the taste of which is [sweeter] (than) honey.” The ministers (?) then asked Mâr Addâ: “O Lord, [what] form does the soul take?” Mâr Addâ answered them thus: “The soul is comparable to the body, which is divided (into five) limbs, (a head), two (arms) and two feet. The soul too [is] just like that: [life] is seen as the [first] limb of the soul, power [is counted] as the second limb, light is counted [as the third] (limb), [beauty] is counted as the (fourth) [limb] and fragrance is counted as the fifth [limb]. And its form and manner are an image [of the body (?)], just as [Jesus (?)] has said: It cannot be seen with a fleshly eye, the fleshly ear does not hear (it), it cannot be held with a fleshly hand nor with a [fleshly] tongue can it be completely explained.” And there in the Roman Empire, [Mâr Ad]dâ [expended] much effort. He purified [many Elect] (and many) Hearers. [] and in large [] the west[ern] and many scriptures [] and [] wrote [] struggle [] and (the) divine [profit] arose upwards through him [and] (spread) in all the Roman lands and cities right up to the [gr]eat Alexandria.¹¹⁵

In all probability, the exact wording of the explanation concerning the soul does not come from Addas himself. However, the existence of a discussion of Addas on the subject of the soul seems to be very likely, because in *Contra Adimantum* Augustine’s fiercest rejection of Adimantus’

¹¹⁵ M 18220 = T. M. 389 a: kt'm ZY x[c](y) 'wn'kw b'r'y-cyk ky ZY cnn w't | trg-try xcy rty šn ZK mr'tt' w'n'kw | p'tcg-ny kw(n)[t'] šyr'k 'šmr'kh ZY my xcy | [2-4](ZK '):[2-4](.) m'nprmt'k ky ZY šy ZK | [7-9 cnn w'] (t) trg-try xcy rtm y ZK | [11-14] (.) xcy ky ZY šy ZK 'rd'y-p | cnn xwr [rxwšntr]y xcy rtm y ZK pyš' br- | [2-4]ykh[3-5](k)h xcy ky ZY šy ZK 'z-b'b | [c](n)n 'nkwp(y)[n'mrtr](y)(?) (xc)y o rty ZK wrz-'yrt ZKn | mr'tt' w'nkw 'prs'nt ZK rw'n ZY bg [-' 3-5] | kršn'k xcy rtšn ZK mr'tt' w'nkw p'(t)[cg-n](y) | kwnt' ZK rw'n ZY m'yd m'n'wk' xcy c'nkw ZY | [Z](K) tnp'r ky (Z)[Y] [p](r) pnc pyš'y-t 'nb'g-t'k 'škwty | [yw s](r)y 'dw' b'(z)['](y)t ZY 'dw' p'd'k ZK rw'n | ZY ms 'ng-wn m'y(d) [xcy] 'prt[my](k) 'ndm'k ZKn rw'n | ZK ['zw'n](h) pt(šm)[yrt](y) dbtyk 'ndm'k z-'wr | [ptšmyrty 'štyk 'nd](m)'k rxwšny'kh ptšmyrty | [c]t[b'r](my)k 'ndm'[k kr]šn'wty'kh ptšmyrty pncmyk | [nd]m'k bwdh pt(šm)yrt y ršy ZK kršn ZY ZK | bd'yn'k (C)[WRH] ptk'r'kh xcy m'yd c'nkw | (ZY ZK)n [3-5](.) (pr)m't 'YKZY pr 'pt'yn'kw cšmy | L['] wy-t bwt rtxw 'pt'yn'k g-wš L p'tg-wšt | pr 'pt'yn'k dstw L 'c'g-t L ZY ms pr | ['pt'y]n'k 'z-b'yrt' bwt o rtxw | [mr't](t) 'wd'yd ZKwy br'wmy g-rb g-nphnh | [10-12] (ZH g)[rb] ng-'wš'kt wš'wc | [+ ½] yn rty pr RBk' | [+ ½] kh ZKw xwrtg-'yz | [-½] (.) rty ZKw g-rb np'ykt | [+ ½] (.) [2-3]ty ZY ZKn | [] np'xštw | [drt ']nxwnch | [+ ½] (.) [5-7]bty rty | [ZK](h b)g-'n'y(k)[h 5-7] pr ZKn dstw ptrwsty | [ZY] (p)rdby-'t d'(r)[t] pr mg-wn br'wm'y'n 'wt'kt ZY | (kn)dt mrxw 'k(w) [R]Bk' rxy-nt'y-kyrd prm]. Transliteration Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte*, 37f., translation based on Lieu, 'Diffusion of Manichaeism', 27 and Sundermann, *Texte*, 37f.

opinions is to be found in Book 12, in which he deals with the soul.¹¹⁶ Besides, a Chinese tract relates that Addas asks Mani a question on the relationship between soul and body.¹¹⁷

Another Sogdian text relates Mani's healing of Nafšâ. This healing probably occurred during Addas' visit to Palmyra. Nafšâ is also mentioned in M2 I. Her sister Tađi, who 'received the truth' because of the healing, has been identified as Zenobia. She took over the reins of government after the death of her husband, Septimus Odaenathus, Prince of Palmyra. This Odaenathus was granted the title of Caesar (*kysr*) because he defeated Shâpûr I when this Persian ruler invaded the Roman Empire.¹¹⁸

... Nafšâ herself [pleaded] with (Jesus); ["Hel]p (?) me, beneficent God!" [] for this reason, because in your [] in the midst of the followers of (foreign) religions and [the Lord Man]i (?), the Apostle openly descended into the presence of Nafšâ, and he laid his hands upon (her), and straight away Nafšâ was healed, and she became wholly without pain. Everyone was astonished at this great miracle. And (there were) many people, who accepted the truth anew. Also Queen Tađi, the sister of Nafšâ, wife of the emperor, with great [] came before Mâr Addâ and from him [] received the truth.¹¹⁹

In addition to the Manichaean sources from the Silk Road, the acts of the Christian martyrs of Karkâ de Bêt Selôk are also important, since they relate the arrival of Addas and a colleague in their city. The relevant passage runs as follows:

But in the time of Shâpûr, Mani, the vessel (*mana*) of all kinds of evil, spat out his satanic gall and let two seeds flourish, which were called Addai and Abzakya, the sons of evil.¹²⁰

¹¹⁶ See n. 48.

¹¹⁷ H. Schmidt-Glintzer, *Chinesische Manichaica. Mit textkritischen Anmerkungen und einem Glossar*, Wiesbaden 1987, 77.

¹¹⁸ Lieu, 'Diffusion of Manichaeism', 30.

¹¹⁹ 18223 = T.M 389 c, R/1 - 13^a: [12-15](y) nbš' xwty 'kw (yšw) | [9-12 b](r)'y-t ZY my šyr'kr't'k bg-' | [11-14](.). cy-wy-d py-d'r pr'ZY pr tw' | [11-14]k ZKwy dyn'ykty my-d'ny rty | (3-5)[mrm'n](y)(?) br'y-štk'nkm'ny'wxšt ZKwy | nbš' p't'y-cy rtxw dštw cwrp wšty rty ywnyd | ZK nbš' py'mt' ZY 'kr't' ng-t'kw 'pw | xwy-ch rty ZK mg-wn mrtxm'y-t pr RBk' wrz | krz wyd'(s)'nt rty g-rb "d'y-t ky ZY ptnw'kw | ršty'kh pcyg-'z-'nt rtms ZKh t'dyyh xwt'yhn | nbš' xw'rh ZKn kysr db'mpnwh pr RBk' | [2-4Z](Kn) mr"tt' p't'y-cy" g-t rtšc ZKwh | [8-11] rštykh pcyg-'z.....]. Transliteration Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte*, 42, translation based on Lieu, 'Diffusion of Manichaeism', 28 and Sundermann, *Texte*, 42.

¹²⁰ *Historia Karka de Beth Selok*, AMS, II, 512, 11-14. Translation: Lieu, 'Diffusion of Manichaeism', 33. See also the German translation by G. Hoffmann, 'Auszüge aus

In all probability, the arrival of Addas in the Mesopotamian city of Karkâ de Bêt Selôk took place in 261/2.¹²¹

The discovery and subsequent publication of a number of new Manichaean texts has given rise to many theories as regards the date and the route of the Manichaean mission. Before discussing the most important ones, we must take into account the fact that the extant Manichaean testimonies are parts of sermons. We should therefore reckon with their tendency to simplify the facts, because they were written for lay people.¹²² Besides, they are sometimes rather fragmentary and are also written with a clear purpose, namely to describe the diffusion of the salvation-bringing doctrine of Mani. As a rule, the Manichaeans were not interested in history as such, but in the history of salvation.¹²³ We must therefore not treat the texts as if they were straightforward descriptions of historical facts.

A hypothesis of Michel Tardieu, based on the just cited texts, has turned out to be important. According to Tardieu, the first group of Manichaean missionaries, of which Patticius, Addas and Mani the scribe are mentioned by name, reached Palmyra between 262 and 267. After a year, Patticius returned to Mani and Mani sent three scribes and his *Gospel* to Palmyra. From the fact that Mani sent scribes and his *Gospel* to Addas after Pattîg's return to him, Tardieu concluded that the situation must have been favourable for Addas and Mani the scribe. In the same period, Odaenathus, the husband of Zenobia (*Tadi*) and brother-in-law of the healed Nafsâ, was killed. At the initiative of Zenobia, who came in power after her husband's death, the Palmyrians undertook a military expedition to Egypt in about 270. Addas went to Egypt in the company of the Palmyrian army (just as Mani accompanied Shâpûr on his military expeditions). Tardieu thus supposes that Manichaeism reached Egypt via an overland route. Furthermore, he refers to two anti-Manichaean documents, dated at the end of the third century, namely, *Papyrus Rylands*

syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer übersetzt und durch Untersuchungen zur historischen Topographie erläutert', *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 7 (1881) no. 3, 46.

¹²¹ Cf. W. Sundermann, 'Zur frühen missionarischen Arbeit Mani's', *AOH* 24 (1971) 79–125 (95) and Lieu, 'Diffusion of Manichaeism', 33.

¹²² Sundermann, 'KgLM', I, 79.

¹²³ Sundermann, 'KgLM', I, 41 f. See also Tardieu, 'Les Manichéens en Égypte', 8.

496, written by a bishop to warn against Manichaean teachings,¹²⁴ and the well-known *Edict of Diocletian*,¹²⁵ in order to underpin his theory that the Manichaeans spread into Egypt from north to south, starting from Alexandria. According to Tardieu, the action of Diocletian compelled the Manichaeans to flee from Alexandria to the south.¹²⁶

Ludwig Koenen, however, has defended the hypothesis that Manichaeism reached Egypt between 244 and 262 from the south, *i.e.*, via a Red Sea route. He argued in this way because the *Acta Archelai* links the arrival of Manichaeans with merchants and with Upper Egypt. Apart from this Greek document, Koenen makes mention of the Middle Iranian text M2, quoted above.¹²⁷ From these sources he deduced that Mani sent his missionaries on a trade route that brought them from Palmyra to the Gulf of Aqaba. After their arrival in Egypt, the missionaries travelled along the Nile to Alexandria. Koenen has focussed his attention on the metaphor of the merchant that was also used by Mani. He did so in order to indicate the parallels between the *Acta Archelai* and M2. Mani sent his missionaries to the Roman Empire in 244, because at that time he had approached the borders of the Roman Empire as a *comitatus* of Shâpûr. It is not very likely that he arrived earlier, for it took some time to win disciples and to write the books that were sent to Addas. The end of the mission would have been before 262, since in that year Addas is on a missionary tour in Mesopotamia.¹²⁸

Some years later, Joseph Vergote discussed both opinions and came to the conclusion that Manichaeism may have reached Egypt along both routes: one official route, which approached Alexandria, and a private one, which came to Assiut.¹²⁹ According to Lieu both options are possible: the overland route, and the trade route via the Red Sea.¹³⁰ Stroumsa, although dating the 'houses' founded in Egypt by Addas and other mis-

¹²⁴ Cf. C.H. Roberts, *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, Manchester 1938, vol. 3, 38–46 (no. 469).

¹²⁵ Cf. Adam, *Texte*, 82 f.

¹²⁶ Tardieu, 'Les Manichéens en Égypte', 9–11.

¹²⁷ See n. 108.

¹²⁸ L. Koenen, 'Klöster', 93–108.

¹²⁹ J. Vergote, 'L'Expansion du Manichéisme en Égypte', in: C. Laga *et al.* (eds.), *After Chalcedon. Studies in Theology and Church History offered to Professor Albert Van Roey for his Seventieth Birthday*, Leuven 1985, 471–478.

¹³⁰ Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*, 103. In his more recently (1994) published article 'Diffusion of Manichaeism', 33 f., Lieu does not make a choice either.

sionaries in the 270s, does not make a choice as regards the route.¹³¹ The same goes for André Villey. He only mentions the two hypotheses, without weighing the arguments or making a decision. The first hypothesis he mentions, is the one according to which the missionaries started in 241 and came along the Red Sea route into Egypt. The second proposal mentioned by Villey, is Tardieu's solution,¹³² which has been referred to above.

Sundermann has drawn some important conclusions about the date of Addas' western mission. He follows Tardieu's northern-infiltration hypothesis which states that it is impossible that Addas and Pattîg approached Upper Egypt, because Alexander of Lycopolis mentions that Pappos and Thomas were the first missionaries in that region.¹³³ Concerning the date of the mission, however, he does not follow Tardieu, but defends an earlier date. Sundermann suggests that it is more likely that Addas was successful in Palmyra on his way back from Egypt, for only Addas is spoken of in the description of activities in Palmyra, and Alexandria is mentioned before Nafṣâ. Besides, Sundermann also refers to the Sogdian text (13941/14285) which relates that Mani gave his *Treasure of Life* to the missionaries at the beginning of their mission.¹³⁴ When Pattîg returned to Mani a year later, Mani sent his *Gospel* to Addas. Both books were written at an early date. In all likelihood, the fact that an important book, such as the *Gospel* was, was not sent with the missionaries right at the beginning, seems to indicate that it was not finished at the start of the mission. Therefore, the reference to both books provides an indication of an early date (about 243) of the mission's beginning.¹³⁵

On the basis of the above-mentioned arguments, it is most probable that Addas started his mission early, about 243. Tardieu's claim that Mani sent books and three scribes to Addas when the situation was favourable (*i.e.*, around 270, in Palmyra), is not very convincing. Already at the beginning of the mission, books and a scribe were sent to accompany

¹³¹ G.G. Stroumsa, 'The Manichaean Challenge to Egyptian Christianity', in: B.A. Pearson & J.E. Goehring (eds.), *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, Philadelphia 1986, 308 ff.

¹³² A. Villey, *Psaumes des errants*, Paris 1994, 47. It is remarkable that, when he discusses another subject (p. 50), Villey seems to prefer AD 241 as the year in which Addas' mission started. Here, Villey (only) refers to W. Sundermann, 'Zur frühen missionarischen Wirksamkeit Manis' (cf. above n. 122).

¹³³ Sundermann, 'KGLM', III, 65 f.

¹³⁴ See n. 114.

¹³⁵ Sundermann, 'KGLM', III, 66 and 70f.

the first missionaries who departed for a country that was probably at war with Persia. Moreover, there is no reason to suppose that Addas made use of the army of the Palmyrians to reach Alexandria. None of the sources makes any mention of such a development. Sundermann's arguments on the basis of the successive sending of the *Treasure* and the *Gospel* to Addas do have more support in the texts.

Apart from the arguments just mentioned, we should also emphasize that Addas undertook many activities during his mission and that they seem to have been successful. It is implausible to suppose that he made so many efforts in such a short time.¹³⁶ In addition, Mani urged his missionaries not to extend their stay in any one location:

Third, he said: “[Do not] extend(?) [your stay] at one place, but rather ...”¹³⁷

It is probable, therefore, that Addas made not only a single journey from Seleucia to Egypt and back, but also travelled around in the Roman East.¹³⁸ In text 18223 which relates Nafṣâ's healing,¹³⁹ a brief indication can be found that may refer to more than one journey of Addas. As a reaction to the healing, the people who saw it *anew* accepted the truth. This seems to presuppose an earlier visit to the town of Palmyra. No mention is made of a conversion of Nafṣâ after her healing, which might have been expected if it were the first time that she had met Addas.¹⁴⁰ Both the multiple activities and the travelling around are indicative of an early date of the first mission and weaken the hypothesis of Tardieu, who stated that there was only one clear-cut journey in the wake of the Palmyrian army.

As regards the question whether Addas came to Egypt via the Red Sea or via Alexandria, the sources from the Silk Road do not provide us with a decisive answer. When we consider, for instance, M2, we see a very short report. It concludes that Manichaeism progressed vigorously in the Roman Empire. This statement is preceded by three remarks that are intended to indicate the enormous success of Addas' method, which has already been described: Alexandria was reached; Nafṣâ, an important woman, became a Manichaean; and many miracles were accomplished.

¹³⁶ Cf. Lieu, 'Diffusion of Manichaeism', 34 f.

¹³⁷ From the Sogdian text (13941/14285), See n. 115.

¹³⁸ Sundermann, 'KgLM', III, 66.

¹³⁹ See n. 119.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Lieu, 'Diffusion of Manichaeism', 34 f.

These remarks function neither as a description of the route that was taken, nor as a chronological indication, but they are in praise of Addas' work. In the fourth Manichaean text quoted above (M 18220),¹⁴¹ we find a similar summary:

... and (the) divine [profit] arose upwards through him [and] (spread) in all the Roman lands and cities up to the [gr]eat Alexandria.

In two texts (M216¹⁴² and 13941/14285)¹⁴³ Alexandria is not even mentioned. M2 also leaves the impression of a rather limited knowledge of the geography of the Roman Empire. A Palmyrian woman and the city of Alexandria are mentioned without any indication that both geographical areas are far from each other. Apart from that, the text speaks of 'those lands' and 'there' without any further specification. So, on the basis of these texts, no specific conclusions can be drawn. In a previous (Dutch) version of his article cited above,¹⁴⁴ Vergote stated in regard to the theory that Manichaeism reached Egypt from the south, that that assumption might be more firmly grounded if it could be demonstrated that Manichaean texts had been translated directly from Syriac into Coptic.¹⁴⁵ Meanwhile, the Kellis discoveries have confirmed that Egyptian Manichaeans were instructed in Syriac, in order to be able to translate Syriac texts directly into Coptic.¹⁴⁶ Another important indication that Manichaeism reached Egypt from the south is found in the Coptic vernacular employed in Manichaean Coptic sources. Almost all the extant Coptic Manichaean texts are written in a southern dialect (*L*), which was spoken in the area around Lycopolis. This goes for the Manichaean literature discovered in Medinet Madi as well.¹⁴⁷ Although the question of the dialects of Coptic is still open to debate, the present state of research gives reason to consider the southern-infiltration-theory of Manichaeism as the most probable one.

¹⁴¹ See n. 115.

¹⁴² See n. 110.

¹⁴³ See n. 114.

¹⁴⁴ See n. 129.

¹⁴⁵ J. Vergote, 'Coptica. Het Manichaeisme in Egypte', *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 9 (1944) 77–83 (78).

¹⁴⁶ T.Kell. Syr./Copt. 1 and T.Kell. Syr./Copt. 2, edition: I. Gardner, *Kellis Literary Texts* (1), Oxford 1996, 101–126 [= Gardner, *KLT*]. Cf. I. Gardner, A. Alcock and Wolf-Peter Funk, *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis I*, Oxford 1999, 344–359 [= Gardner, *CDTK*].

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Gardner & Lieu, 'From Marmouthis to Kellis', 152 and 164; Gardner, *KLT*, vii and xv.

The fact that Alexander of Lycopolis claims that Pappos and Thomas were the first missionaries to bring Mani's teachings to Egypt, does not rule out the possibility that Addas reached Egypt along the southern route, as it has been suggested by Sundermann.¹⁴⁸ If the name of Pappos is not to be identified as the Greek version of Addas, it is also quite possible that Pappos and Thomas were among the scribes in the company of Addas.¹⁴⁹

Another question in this context is how strictly the limit of Alexandria should be taken.¹⁵⁰ Above, we have discussed the hypothesis of Decret and others, who suppose that Adimantus was the Manichaean missionary of Roman Africa. Although we did not find this supposition a compelling reason to reject Augustine's identification of Addas with Adimantus,¹⁵¹ it is still worth considering the possibility that Addas came as far as Roman Africa. Perhaps, Alexandria is spoken of as a well-known town in the Roman Empire that was even reached by Addas. Probably other (more westward) cities were not known to the Manichaean Hearers in the Middle Persian speaking countries: therefore they were not mentioned in the summary of Addas' activities.¹⁵²

The opinion of Decret¹⁵³ and De Beausobre,¹⁵⁴ namely that Adimantus was Mani's missionary in Roman Africa, is based on Adimantus' reputation among the Manichaeans in Roman Africa. Two sources have been quoted to support this hypothesis. The first passage is a eulogy of Adimantus by Faustus:

Although sufficiently and even more than that, the errors of the Jewish superstition have already been brought to light, and likewise the deception of the semi-Christians has abundantly been detected by the most learned Adimantus—the only person whom we have to study after our blissful father Manichaeus ...¹⁵⁵

¹⁴⁸ See n. 133.

¹⁴⁹ See Part A, section 5. *Adimantus = Pappos?*

¹⁵⁰ See e.g. above M2, n. 108.

¹⁵¹ See Part A, section 3. *The different regions of Adimantus' activity.*

¹⁵² Cf. e.g. the fact that only Nafṣā is mentioned as being chosen for the religion, not her sister the queen.

¹⁵³ See nn. 39 and 40.

¹⁵⁴ De Beausobre, *Histoire Critique* I, 433 f.

¹⁵⁵ *c. Faust.* 1, 2 (CSEL 25,1: 251,22–252,2): 'Satis superque in lucem iam traductis erroribus, ac Iudaicae superstitionis simul et semichristianorum abunde detecta fallacia a doctissimo scilicet et solo nobis post beatum patrem Manichaeum studendo Adimanto ...'. In *c. Faust.* 6, 6 Augustine refers to this statement twice.

The second source is a *Latin Formula of Renunciation* dating from the year 526. In this *Formula*, a certain Prosper recalls Manichaean teachings and opinions. The text of paragraph 10 runs as follows:

Everyone who in regard to the coming of the Spirit, the Paraclete, about whom the Lord has promised in his Gospel that He should come into the Apostles, does not believe that after the Lord's Ascension, at the day of Pentecost, it has been fulfilled immediately, but believes that after many years He has come in Mani or in Adimantus, his disciple, [let him] be anathematized.¹⁵⁶

Apart from this tenth *anathema*, the twentieth *anathema*, which is neither referred to by Decret nor by De Beausobre, is of importance as well. Here, the text even mentions *discipuli* and *sectatores* of Adimantus:

[While further] be anathematized Adimantus and all his disciples and adherents; and as it has already been said, he, who believes that into him (*i.e.* Adimantus) the Spirit, the Paraclete, has come, be anathematized.¹⁵⁷

This *anathema* gives rise to speculations about 'Adimantianism' as a distinct stream within Manichaeism and, in any case, testifies to the impact of Adimantus on Manichaeans in the western part of the Roman Empire. The same goes for the other two *loci* mentioned above: both passages testify to Adimantus' reputation among Manichaeans in the Latin West as well. Therefore, a personal presence of Addas in these regions is quite conceivable.

However, these testimonies should be evaluated within their proper perspectives. The saying of Faustus which, due to its date and context, is the most important testimony, does not testify to an actual mission of Adimantus in Roman Africa. Faustus only says that Adimantus is worth studying. He commemorates his activities neither as a founder of communities, nor as an opponent of (Catholic) Christian bishops there.¹⁵⁸ It was the *teachings* of Adimantus that became popular among African Manichaeans.¹⁵⁹ This may be explained from the fact that, in

¹⁵⁶ Adam, *Texte*, 92 f., 10: 'Quicumque adventum spiritus paraleti, quem dominus in evangelio promittit esse venturum in apostolos, post ascensionem domini in die Pentecostes non statim credit impletum, sed post multos annos in Mane vel in Adimanto discipulo eius venisse credit, anathema sit.' Cf. Decret, *L'Afrique* I, 175 and II, 122 n. 90.

¹⁵⁷ Adam, *Texte*, 93, 20: 'Anathema Adimanto et omnibus discipulis ac sectoribus eius; et, sicut jam dictum est, qui in eum spiritum paraletum venisse credit, anathema sit.'

¹⁵⁸ Cf above n. 155.

¹⁵⁹ This may also be concluded from the quantity of allusions to the teachings of Adimantus in the already mentioned *Latin Formula of Renunciation*.

Roman Africa, and from the beginning of the third century onwards, the Christian-Gnostic tradition was strong. The message of Adimantus seems to have matched well this tradition. Hence, it is not completely incredible to assume that it was precisely Adimantus who could have become popular among the Manichaeans in this part of the Roman Empire.¹⁶⁰

The *Latin Formula of Renunciation* gives more importance to Adimantus than Faustus did. Adimantus is considered to be almost on the same level as Mani. However, this text is rather late (early sixth century) and has its origin in Gaul. It is not clear whether the high status attributed to Adimantus was already granted during the lifetime of Faustus, or must be treated as a later development that might be attributed to a lack of exact knowledge. Nevertheless, it is beyond dispute that Adimantus was the most popular Manichaean missionary in Roman Africa.

In sum, we may be sure about a number of facts. The first is that Addas was sent as a bishop from Seleucia to the Roman Empire in about 243. After one year, he was in charge of the mission there, due to the departure of Pattīg. He was in Mesopotamia (Karkâ the Bêt Selôk) in about 261, because he is mentioned in the local acts of Christian martyrs.¹⁶¹ It seems quite probable that he was in Palmyra after 260, that is in the years when the brother-in-law of Nafšâ was already emperor. Moreover, he even went as far as Alexandria. It remains unclear how long he stayed at any location and when exactly he was in Alexandria. But his mission there met with considerable success: in any case, it had an important impact on both the (proto-) orthodox Christians and the secular authorities.

4. *Mani's missionary precepts and Adimantus*

The sources from the Silk Road, and also the recent finds from Kellis, provide us with a rather detailed picture of the daily life of a Manichaean missionary.¹⁶²

¹⁶⁰ See Frend, 'The Gnostic-Manichaean Tradition', 15 f.

¹⁶¹ See n. 120.

¹⁶² The archaeological finds in Kellis (Egypt) are of great value, as they supply students of Manichaeism with a view behind the scenes of an early Manichaean community. Concerning the dating, see I. Gardner, 'He has gone to the monastery', in: Emmerick *et al.* (eds.), *Studia Manichaica*, 248: 'It should be noted that all dated texts from this area derive from the period (every decade is represented) between the 290s and the 390s ce.' Thus the Manichaean community in Kellis seems to reach back almost to the time of Addas, who

Mani urged Addas and his fellows ‘to become familiar with the writings’ at the beginning of their mission.¹⁶³ There is every likelihood that Mani meant his own writings, for in the Sogdian text 13941/14825 he states that the missionaries must be ‘very learned and well versed in the message.’¹⁶⁴ Besides, Mani provided them with the *Treasure of Life* and other books,¹⁶⁵ and after a year he sent his *Gospel* and two other writings.¹⁶⁶ Several personal letters recently found in Kellis indicate that the Manichaeans—both the Elect and the Hearers—attached considerable importance to the writings (of Mani). A relatively large number of letters refer to books.¹⁶⁷ The encouragement that a certain father Makarios gives to his son is illustrative in this context:

Study [your] psalms, whether Greek or Coptic, ⟨every⟩ day (?) ... Do not abandon your vow. Here, the *Judgment 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 some books here.¹⁶⁸

In the Manichaean community at Kellis, copying books was an important task for both the Elect and the Hearers. This can be derived from the multiplicity of handwritings found in the various copies of Manichaean Psalms at Kellis.¹⁶⁹

Mani also urged his missionaries to be ‘wise and proficient in the languages in every place.’¹⁷⁰ As may be derived from findings in Kellis as well, such an instruction was not given in vain. In a building, designated by the discoverers as House 3, wooden boards have been excavated on which texts are written both in Syriac and Coptic.¹⁷¹ In all likelihood, these boards were exercise material of Manichaeans in Egypt who got instruction in translating Syriac into Coptic.¹⁷² The purpose of this

might have remained in Egypt until 260. As information from eastern sources matches these indications from an early Manichaean community in Egypt, we are able to gain a rather accurate impression of the Manichaean missionary’s daily life.

¹⁶³ M2, see n. 108.

¹⁶⁴ See n. 114.

¹⁶⁵ See n. 114.

¹⁶⁶ M2, see n. 108.

¹⁶⁷ Gardner, *CDTK*, 77 and 174 n. 25.

¹⁶⁸ P.Kell. Copt 19, in: Gardner, *CDTK*, 160.

¹⁶⁹ Gardner, *CDTK*, 77.

¹⁷⁰ See n. 114.

¹⁷¹ See n. 146.

¹⁷² Gardner, *KLT*, 102 and 110.

education was missionary,¹⁷³ which is illustrated by a personal letter, also found in Kellis, written by father Makarios to his wife about their son Piene:

And Piene: The great Teacher let him travel with him, so that he might learn Latin. He teaches him well.¹⁷⁴

Piene belonged to the company of a *Manichaean* Teacher. From other personal letters we can see that the Teacher trained Piene for missionary work.¹⁷⁵ The study of Latin was part of the training. It is not clear whether Piene learned Latin with the purpose to go to Latin-speaking areas (e.g. to *Africa Proconsularis* with its capital Carthage, the second city of the Latin West), or to be fluent in the official language of the Roman Empire. The first option seems most probable, as in Egypt Latin was scarcely used, even in formal settings.¹⁷⁶ Both examples demonstrate that Manichaeans attached great value to becoming proficient in languages for their missionary work.

The commands Mani gave to his missionaries, such as the ones described in the Sogdian text 13941/14285,¹⁷⁷ indicate the manner in which the missionaries were required to behave. They were not allowed to accept more than they needed; sexual intercourse was forbidden; and they were not allowed to prolong their stay in any one place.

The first two precepts were required of all the Elect.¹⁷⁸ The first one had to do with the ideal of poverty. In the *Cologne Mani Codex*, missionaries are even forbidden to take equipment with them, and they were not allowed to work for their living.¹⁷⁹ It was one of the duties of the Hearers to provide the Elect with food and shelter. Personal letters from Kellis

¹⁷³ I. Gardner, 'The Manichaean Community at Kellis: a Progress Report', in: P. Mirecki & J. BeDuhn (eds.), *Emerging from Darknes*, 166 and idem, 'Personal Letters from the Manichaean Community at Kellis', in: Cirillo & Van Tongerloo (eds.), *Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico*, 83.

¹⁷⁴ P.Kell. Copt. 20, in: Gardner, *CDTK*, 166–172.

¹⁷⁵ Gardner, *CDTK*, 39.

¹⁷⁶ Gardner, *CDTK*, 15.

¹⁷⁷ See n. 114.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. J. Ries, 'Commendements de la justice et vie missionnaire dans l'église de Mani', in: M. Krause (ed.), *Gnosis and Gnosticism*, Leiden 1977, 93–106; N. Sims-Williams, 'The Manichaean Commandments: a Survey of the Sources', in: A.D.H. Bivar (ed.), *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce* ii, Téhéran-Liège 1985, 573–582; Polotsky, 'Manichäismus', 131 f. and Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, 79 ff.

¹⁷⁹ *CMC* 93:14–23, edited by A. Henrichs and L. Koenen, *ZPE* 32 (1978) 113 and n. 267 and 268.

provide us with some evidence that Mani's first command was put in practice. A (probably deliberately) anonymous 'father' who wrote from the Nile valley to a group of women in Kellis, asks for oil as a kind of almsgiving.¹⁸⁰ The prohibition of sexual intercourse for Elect was upheld among the Manichaean Elect in Egypt as well. For this rule has as its consequence a low esteem for marriage and the *Papyrus Rylands 496* informs us about an Episcopal letter that warned Catholic Christians in Egypt at the close of the third century against the Manichaean teachings on marriage.¹⁸¹ Mani's incentive not to stay in any one place for long, was followed by Piene and others who travelled in the company of a Manichaean Teacher.¹⁸²

As regards the ethical commands, we may conclude that Addas Adimantus attached a high value to them since, in his *Disputationes*, he discusses more than once both poverty and marriage.¹⁸³

Furthermore, all of Mani's prescriptions under discussion have parallels in other Christian writings. Mani's rule not to stay long at one place is not found in the New Testament, but it is in early Christian sources. In the *Didache*, for example, apostles and prophets who travelled around, were considered to be false prophets when they continued their stay in one place for more than two days. Besides, they were not allowed to accept more food than necessary for their journey to the next destination.¹⁸⁴ The Manichaeans based their opinion on marriage on the writings of the apostle Paul. This can be derived from *Contra Adimantum*, and from *Papyrus Rylands 496*, where a bishop warns against the Manichaeans' exegesis of *1 Cor.* 7.¹⁸⁵ Also, the followers of Mani upheld a well-known Christian tradition in their rejection of any wealth for the Elect.¹⁸⁶ In this connection, *Contra Adimantum* 24 is interesting, because it demonstrates Augustine's difficulties to counter Adimantus' arguments, and so it is an indication of the legitimacy of the Manichaeans' claim to follow

¹⁸⁰ Gardner, *CDTK*, 207 f. The reference is to the letters P. Kell. Copt. 31–33.

¹⁸¹ See n. 124.

¹⁸² See n. 174.

¹⁸³ Concerning the poverty-ideal: *c. Adim.* 18, 19, 20 and 24; concerning women and marriage: *c. Adim.* 3 and 23.

¹⁸⁴ *Didache* Ch. 11, which also has parallels concerning the poverty-ideal: 4. πᾶς ἀπόστολος ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς 5. οὐ μενεῖ δὲ εἰ μὴ ἡμέραν μίαν· ἐὰν δὲ ἢ χρεία, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην. τρεῖς δὲ ἐὰν μείνη ψευδοπροφήτης ἐστίν 6· ἐξερχόμενος δὲ ὁ ἀπόστολος μηδὲν λαμβανέτω εἰ μὴ ἄρτον ἕως οὗ αὐλισθῆ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀργύριον λαμβάνη ψευδοπροφήτης ἐστίν. Text according to K. Wengst, *Schriften des Urchristentums*, 2, München 1984, 82 ff.

¹⁸⁵ See n. 124.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Koenen, 'Klöster', 99.

a Christian and even biblical tradition. Augustine takes refuge to a non-exegetical argument and a *reductio ad absurdum* in order to refute this claim. The chapter under discussion deals with the contradiction between the precept in *Proverbs* to imitate ants,¹⁸⁷ and the commandment of the Lord not to worry about tomorrow.¹⁸⁸ Having discussed the meaning of the imitation of the ants, and its relation to *Mt.* 6:34, Augustine continues:

Because, if this has been said for reason that one should not keep bread for the next day, than the Roman tramps (those they call tramps [*Passivi*],¹⁸⁹ who, as they are satisfied after their daily food-supply, used to give or throw away immediately that which remained), should even discharge it more than either the disciples of the Lord, who, even when they walked on earth in company of the Lord of heaven and earth, had cash boxes; or than the apostle Paul, who, even though he despised all earthly goods, thus governed the things that were necessary to the present life, that he even prescribed concerning the widows, saying: *If any believer has widows, let him bestow them sufficiently, in order that the Church might not be charged too much and could supply real widows* (1 *Tim.* 5:16).¹⁹⁰

Augustine here makes more use of emotional arguments (e.g. tramps cannot be better Christians than the disciples or Paul) than of a solid exegesis and logical reasoning. The ascetical conduct of Mani's missionaries probably was an excellent propaganda tool in third-century Christian circles. The Manichaean ascetic missionaries appeared on the scene half a century before the beginning of the mainstream Christian monastic movement. Therefore, the Manichaean ascetic teachings might well have met an already existing demand.¹⁹¹ It had its own Christian roots, and, therefore, Christian leaders found it difficult to challenge.

¹⁸⁷ *Prov.* 6:6–8.

¹⁸⁸ *Mt.* 6:34.

¹⁸⁹ According to R. Jolivet and M. Jourjon, *Six traités anti-manichéens* (BA 17), Paris 1962, 779 n. 40, among Roman African writers *passivi* was a common characterization for tramps. A. Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*, Turnhout s.a., 599, interprets the word 'passivus' in the context of *c. Adim.* 24 in the same way.

¹⁹⁰ *c. Adim.* 24 (CSEL 25,1: 182,22–183,3): 'nam si hoc ideo dictum est, ut non seruetur panis in crastinum, magis hoc implent uagi Romanorum, quos passiuos appellant, qui annona cotidiana satiatio uentre, aut donant statim, quod restat, aut proiciunt, quam uel domini discipuli qui etiam cum ipso Domino caeli et terrae in terra ambulantes loculos habebant, uel Paulus apostolus, qui omnium terrenorum contemptor, sic tamen gubernauit ea quae praesenti uitae erant necessaria, ut etiam de uiduis praeceperit, dicens: Si quis fidelis habet uiduas, sufficienter tribuat illis, ut non grauentur ecclesia, quo ueris uiduis sufficere possit.'

¹⁹¹ Cf. Stroumsa, 'Manichaean Challenge', 309.

5. *Adimantus' missionary activities*

Apart from Mani's precepts, the historical texts quoted above also report activities undertaken by Manichaean missionaries. When we examine the description of Addas' activities given in M2,¹⁹² it is remarkable to see that the very first mentioned action of Addas is his founding of monasteries.

For many years, the organization of cloistered communities by Manichaeans in the east of the Roman Empire was a matter of discussion. This was not without reason. Among the ancient authors, it is only Augustine who makes mention of a Manichaean monastery.¹⁹³ Some scholars have even called in question the claim that monasteries originally belonged to Manichaeism. According to Jes P. Asmussen, the phenomenon of Manichaean monasteries belongs to a later development in Manichaeism, and its rise and expansion was due to Buddhism.¹⁹⁴ More recently, Koenen has discussed the question of the origin and purpose of Manichaean monasteries extensively. He concludes that already early in the history of Manichaeism the titles of 'abbot' and 'presbyter' were almost synonymous. For that reason, he considers monasteries to be an original feature of the Manichaean church.¹⁹⁵ Furthermore, the recent discovery of an agricultural account book in Kellis has provided us with decisive proof of the existence of a monastic community of Manichaeans in the vicinity of Kellis.¹⁹⁶ Thus, there is no reason to suppose that the information in M2 about Addas founding many monasteries is incorrect.

As to the monasteries' purpose, we can say that they were a central place of living for the Elect, who were required to behave very soberly, to obey the rules concerning food, and to preach the gospel of Mani. A monastery was also meant to ease the task of the Hearers, who were obliged to provide the Elect with the necessities of life. The monasteries were crucial to the diffusion of Manichaeism, for they functioned as the bases for the missionaries. They were also centres where books were translated and copied, in order to serve missionary ends. Furthermore, the monasteries functioned as 'centres of education' for the new Elect,

¹⁹² See n. 108.

¹⁹³ Namely in his *mor.* 20 (74) (CSEL 90: 154–156).

¹⁹⁴ J.P. Asmussen, *X^uâstvânîft. Studies in Manichaeism*, Copenhagen 1965, 200f.

¹⁹⁵ Koenen, 'Klöster', 100.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. R.S. Bagnall (ed.), *The Kellis Agricultural Accountbook*, Oxford 1997, 81 f. and Gardner, 'He has gone to the monastery', 253–256 and CDTK, 76 f.

so that they would become instructed in the Manichaeian traditions and habits.¹⁹⁷ Hence it is not without reason that precisely the founding of monasteries is mentioned as Addas' first activity.

The next activity mentioned in the Silk Road sources—apart from the reference to the many Elect and Hearers chosen by Addas—is the production of texts. Addas had the reputation of being a prolific writer and several traces of his literary activities have been found. Photius quotes in his *Bibliotheca* from an anti-Manichaeian work of Heraclianus, which related that Addas' writings were refuted by Catholic Christian authors:

... and Titus, who thought to write against the Manichaeians, actually wrote against the treatises of Addas ...¹⁹⁸

Addas' writings were sometimes even confused with the works of Mani himself. Photius' *Bibliotheca* informs us about Diodore of Tarsus, who supposed he was writing against the *Living Gospel* of Mani but in reality was attacking a writing of Addas, called *Modion*:

...and Diodoros, disputing the Manichaeians in a collection of twenty-five books, thought to reject the Living Gospel of Manichaeus in the first seven books, but he actually dealt with the writing of Adda, called *Modion*.¹⁹⁹

Besides, Faustus attached great importance to Adimantus' literary activities when he stated that—apart from Mani—Adimantus is the only Manichaeian author to be *studied*.²⁰⁰ In the next chapters, we will examine the traces of Addas' literary activity.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Koenen, 'Klöster', 100 f.; Lieu, 'Precept and Practice in Manichaeian Monasticism', in: idem, *Manichaeism in Central Asia & China*, Leiden-Boston-Köln, 1998, 76–97 (81); Vergote, 'Manichaeisme in Egypte', 82 f. For the eastern Manichaeian monasteries, see e.g. B. Utas, 'Mânistân and Xânaqâh', in: A.D.H. Bivar (ed.), *Papers in Honour of Mary Boyce* ii, 655–664.

¹⁹⁸ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 85, line 6ff.: '... και Τίτον ὃς ἔδοξε μὲν κατὰ Μανιχαίων γράψαι ἔγραψε δὲ μᾶλλον κατὰ Ἀδδοῦ συγγραμμάτων ...' Text R. Henry, *Photius Bibliothèque*, Tome II, Paris 1960, 9. Cf. below Ch. V, n. 4.

¹⁹⁹ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 85, lines 11–16: 'και τὸν Διόδωρον, ἐν κ' και ε' βιβλίοις τὸν κατὰ Μανιχαίων ἀγῶνα ἀγωνισάμενον, ὃς διὰ μὲν τῶν πρώτων βιβλίων ἑπτὰ οἶεται μὲν τὸ τοῦ Μανιχαίου ζῶν εὐαγγέλιον ἀνατρέπειν, οὐ τυγχάνει δὲ ἐκείνου, ἀλλὰ ἀνατρέπει τὸ ὑπὸ Ἀδδα γεγραμμένον, ὃ καλεῖται Μόδιον.' Text *idem*, 9 f.

²⁰⁰ See above n. 155.

²⁰¹ See Ch. III for Adimantus' *Disputationes* and Ch. V for his other writings.

Addas' third activity is the pursuit of doctrinal debates. In M2 this activity is not considered to be that of Addas alone: it is mentioned at the beginning of the text where reference is made to the time that Pattîg was still in Addas' company.²⁰² The same goes for the Sogdian text 13941/14285.²⁰³ However, we can be fairly sure that Addas was one of the debaters. M2 speaks about Addas as 'making wisdom his weapon,' whereas M216c/a makes mention of Addas' 'grasping wisdom as a weapon for the refutation of the dogmas'.²⁰⁴

Debate was one of the most important activities of Manichaean missionaries. Richard Lim has demonstrated that, to a certain extent, disputation belonged to the self-definition of Manichaeism. To discuss other opinions was part of the compelling nature of their message. Many reports of discussions—be they false or true: the discussions of Augustine with the Manichaeans, the *Acta Archelai*, et cetera—have come down to us.²⁰⁵ Lim supposes that the Manichaeans did not take the initiative to engage in public debates, but that they were urged by their opponents to do so. The Manichaeans themselves would have preferred private discussions. Whether this is correct or not,²⁰⁶ it is certain that the Manichaeans did not avoid the debates, and that they were well trained and skilled to cope with their opponents. In the next chapter, we will examine the traces of *quaedam disputationes Adimanti*²⁰⁷ in order to get a better understanding of the methods and contents of such debates.

C. Provisional conclusions

The author of the writing that Augustine refuted in his *Contra Adimantum* was Adimantus. This Adimantus turns out to be one of the most important followers of Mani, since he is to be identified with Addas. Addas or Adda(i) was a member of Mani's Church almost from the very

²⁰² See n. 108.

²⁰³ See n. 114.

²⁰⁴ See n. 110.

²⁰⁵ R. Lim, 'Manichaeans and Public Disputation in Late Antiquity,' *RA* 25 (1993) 233–272.

²⁰⁶ Lim's arguments are not convincing in every instance, e.g. when he bases his opinion that the Manichaeans did not take the initiative for such debates on the fact that in M2 the pursuing of debates is not mentioned as the first activity of Addas (Lim, 'Public Disputation,' 238).

²⁰⁷ Augustine, *retr.* 1,22,1 (*CCL* 57: 63, 1 f.).

beginning. He may well have belonged to the Twelve Teachers or Apostles, which is only one rank below the *archègos*. Shortly after the beginning of the mission in the eastern part of the Roman Empire, Mani burdened Addas with the weighty responsibility of the mission's command, which is a strong indication of Mani's full confidence in Addas' abilities and in his interpretation of Mani's message. On this basis, we are entitled to infer that Addas Adimantus' opinions belonged to the essence of Manichaeism. The fact that Addas was well known among Manichaeans—his efforts and opinions were commemorated in the Manichaean communities, both in the East and the West—underlines this claim.

Especially two aspects of Addas' life may well have left a mark on Addas' literary activities and, consequently, they may be of importance to a balanced assessment of Addas' *Disputationes*. The first is Addas' background. The origin of Addas' name may argue in favour of a Jewish Christian milieu. Furthermore, especially Marcionitism may have been an important formative factor in Adimantus' life as well. Another important factor is Addas' way of living as a Manichaean missionary. On the basis of Addas' reputation, we may assume that Addas was a gifted man (he was well versed in many languages, a sharp debater and a good organizer), and with great prospects for a distinguished secular career. Nevertheless, he became a wandering disciple of Mani and thus he opted for a Christian ascetic lifestyle. Moreover, he had to endure the discomfort of travelling far and wide and suffering great hardships. It is against this background that we have to construe Adimantus' writings.

CHAPTER THREE

ADIMANTUS' *DISPUTATIONES*: A RECONSTRUCTION

A. Introduction

The most important—if not the only—source for the reconstruction of Adimantus' *Disputationes* are Augustine's refutations of it. Augustine consolidated most of his polemics against the Manichaean missionary in *Contra Adimantum*. *Contra Adimantum* does not have an introduction and, therefore, it does not give any indication of the method that Augustine used when he was refuting the arguments of Adimantus. Nor does the work provide us with any indication of the time of its composition; nor even to the particular reason for Augustine's rejection of it.¹ In the *Retractationes*, however, when he reviewed his encounter with Adimantus' arguments, Augustine supplies crucial information about the *Disputationes* and the way he refuted it:

In the same period, some disputations of Adimantus fell into my hands. He was a disciple of Manichaeus. He drafted them against the Law and the Prophets as an attempt to demonstrate that the Gospels and the apostolic writings contradicted them. Thus I answered him, rendering his words and giving them my response. I have consolidated the work in one volume; and in it I answered certain questions not only once but even a second time: since what I had already answered once was lost, and it was found then, when I had already responded to it all over again. I have surely resolved some of the questions in sermons for the people in church. Up to now, I have even not replied to some of them; some have been put aside and have been neglected due to other more urgent matters, in combination also with the summit of oblivion.²

¹ For a more comprehensive description of *Contra Adimantum* see Part C, sections 1–4.

² *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 63 f., 2–13): 'Eodem tempore uenerunt in manus meas quaedam disputationes Adimanti, qui fuerat discipulus Manichaei, quas conscripsit aduersus legem et prophetas, uelut contraria eis euangelica et apostolica scripta demonstrare conatus. Huic ergo respondi, uerba eius ponens eisque reddens responsonem meam. Quod opus uno uolumine conclusi, et in eo quibusdam quaestionibus not semel sed iterum respondi, quoniam quod primo responderam perierat et tunc inuentum est, cum iam iterum respondissem. Aliquas sane earundem quaestionum popularibus

Augustine's account of his refutation of Adimantus' *Disputationes* provides us with some valuable hints at how the *Disputationes* can be reconstructed and also raises some important questions. E.g., *Retractationes* I, 22, 1 hints at the history of Augustine's encounter with Adimantus' work. This history, of course, is a matter of great interest for a well-founded reconstruction of the *Disputationes*. The very first words of Augustine's reminiscence of his encounter with Adimantus' writing ('In the same period, some disputations of Adimantus fell into my hands')³ are both informative and oblique, because they clearly indicate when Augustine started to refute the *Disputationes*. On the other hand, they leave open the question of the provenance of the *Disputationes*. In the next section, we will attempt to establish more precisely when Augustine read the *Disputationes* for the first time and in which period of his life he discussed its subject matter. We will also discuss who first drew Augustine's attention to the *Disputationes*. A related question is what kind of text did Augustine come across: single pages or a whole codex? Another question to be dealt with in the next section is: what drove Augustine to pay such great attention to Adimantus' work?

Augustine explicitly states that he quoted from Adimantus' work before he refuted the questions raised by Adimantus; and subsequently consolidated most of his refutations in a book that we know under the title *Contra Adimantum Manichaei discipulum*.⁴ Thus, by examining the refutations of Augustine, it will be possible to reconstruct Adimantus' own words. In a section which follows, *Contra Adimantum* will be examined closely in order to discover what Augustine actually did quote from the *Disputationes*.

Since Augustine claims to have directed some of his sermons against the work of Adimantus,⁵ we will look at the *sermones* of Augustine as well in order to discover more material from Adimantus' *Disputationes*. In the present state of research, some of the sermons against Adiman-

ecclesiasticis sermonibus solui. Adhuc etiam quibusdam non respondi; aliquae remanserunt, quae rebus aliis magis urgentibus praetermissae sunt cumulo quoque obliuionis adiuncto.'

³ *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 63 f., 2 f.): 'Eodem tempore uenerunt in manus meas quaedam disputationes Adimanti ...'

⁴ See n. 3 and concerning the title see F. Decret, 'Adimantum Manichei discipulum (Contra-)', *AL* I 90, and idem, *L'Afrique manichéenne*, II (notes) 70 n. 1.

⁵ *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 64, 9 ff.): 'Aliquas sane earundem quaestionum popularibus ecclesiasticis sermonibus solui.'

tus are already known,⁶ but others may be found with the help of digital search. Moreover, it is not only *Contra Adimantum* and Augustine's sermons that contain traces of Adimantus' *Disputationes*. In other writings Augustine also discussed the list of contradictions between the Old and the New Testament which had been compiled by Adimantus. Those *loci* will also be discussed in this chapter. After the search for traces of the *Disputationes* in the Augustinian corpus, we can present an overview of the contents of Adimantus' writing in the final section of this chapter.

B. Augustine's acquaintance with the *Disputationes*

1. *The years of Augustine's priesthood*

It is quite likely that Augustine had argued against Adimantus' *Disputationes* for several months or even years, because Augustine admits that he had lost some of his answers and sometimes dealt with a question twice.⁷ When Augustine says: 'in the same period, some disputations of Adimantus fell into my hands'⁸ this certainly helps us to identify this period. Most probably, 'in the same period' means: 'having been ordained a priest, but before I became a bishop.'⁹ This suggests that Augustine most probably

⁶ See part D, section 1. *Introduction*.

⁷ See n. 2.

⁸ *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 63, 2 f.): 'Eodem tempore uenerunt in manus meas quaedam disputationes Adimanti.'

⁹ In *Retractationes* I Augustine discusses his writings dating from the time before he became a bishop, for *retr.* II, 1, 1 starts with the sentence (CCL 57: 89, 3 f.): *Librorum quos episcopus elaborauit primi duo sunt ad Simplicianum ecclesiae mediolanensis antistitem*. In *retr.* I, Augustine refers to six important periods in his life: I, 1, 1 (CCL 57: 7, 3–5): being a Christian, but not yet baptised; I, 5, 1 (CCL 57: 15, 3.): return to Milan; I, 6, 1 (CCL 57: 17, 40 f.): baptism; I, 7, 1 (CCL 57: 18, 2 f.): in Rome; I, 10, 1 (CCL 57: 29, 2 f.): in Africa and in *retr.* I, 14, 1 (CCL 57: 41, 2 f.) Augustine calls his *De utilitate credendi* his first writing after his ordination as a priest. *retr.* I, 15, 1 (CCL 57: 45, 2 f.) mentions his *duab. an.*, as having been written 'post hunc'. I, 16, 1 (CCL 57: 51, 2 f.) has the time-marker 'eodem tempore'; I, 17, 1 (CCL 57: 52, 2 f.), 'per idem tempus'; I, 18, 1 (CCL 57: 54, 2 f.), on *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*, has no temporal markers; in I, 19, 1 (CCL 57: 55, 2 f.), on *De sermone Domini in monte*, Augustine says that he wrote it 'per idem tempus'; I, 20 (CCL 57: 61, 1–15) and 21 (CCL 57: 62 f.) on two writings against the Donatists, give no indication about the date, whereas in I, 23, 1 (CCL 57: 66, 2 f.) Augustine relates that he wrote *Expositio quarundam propositionum ex epistula apostoli ad romanos* 'cum presbyter adhuc essem'. In this context, Augustine's remark in *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 63, 2) 'in eodem tempore', should be construed as 'when I had been ordained a priest'.

read Adimantus' *Disputationes* after the spring of 391; and in the years which followed, he refuted its arguments both in sermons and in *Contra Adimantum*.

In view of the fact that, in the *Retractationes*, Augustine discussed *Contra Adimantum* immediately after producing two anti-Donatist writings, it is quite conceivable that the final redaction of *Contra Adimantum* was done between the end of 393 and the summer of 394.¹⁰ This dating accords fully with what Augustine tells us in *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum*:

Although at the end of Adimantus' writing there are very few (questions) to which I have not given any answer, however, I do not know which ones, because, they were interrupted by matters which, as usual, seemed to be more urgent; they remained thus (unanswered). Anyway, as I said, at the end there are some which I will take care to explain as soon as possible, if the Lord will grant it.¹¹

The incidents may well have been caused by his troublesome relationship with the Donatists.

Decret arrives at almost the same conclusion regarding the dating. He bases it on the final paragraph of Augustine's *De duabus animabus contra Manichaeos*, which dates from the year 392. In this writing Augustine declares that he intended to defend the Holy Scriptures against the attacks of the Manichaeans in other writings.¹² Decret deduces from this remark that, when Augustine finished his *De duabus animabus*, he was not only already acquainted with Adimantus' *Disputationes*, but also intended to refute them.¹³ Decret's opinion is quite probable, for in the early years after *De duabus animabus contra Manichaeos*, Augustine only wrote *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* and *Contra Adimantum* in order to defend the Scriptures against the criticisms of the Manichaeans.¹⁴

¹⁰ P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, London and Boston 1990⁶, 74. Also cf. J. van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon. A Study into Augustine's City of God and the Sources of his Doctrine of the Two Cities*, Leiden–New York–Copenhagen–Köln 1991, 56.

¹¹ *c. adu. leg.* II, 12, 42 (CCL 49: 131, 1328–1332): 'Quamuis quaedam sint perpauca in fine ipsius operis Adimanti, quibus non respondi; nescio quibus enim, ut fieri solet, incurrentibus, quae magis uidebantur urgere, illa interrupta sic remanserunt. Sed ut dixi, in fine perpauca sunt, quae si dominus uoluerit, quantocius explicare curabo.' Cf. *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 64, 12): '... quae rebus aliis magis urgentibus praetermissae sunt.'

¹² *duab. an.* 24 (CSEL 25,1: 80, 6–10): 'Video maxime expectari hoc loco, quomodo etiam catholicas scripturas a manichaeis accusatas uel tunc defenderem, si, ut dico, cautus essem; uel nunc defendi posse demonstrem. Sed in aliis uoluminibus deus adiuuabit propositum meum.'

¹³ Decret, *L'Afrique*, I, 93; '*Adimantum (Contra—)*', 91.

¹⁴ In *De utilitate credendi* (392) Augustine also discusses Manichaean criticisms of the

Augustine's words 'fell into my hands' should be construed as an indication of Augustine's motive for refuting Adimantus' writing. It is conceivable that it was actually some members of Augustine's parish who first gave a copy of the *Disputationes* to Augustine together with a request to refute it. This may be concluded from *sermo* 1, in which Augustine refers to his promise to deal with the Manichaean questions about the Old Testament.¹⁵ This is all the more likely, because from *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum* II,12,42¹⁶ we can deduce that Adimantus' writing was already in circulation in Roman Africa among people who were not Manichaeans. Both these quotations support the hypothesis that Catholic Christians in Hippo Regio had already read the *Disputationes* and asked their clever new priest to refute it.

But what kind of work, precisely, fell into the hands of Augustine? Recently, N.J. Baker-Brian has adopted an agnostic stance on the way in which Adimantus' arguments circulated, claiming that 'we know nothing about the way in which the arguments of Adimantus were presented and circulated; whether, for instance they derive from one or a number of his writings'.¹⁷ This conclusion will turn out to be too hesitant, because there are at least some indications about the kind of writing that Augustine got hold of.

Decret is an advocate of the hypothesis that Augustine found single pages of this writing circulating in his parish. On each of them, a *disputatio* would have been written.¹⁸ However, Decret himself quotes *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum* II,12,42, where Augustine says: 'at the end of that work of Adimantus'.¹⁹ This gives us reason to suppose that it must have been a book rather than single pages which were

Scripture, but this writing has a wider scope. See e.g. A. Hoffmann, *Augustins Schrift "De utilitate credendi"*. Eine Analyse, Münster 1997.

¹⁵ s. 1, 1 (CCL 41: 3, 10–14): 'Memini me fuisse pollicitum caritati uestrae, aduersus manicheorum stultas perniciosasque calumnias, quibus Veteri Testamento insidiantur, responsonem per nos non defuturam, quantum dominus donare dignatur.'

¹⁶ c. *adu. leg.* II, 12, 42 (CCL 49: 131, 1320 ff.): 'iam illud aliud, quod in eodem codice scribi coeperat, Adimanti opus est, illius discipuli Manichaei, qui proprio nomine Addas dictus est.'

¹⁷ N.J. Baker-Brian, "... *quaedam disputationes Adimanti*" (*Retract.* I.xxii,1). Reading the Manichaean Biblical Discordance in Augustine's *Contra Adimantum*, *AS* 34,2 (2003) 175–196 (177).

¹⁸ Decret, *Adimantum (Contra—)*, 91 f.

¹⁹ See n. 11.

circulating separately. In *Contra Adimantum* one can also find support for the idea that Augustine actually came across a whole volume. In chapter 15 Augustine says:

Did he (Adimantus) not quote just before (= *c. Adim.* 14) the testimony of the apostle, where he says: *It is good brothers, neither to eat meat nor to drink wine (Rom. 14:21)?*²⁰

It is more common to refer to anything that has already been written when a volume is available, rather than just single pages. In chapter 28 the most important statement of Augustine concerning this subject occurs. Here Augustine objects to the way in which Adimantus had quoted a text from the New Testament:

Either he has read false codices, or this one is false, where we read Adimantus himself.²¹

Augustine also used the word ‘codex’ to denote the work of Adimantus. Therefore, it is more likely that the work of Adimantus consisted of a single volume rather than a pile of odd leaves.²²

As a provisional conclusion, we may claim that Augustine discussed Adimantus’ *Disputationes* shortly after his ordination as a priest in Hippo Regius. The pastoral needs of his parish, threatened by Manichaean teachings, prompted Augustine to disprove Adimantus’ arguments which were transmitted in the form of a *codex*.

2. *The Manichaean years*

Augustine’s account of his encounter with the *Disputationes* in the form in which it is given in the *Retractationes*, however, may not tell us the whole truth. It is questionable whether Augustine read the *Disputationes* for the first time in 391. In *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos*, Augustine discussed a contradiction between the Old and the New Testament that runs parallel to one found in *Contra Adimantum*.²³ This feature is highly indicative of an earlier acquaintance with Adimantus’ arguments,

²⁰ *c. Adim.* 15 (CSEL 25, 1: 154, 16 ff.): ‘nonne ipse (*i.e. Adimantus*) paulo ante posuerat apostoli testimonium dicentis: Bonum est fratres, non manducare carnem, neque bibere uinum.’

²¹ *c. Adim.* 28 (CSEL 25, 1: 188, 8 f.): ‘aut si forte mendosos codices legerat, aut iste mendosus est ubi nos ipsum Adimantum legimus ...’

²² Cf. Jourjon, *Six traités anti-manichéens*, 205.

²³ See Part E, section 3. *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos*.

because Augustine started to write *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos* in 388 or 389. Yet, *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos* gives occasion to suppose that we must reckon with an encounter with the contents of Adimantus' writing earlier than 388, because Augustine did not direct *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos* against any particular one of the Manichaean writings that came to his notice when he was leaving Rome or staying in Roman Africa, but, rather, against what he *remembered* of the Manichaeans' attacks on *Genesis*. This may be deduced from the fact that, in *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos*, Augustine regularly used phrases such as: 'the Manichaeans used to reprehend'²⁴ and, especially, because he said in *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos* 11,17 that he could not *remember* any Manichaean objection to *Gen.* 1:6–7.²⁵

To determine a *terminus post quem* for Augustine's acquaintance with Adimantus' contradictions between the Old and the New Testament, we need to investigate in which precise period those memories did originate. We must start this investigation in 373, the year of Augustine's conversion to Manichaeism, because the Manichaeans' critique of the Old Testament was one of the main reasons why Augustine decided to become a member of Mani's church.²⁶ Therefore, Augustine's recollections of Manichaean objections to the Old Testament may well have originated during his first contacts with Manichaeans. It might even be possible to find some clues that point more specifically to knowledge of the subject-matter of the *Disputationes* in the *Confessiones*, where Augustine's most extensive account of the reasons for his conversion can be found. Although Augustine's description of this episode in *Confessiones* 3 cannot be treated as a completely objective reconstruction of what actually happened—it is a conflation of confession, introspection and polemics—his description of the Manichaeans and the subject-matter they used in their propaganda, more and more turns out to be reliable, as has already been demonstrated in some recent studies.²⁷ It is illuminating to consider *Confessiones*

²⁴ Cf. *Gn. adu. Man.* I, II, 3 (CCL 91: 68, 1 f.): 'Primum ergo librum vetris testamenti, qui inscribitur Genesis, sic solent Manichaei reprehendere: ...'; I, IV, 7 (CCL 91: 73, 8): '... quia solent dicere'; I, V, 8 (CCL 91: 74, 2): '... sic solent Manichaei reprehendere'; et cetera.

²⁵ *Gn. adu. Man.* I, XI, 17 (CCL 91: 83, 5 f.): 'Hoc non memini Manichaeos solere reprehendere.'

²⁶ See E. Feldmann, 'Der Übertritt Augustins zu den Manichäern', in: A. Van Tongerloo and J. van Oort (eds.), *The Manichaean NOYΣ*, Leuven 1995, 103–128 (esp. 122–127) and Van Oort, *Jerusalem and Bayblon*, 36 ff.

²⁷ See especially J. van Oort, *Augustinus Confessiones. Gnostische en christelijke spiritualiteit in een diepzinnig document*, Turnhout 2002 and idem, 'Van Vergilius en Mani

3, 7, 12 – 3, 11, 18, where Augustine hints at the objections to the Old Testament that the Manichaeans made, and to compare them with the criticisms of the Old Testament which can be found in the *Disputationes*.²⁸ At least five of the topics to which Augustine refers can be mentioned as analogous to various chapters of the *Disputationes*: anthropomorphic descriptions of God;²⁹ sacrifices of animals;³⁰ creation of man in the image of God;³¹ different rules and habits in the Old and New Testaments;³² and the possession of earthly goods.³³ This brief comparison demonstrates that especially the last two of those topics have many parallels in the *Disputationes*. In a considerable number of the disputations, Adimantus quoted texts from both the Old and the New Testament in order to establish an apparent contradiction between the Old and New Testament with respect to what is permitted or forbidden by God. In many of the other chapters, Adimantus did this in order to demonstrate the difference between the Law and the Gospel when it comes to the question of how earthly goods should be evaluated. Therefore, we may observe that Augustine's account of his conversion implies that it was to

tot de Catholica: Augustinus oorspronkelijke spiritualiteit', in J. van Oort and P. van Geest (eds.), *Augustiniana Neerlandica. Aspecten van Augustinus'spiritualiteit en haar doorwerking*, Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA 2005, 11–29 (esp. 22). For a recent interpretation of the concerning passages in *Confessiones* 3, see A. Kotzé, 'The "Anti-Manichaean" Passage in *Confessions* 3 and its "Manichaean Audience"', *VC* 62 (2008) 187–200.

²⁸ In nn. 29–33 reference is made to the reconstruction of *Disputationes* in part F of this chapter.

²⁹ *conf.* 3, 7, 12 (CCL 27: 33, 3 f.): 'et utrum forma corporea deus finiretur et haberet capillos ent unguis'; *idem* (10–14): 'Et non noueram deum esse spiritum, non cui membra essent per longum et latum nec cui esse moles esset, quia moles in parte minor est quam in toto suo, et infinita sit, minor est in aliqua parte certo spatio definita quam per infinitum et non est tota ubique, sicut spiritus, sicut deus.' The theme of an anthropomorphic God is mentioned in *Disputatio* 2 (Is God tired?), 9, 28 and 29 (God can be seen by humans) and 10 (God requires the building of a visible and tangible house).

³⁰ *conf.* 3, 7, 12 (CCL 27: 33, 5 f.): 'et sacrificent de animalibus'. Cf. *Disputatio* 31.

³¹ *conf.* 3, 7, 12 (CCL 27: 33, 13 ff.): 'Et quid in nobis esset secundum quod essemus, et recte in scriptura diceremur ad imaginem dei, prorsus ignoram'. Cf. *Disputatio* 5.

³² In *conf.* 3, 7, 13 – 3, 9, 17 (CCL 27: 33, 17 – 36, 4) Augustine discusses at great length how the apparent differences between the injunctions of the Old and the New Testament should be treated. Adimantus often used this difference in rules and habits to establish a contradiction between Old and New Testament passages; cf. *Disputatio* 3 (on marriage), 6 (on honouring parents), 8 (on retaliation), 14 (on eating and drinking), 15 (on clean and unclean), 16 (on the Sabbath and circumcision), 17 (on killing enemies), 22 (on the Sabbath) and 23, 25, as well as 34 (on procreation).

³³ *conf.* 3, 7, 12 (CCL 27: 36, 4–7): 'Et sunt quaedam similia uel flagitio uel facinori et non sunt peccata, quia nec te offendunt, dominum deum nostrum, nec sociale consortium, cum consiliantur aliqua in usum uitae congrue temporis—et incertum est an libidine habendi—...'. Cf. *Disp.* 18, 19, 24 and 30.

a considerable extent ideas similar to those propagated by Adimantus in the *Disputationes*, that persuaded him to become a Manichaean in the first place. So it is not impossible that, in *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos*, Augustine's reference to a contradiction between an Old and a New Testament passage stemmed from what he remembered about his first encounters with Manichaean missionaries.

Admittedly, the similarity of the subject-matter does not automatically lead to the conclusion of dependence on the same source. Nevertheless, it is highly indicative that so many of the Manichaean topics referred to in *Confessiones* 3, can also be found in Adimantus' *Disputationes*. Moreover, it is quite plausible that the Manichaean missionaries were well acquainted with Adimantus' writings. This can be concluded from the words of the Manichaean bishop Faustus of Milevis, a very influential Manichaean bishop during the lifetime of Augustine.³⁴ He wrote a work entitled *Capitula* as a kind of handbook which could be used during the debates between Manichaeans and Catholic Christians.³⁵ In his *Capitula* he maintained that Adimantus was the only writer who should be studied apart from Mani.³⁶ This suggests that it is quite likely that the Manichaean missionaries in Roman Africa must have been well acquainted with many of the ideas running parallel to those that can also be found in Adimantus' *Disputationes*.

Nevertheless, it is uncertain whether Augustine learned from the very beginning exactly the same arguments that he found in the *codex* about which some members of his congregation had already asked questions; let alone that he knew every one of the putative contradictions between the Old and the New Testament proposed by Adimantus in the *Disputationes*. After all, Augustine did not refer explicitly to any contradiction between an Old and a New Testament passage in *Confessiones* 3 explicitly. Moreover, we must also take into account that Augustine never explicitly mentions the reading of any tract that could conceivably have persuaded him to become a Manichaean. In the Manichaean propagation debates played a major role.³⁷ Furthermore, from Faustus of Milevis' *Capitula*

³⁴ Cf. *conf.* 5, 6, 10 (CCL 27: 61 f.).

³⁵ See n. 185.

³⁶ On Faustus, see Part E, section 2. Contra Faustum; and Ch. V, Part A, section 3. *The Contra Faustum and the Capitula*.

³⁷ See J. van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon*, 45. Nevertheless, the Manichaeans' use of books in a missionary context should not be excluded completely, because Augustine mentions them as well when he describes his encounters with the Manichaeans in *conf.* 3, 6, 10 (CCL 27: 31, 13 f.): '... voca sole et libris multis et ingetibus!'

it can be concluded that Manichaeans easily reformulated older material and were quite prepared to use arguments from other Manichaean tracts in a completely new context when they were debating with Catholic Christians.³⁸ Therefore, it can be assumed that, at the time of his conversion to Manichaeism, Augustine had already learned arguments similar to those in the *Disputationes* by hearsay and perhaps even in a second-hand formulation.

As regards the following, almost hidden years, the information about Augustine's knowledge of Manichaean writings about the Old Testament is scanty and indirect. Nevertheless, by consolidating some of the evidence from Augustine's reports about those years, we can still draw some important conclusions. In *Confessiones* V Augustine says that he was eager to make progress in the Manichaean religion³⁹ and, due to this fervour for Mani's teachings, he even tried and succeeded to win over at least some of the other Catholic Christians. For example, Augustine's saying in *De duabus animabus contra Manichaeos* 11 about his debates with Catholic Christians clearly testifies to his zeal and success. There, Augustine mentions at least two reasons for his willingness to be a Manichaean: their friendship and his success in debates with Catholic Christians.⁴⁰ Augustine may well have told the truth about his success in *De duabus animabus contra Manichaeos*, because many of his friends had been attracted to Manichaeism as the result of his influence.⁴¹ The results that Augustine achieved in his polemics demonstrate that he certainly acquired a sound knowledge of the teachings of the Manichaeans and their missionary strategies. Moreover, Augustine himself attributed his

³⁸ See Part E, section 2. Contra Faustum. Cf. N.A. Pedersen, *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-Boston 2004, 248 f.

³⁹ *conf.* 5, 7, 13 (CCL 27: 63, 28 ff.): 'Ceterum conatus omnis meus, quo proficere in illa secta statueram, illo homine cognito prorsus intercidit.'

⁴⁰ *duab. an.* 11 (CSEL 25, 1: 65, 19 – 66, 2): 'Sed me duo quaedam maxime, quae incautam illam aetatem facile capiunt, per admirabiles adtriure circuitus: quorum et unum familiaritas nescio quomodo repens quadam imagine bonitatis tamquam sinusum aliquod uinculum multipliciter collo inuolutum, alterum, quod quaedam noxia uictoria paene mihi semper in disputationibus proueniebat dissertenti cum inperitis, sed tamen fidem suam certatim, ut quisque posset, defendere molientibus christianis. quo successu creberrimo gliscebat adulescentibus animositas et impetus suos in peruicaciae magnum malum inprudenter urgebat.'

⁴¹ Cf. *conf.* 4, 4, 7 (CCL 27: 43). Cf. e.g., Van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon*, 44 f. and J. Kevin Coyle, 'Saint Augustine's Manichaean Legacy', *AS* 34,1 (2003) 1–22 (8).

success 'to a kind of talent and to other readings(!)'.⁴² Since criticisms on the Old Testament were amongst the most important weapons in the Manichaeans' war of words with Catholic Christians,⁴³ it is virtually certain that the Old Testament must have been one of the prime targets that Augustine singled out for criticism in his confrontations with Catholic Christians. This opinion is quite consistent with Augustine's regrets in the final paragraph of *De duabus animabus contra Manichaeos*, that he had not defended the Catholic *Scriptures* during his Manichaean years.⁴⁴

As to the question of whether Adimantus' writings were included in the readings from which Augustine learned the arguments he used in his debates with Catholic Christians, we can safely assume that this was indeed the case. In addition to the above-mentioned argument (namely that Faustus regarded Adimantus as the only author—apart from Mani—worth studying), there is other evidence. Many years before he could have learned this from Faustus' *Capitula*, Augustine was well aware that Adimantus was highly regarded among the Manichaeans, because, in *Contra Adimantum* 12 he tells his readers that Adimantus was venerated as a great teacher of Mani's religion.⁴⁵ These textual arguments all indicate that the Manichaean Hearer Augustine will have studied Adimantus' writings, probably including the *Disputationes*, which writing could well have been a very useful guide during debates with Catholic Christians.

Some might doubt whether Augustine only heard the Manichaean criticisms of the Old Testament when they were read out from a codex by an *Electus* as a kind of instruction into the art and science of debating, or that Augustine must also have read them himself.⁴⁶ J. Kevin Coyle, for instance, is very sceptical about the possibility that Augustine could

⁴² *duab. an.* 11 (CSEL 25, 1: 66, 2–5): 'quod altercandi genus quia post eorum auditionem adgressus eram, quicquid in eo uel qualicumque ingenio uel aliis lectionibus poteram, solis illis libentissime tribuam.'

⁴³ See nn. 29–33.

⁴⁴ *duab. an.* 24 (CSEL 25, 1: 80, 6 ff.): 'uideo maxime expectari hoc loco, quomodo etiam catholicas scripturas a Manichaeis accusatas uel tunc defenderem.' See for the full context n. 54.

⁴⁵ *c. Adim.* 12 (CSEL 25, 1: 139, 9 f.): '... Adimantus unus ex discipulis Manichaei, quem magnum doctorem illius sectae commemorant.'

⁴⁶ In *duab. an.* 11 (CSEL 25, 1: 66, 4 f.) Augustine uses 'lectionibus' and 'sermonibus'. Both words are ambiguous, because 'lectiones' may mean both the readings done by others that one hears, and the texts that one reads oneself. 'Sermo' means both spoken and written discourse. Here, I am inclined to accept the last meaning, as Augustine says that he 'devoted himself to the lectiones with much pleasure' (cf. n. 39 on his fervour), which is more natural in the case of a study than in the case of listening.

have read any Manichaean tract during the time he was still a Manichee.⁴⁷ Undoubtedly, Augustine *did indeed hear* many Manichaean teachings,⁴⁸ but it is also quite possible that Augustine *read* Manichaean criticisms of the Old Testament. First, we need to remember that Augustine tells us in the *Confessiones* that his fervour for the study of Mani's books diminished due to his disappointment in Faustus and his lack of ability to resolve all the conundrums on cosmogony.⁴⁹ This clearly indicates that Augustine, although he was only a Hearer, read Manichaean books; and, moreover, that he did it thoroughly thanks to his enthusiasm for Mani's teachings. Besides, the fact that Manichaean Hearers read Manichaean books can also be demonstrated from the abundance of handwritings in the copies of the Manichaean *Psalms* which were found at Kellis. This indicates that both *electi* and *auditores* were involved in copying the Manichaean *Psalms*.⁵⁰ So, it is quite possible that the *Hearer* Augustine read the *Disputationes*. Moreover, if Catholic Christians could have possessed the *Disputationes* in codex form,⁵¹ why not a Manichaean Hearer who was as eager and capable as Augustine to learn and teach?

After all, it is reasonable to suppose that Augustine mentions a contradiction between the Old and the New Testament in *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos* because he remembered it from his Manichaean years; perhaps even from the very beginning. Therefore, the method as well as the subject-matter of the arguments that Adimantus used in his *Disputationes* would not have been much of a surprise to Augustine.

⁴⁷ J. Kevin Coyle, 'What did Augustine know about Manichaeism when he wrote his two Treatises De Moribus?', in: J. van Oort *et al.* (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West; Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaean Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001, 41–56 (51) and *idem*, 'Augustine's Manichaean Legacy', 14. Recently, J. van Oort has discussed the question of the young Augustine's knowledge of Manichaeism and the way Augustine learned about the teachings of Mani. See his, 'Young Augustine's Knowledge of Manichaeism. An Analysis of the *Confessiones* and Some Other Relevant Texts', *VC* 62 (2008) 425–451, in which Van Oort criticizes Coyle's position. Cf. as well J. van Oort, 'Heeding and Hiding their particular Knowledge? An Analysis of Augustine's Dispute with Fortunatus', in: Thérèse Fuhrer (ed.), *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike* (Philosophie der Antike), Stuttgart 2007, 113–121.

⁴⁸ See esp. Augustine, *c. ep. Man.* 5 (CSEL 25,1: 197, 8 ff.): 'ipsa enim nobis illo tempore miseris quando lecta est, inluminati dicebamus a uobis.'

⁴⁹ *conf.* 5, 7, 13 (CCL 27: 63, 22f.): 'Refracta itaque studio, quod intenderam in Manichaei litteras . . .'. See for more examples: Van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon*, 45 (esp. n. 165).

⁵⁰ Cf. Ch. II, n. 169.

⁵¹ Cf. n. 21.

In addition to the pastoral reason mentioned above, one may assume that Augustine's readiness to refute Adimantus' *Disputationes* was also caused by feelings of guilt towards his former friends. In the first section of *De duabus animabus contra Manichaeos* Augustine deplors his former misery and his failure to protect the seed of the true religion.⁵² One of the things he ought to have done was to consider the sheer implausibility of Manichaean teachings on the two kinds of soul,⁵³ which is the subject of *De duabus animabus*. In the final section of *De duabus animabus* Augustine mentions a second omission, but first he utters a heartfelt prayer:

Great God, almighty God, God of supreme goodness, it is appropriate to believe and understand that you are invulnerable and unchangeable; Trinity, whom the Catholic Church worships; as your suppliant, I pray to you, having experienced your mercy in me, that you will not allow the men, with whom I lived from my boyhood most harmoniously in every sense, will dissent from me in the worship of you!

I see, how it was especially in this case to be expected, that I certainly should have defended the Catholic Scriptures against the Manichaean attacks, either at that time, if, as I say, I had been cautious, or that I should demonstrate now, how they can be defended. However, in other tomes, God will help my purpose.⁵⁴

From these words, we can deduce that one of Augustine's reasons for refuting the exegesis of the Manichaeans was a sense of guilt towards his (former) friends. Augustine's return from Milan and Rome to Roman Africa in 389 may have evoked memories of his early Manichaean years and his zeal in the propagation of Mani's teachings. Such memories could well have stirred up his conscience and incited him to repudiate his former teachings.

Besides, the resolution of the questions put forward by Adimantus meant for Augustine a quest for a new understanding of the Old

⁵² *duab. an.* 1 (CSEL 25,1: 51, 4–6).

⁵³ *duab. an.* 1 (CSEL 25,1: 51, 9–12).

⁵⁴ *duab. an.* 24 (CSEL 25,1: 79, 26 – 80, 10): 'deus magne, deus omnipotens, deus summae bonitatis, quem inuiolabilem atque incummutabilem credi atque intellegi fas est, trina unitas, quam catholica ecclesia colit, subplex oro expertus in me misericordiam tuam, ne homines, cum quibus mihi a pueritia in omni conuictu fuit summa concensio, in tuo culte a me dissentire permittas. uideo maxime expectari hoc loco, quomodo etiam catholicas scripturas a Manichaeis accusatas uel tunc defenderem, si, ut docui, cautus essem, uel nunc defendi posse demonstrarem. sed in aliis uoluminibus deus adiuuabit propositum meum.'

Testament. The contradictions between the Old and the New Testament had once been his own problem, and solving them involved searching for new ways of understanding the Scriptures.

In short: during his years as a priest in Hippo Regius, Augustine composed his rejection of Adimantus' *Disputationes*. Its immediate cause was a request from members of his parish who were sorely troubled by the *Disputationes*. Its contents were no surprise to Augustine. During his Manichaean years, he had learned—and even taught—what Adimantus maintained. His willingness to refute that body of teaching was intensified by feelings of sorrow.

C. *Disputationes refuted in Contra Adimantum*

1. *The structure of Contra Adimantum*

Contra Adimantum consists of 28 *capitula*. In every one of them Augustine challenged one of the arguments that Adimantus had already used in the *Disputationes*. In the *Disputationes* Adimantus attempted—by means of the quotation of apparently contradictory passages from both main parts of Holy Scripture—to demonstrate that they are radically different from each other. Augustine's strategy is to comment on the passages from both Testaments in order to demonstrate that the Old and the New Testament are ultimately quite consistent with each other. In *Contra Adimantum* almost every one of the 28 *capitula* starts with the words: *de eo quod (in ...) scriptum est*. Then a quotation from the Old Testament follows. Sometimes Augustine first discusses Adimantus' reason to select precisely this text.⁵⁵ As a rule, however, he first mentions the New Testament passage that Adimantus treated as a contradiction of an Old Testament text. Augustine challenges every one of Adimantus' *Disputationes* in an almost identical way. Therefore it may be useful to give a translation of *Contra Adimantum* 1 as a typical example of his strategy:

Concerning what is written: *In the beginning, God made the heaven and the earth*, until what is written: *and it became evening, and it became morning, the first day (Gen. 1:1–5)*. The most stupid Manichaeans consider this chapter of the Law to be contrary to the Gospel, saying: In *Genesis* it is written that God created the heaven and the earth and the light through

⁵⁵ E.g. *c. Adim.* 11 (*Ex.* 20:5), 13 (*Dt.* 4:23 f.) and 20 (*Lev.* 26:3–10).

himself, whereas in the Gospel it is written that the world was constructed through our Lord Jesus Christ, where it was said: *And the world was made through Him and the world recognised Him not (John 1:10)*. However, they can be refuted in three ways.

First, because, when it is said: *In the beginning God made heaven and earth (Gen. 1:1)*, a Christian envisages the Trinity itself, with whom not only the Father, but also the Son and the Holy Spirit are meant as well. For we do not believe in three gods, but in one God: the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit; although the Father is the Father and the Son the Son and the Holy Spirit the Holy Spirit. In this passage, however, it would take too long to discuss the unity of the Trinity.

Further, because where it is said: *God said: let it be made, and it was made (Gen. 1:3)*, it is necessary to understand that what He made, He made it through the Word. The Word of the Father, however, is the Son. Thus, this chapter in *Genesis*, where it is written: *And God said: let it be made, and it was made (Gen. 1:3)*, does not disagree with that passage in the Gospel where it is said: *And the world was made through Him (John 1:10)*, that is: through our Lord Jesus Christ, because He is the Word of the Father, through Whom all things were made.

Finally, if the Son is not identified in *Genesis* for reason that it had not been said that God created through the Son, then in the Gospel, God does as well not feed the birds through the Son, neither clothes the lilies, nor all those innumerable things about which the Lord himself said that God the Father works them, whereas He did not say that He accomplished them through the Son. When they even add the testimony of the apostle, which he said about our Lord Jesus Christ: *He is the Firstborn of all creation; and all things were made through Him in heaven and on earth, both visible and invisible (Col. 1:15 f.)*,—they say as it happens that this chapter is the opposite of *Genesis*, where in such a way it is said that God made the earth, that in particular the Son had not been mentioned by name on that occasion—they are greatly mistaken. They do not comprehend that the apostle is in contradiction with himself if that were true. Because, in another place, he only speaks of one (Person): *from Him and through Him and in Him are all things (Rom. 11:36)*, without mentioning the Son. Furthermore, the way that this Son was not mentioned, but still perceived, applies as well for *Genesis*. And just as these two chapters of Paul are not in opposite of each other, the same way *Genesis* is not in contradiction with the Gospel.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ c. *Adim.* 1 (CSEL 25,1: 115, 3–116, 21): 'De eo quod scriptum est: in principio fecit deus caelum et terram usque ad id quod scriptum est: et factum est uespere, et factum est mane dies una. hoc capitulum legis aduersum esse euangelio stultissimi Manichaei arbitrantur dicentes in genesi scriptum esse, quod deus per se ipsum fecerit caelum et terram et lucem, in euangelio autem scriptum esse per dominum nostrum Iesum

Decret claims that Augustine did indeed discuss 29 of these contradictions, because Decret construes *Psalm 143* in *Contra Adimantum* 18⁵⁷ as a quotation introduced into the argument by Adimantus.⁵⁸ At first sight, Decret seems to be right, because some lines after the rendering of *Ps. 143* Augustine mentions a passage in the Gospel about which he says that the Manichaeans treated it as a contradiction of that (*huic*) passage in the Old Testament.⁵⁹ Because Augustine uses the word ‘hic’, he seems to be referring to *Ps. 143*. However, the context demonstrates quite clearly that the quotation from *Ps. 143* was actually introduced into the argument by Augustine. In *Contra Adimantum* 18, Augustine deals with the putative difference between the Old and the New Testament when it comes to the appreciation of earthly goods. In the Old Testament, wealth is promised to believers; whereas in the New Testament believers are exhorted to forego earthly treasures. Augustine introduces the quotation from *Ps. 143* with the words:

However, lest they think that only in the books of the New Testament are these (earthly treasures) looked upon as contemptible, let them listen to

Christum fabricatum esse mundum, ubi dictum est: Et mundus factus est per ipsum, et mundus illum non cognouit. tribus enim modis reffeluntur. primo quia cum dicitur: in principio fecit deus caelum et terram, trinitatem ipsam christianus accipit, ubi non solus pater, sed et filius et spiritus sanctus intellegitur. non enim tres deos sed unum deum credimus: patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum, quamuis pater pater sit et filius filius et spiritus sanctus spiritus sanctus. de qua unitate trinitatis hoc loco longum est disputare. deinde quia ubi dicitur: dixit deus: fiat, et factum est, ibi necesse est intellegatur per uerbum eum fecisse, quod fecit. uerbum autem patris est filius, non ergo repugnat hoc capitulum geneseos, ubi scriptum est: et dixit deus: fiat, et factum est, illi loco euangelii, ubi dicitur et mundus per eum factus est, id est per dominum nostrum, quia ipse est uerbum patris, per quod facta sunt omnia. postremo si propterea in genesi non intellegitur filius, quia non est dictum quod per filium deus fecerit, nec in euangelio per filiu deus et aues pascit et lilia uestit et cetera innumerabilia, quae ipse dominus dicit deum facere patrem, quamuis non dicat, quod ea per filium faciat. quod autem etiam testimonium apostoli adiugunt, quod ait de domino nostro Iesu Christo: Ipse est primogenitus totius creaturae; et omnia per ipsum facta sunt in caelis et in terris, uisibilia et inuisibilia et hoc capitulum aduersum esse dicunt genesi, ubi deus ita dicitur fecisse mundum, ut specialiter filius ibi non sit nominatus, uehementer errant; ea non uident, si ita est, ipsum apostolum sibi esse contrarium, cum alio loco unum dicit: ex quo omnia, per quem omnia, in quo omnia et filium non nominat. quomodo autem hic filius nominatus non est, intellegitur tamen, ita et in genesi; et quomodo sibi haec duo capitula Pauli non aduersantur, ita nec genesis euangelio.’

⁵⁷ CSEL 25,1: 174, 6–16.

⁵⁸ Decret, *L’Afrique*, I, 100 and ‘*Adimantum (Contra—)*’, 91.

⁵⁹ *c. Adim. 18* (CSEL 25,1: 174, 20 f.): ‘...contrarium esse putauerunt huic loco ueteris testamenti.’

the prophetic song which states that this kind of happiness should be left behind and that one ought to flee to God, who is the only Lord.⁶⁰

Augustine brings his quotation from *Ps.* 143 to an end with similar words.⁶¹ It must therefore be clear enough that Augustine quoted *Ps.* 143 in order to substantiate his own point of view. A striking difference between the Masoretic text tradition of the Old Testament and that used by Augustine might have been a complicating factor for *Decret.* Otherwise than in the Masoretic text, treasures and earthly goods are not promised to believers in the text tradition used by Augustine, but to unbelievers.

The sequence of the chapters in *Contra Adimantum* does not seem to be determined by any specific strategy.⁶² The chapters have not been arranged thematically, nor can any correspondence be found with the order of the books in the biblical canon. *Decret.* has already suggested that the sequence of the chapters in *Contra Adimantum* might be different from the chronological order in which Augustine discussed Adimantus' *Disputationes*. One of *Decret.*'s main reasons to support this hypothesis is—apart from the illogical order of the chapters in *Contra Adimantum*—that Augustine did not mention the name of Adimantus throughout the whole of the first 11 chapters.⁶³ This is, admittedly, a rather odd feature. However, the text of *Contra Adimantum* entitles us to suppose that the sequence Augustine followed when he rebutted Adimantus' arguments is precisely what we find in *Contra Adimantum*. In many chapters references can be found to items already discussed and never to items which still have to be discussed.⁶⁴ The fact that throughout the first 11 chapters the name of Adimantus does not occur, could perhaps be explained in another way. It is not inconceivable that the occasion on

⁶⁰ *c. Adim.* 18 (CSEL 25,1: 174, 3–6): 'sed ne in solis noui testamenti libris ista arbitrentur esse contempta, audiant prophetam abicientem talem felicitatem, et ad unum dominum deum confugiendum esse cantatem.'

⁶¹ *c. Adim.* 18 (CSEL 25,1: 174, 16–20): 'adtentant ergo, quomodo inrideatur ista felicitas in hominibus impiis et tota beatitudo in deo solo inconcussa figuratur. illi enim dicunt beatum populum, cui haec sunt: sed beatus populus, cuius dominus deus ipsius.'

⁶² *Decret.* *L'Afrique* I, 96 (II, n. 19, p. 73 f.).

⁶³ *Decret.* '*Adimantum (Contra—)*', 92: 'D'autre part, les réfutations successivement écrites par A. ne correspondent peut-être pas à l'ordre des chapitres du (volumen) tel qu'il a été constitué. En effet, dans les onze premiers chapitres, le nom d'Adimantus n'est pas cité une seule fois—A. s'attaquant aux (Manichaei) en général, sans préciser son adversaire.'

⁶⁴ *c. Adim.* 6 → 3, 13 → 9, 15 → 14, 20 → 18 and 19, 22 → 16 and 17, 23 → 3, 24 → 4, and 27 → 26.

which Augustine refuted Adimantus in some way influenced him when he was mentioning his opponent. In a church in front of a large congregation, the use of the name of an opponent certainly draws the attention of the hearer to the identity of one's opponent. In a written text, however, there is less need to keep on mentioning the name of an opponent. It is also worth considering that Augustine delivered his refutations during a period of several months or even years.⁶⁵ Any or even all of those considerations could explain why the name of Adimantus is not mentioned at all before chapter 12; whereas after chapter 12 Augustine used either 'Adimantus' or 'manichaei' (nom.pl.) to identify the opposition.⁶⁶ So there is no reason to suppose that the order of the topics in the book should not reflect the sequence in which Augustine discussed the refutations. The illogical order we find here, cannot be explained on the basis of the assumption that Augustine's answers must have been jumbled up.

In all probability, Augustine followed the order he found in the book of Adimantus. The simple reason is that such is the most effective way to refute the arguments of an opponent.⁶⁷ Besides, Augustine says in *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum* that he—due to the restrictions of time and unexpected calls to do other things—did not discuss several contradictions *at the end* of Adimantus' work.⁶⁸ This gives strong support to the assumption that Augustine followed the order he found in the work of Adimantus. As a consequence, the apparently arbitrary order of the *capita* in *Contra Adimantum* probably had its origin in the sequence of the chapters in the *Disputationes*. The absence of a logical scheme

⁶⁵ See Part B, section 1. *The years of Augustine's priesthood*.

⁶⁶ The name of Adimantus is found in the *capitula* 12 (2×), 13 (3×), 14 (1×), 15 (1×), 16 (3×), 17 (1×), 18 (1×), 21 (1×), 24 (1×), 25 (1×), 26 (2×), 27 (2×), 28 (2×). Even after *capitulum* 12, there are four chapters in which the name Adimantus does not occur. In the chapters where the proper name 'Adimantus' can be found, Augustine did not use it consistently, but also made mention of 'manichaei'. In addition, he applied both plural and singular grammatical forms when he referred to the opposition.

⁶⁷ Against Decret, '*Adimantum (Contra—)*', 91.

⁶⁸ *c. adu. leg.* II, 12, 42 (CCL 49: 132, 1328–1332): 'Quamuis quaedam sint perpauca in fine ipsius operis Adimanti, quibus non respondi; nescio quibus enim, ut fieri solet, incurrentibus, quae magis uidebantur urgere, illa interrupta sic remanserunt. Sed, ut dixi, in fine perpauca sunt, quae si dominus uoluerit, quantocius explicare curabo.' Cf. *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 64, 6–9): '... quae rebus aliis magis urgentibus praetermissae sunt.' Nevertheless, Decret ('*Adimantum (Contra—)*', 92) opined: 'Certaines—bien rares et qui se trouvaient en fin de l'oeuvre manichéenne (*c. adu. leg.* 2, 42)—furent remises à plus tard et finalement oubliées (*retr.* 1, 22, 1).' Probably he said this because of *incurrentibus* in *c. adu. leg.* This word, however, may also be explained as an abl.pl. of the participle of the verb *incurro*, meaning 'unexpected happenings' or 'coincidences'. This explanation is more consistent with *retr.* I, 22, 1.

to arrange the chapters of the *Disputationes* might well have been a typical Manichaean trait, because it can also be observed in Faustus' *Capitula*.⁶⁹

2. Double answers

A remarkable feature of *Contra Adimantum* is that—according to the *Retractationes*—Augustine must have discussed at least some of the questions twice, because he lost the first answer and later, when he had already given another answer to the same question, rediscovered it.⁷⁰ The following chapters could well be examples of a double answer to the original question:

Contra Adimantum 3: in the first section Augustine gives a brief answer that he concludes with the words:

Because, things that seem to the ignoramuses to contradict each other, must be penetrated, not wilfully challenged.⁷¹

At the end of the third chapter, Augustine says:

However, Holy Scripture does not need headstrong and supercilious accusers, but readers who are diligent and devout.⁷²

These words are an almost perfect repetition of the words at the end of the first paragraph, which gives us reason to suppose that *Contra Adimantum* 3 consists of two answers which were originally intended to respond to the same question. This is even more likely when we take into account the second repetition of the arguments in this third chapter. In the first section of *Contra Adimantum* 3, Augustine says:

⁶⁹ Cf. G. Wurst, 'Bemerkungen zu Struktur und *genus litterarium* der *Capitula* des Faustus von Mileve', in: J. van Oort *et al.* (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaean Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001, 307–324 (321).

⁷⁰ *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 64, 6–9): 'Quod opus uno uolumine conclusi, et in eo quibusdam quaestionibus non semel sed iterum respondi, quoniam quod primum responderam perierat, et tunc inuentum est, cum iam iterum responderem.' Although both Decret, *Adimantum (Contra—)*, 91, and Jourjon, *Six traités antimanchéens*, 205, said that some chapters have a double answer, they do not indicate which chapters Augustine alluded to.

⁷¹ *c. Adim.* 3 (CSEL 25,1: 119, 5 f.): 'intelligenda enim sunt, non temere accusanda, quae inperitis uidentur esse contraria.'

⁷² *c. Adim.* 3 (CSEL 25,1: 122, 12 f.): 'sed sanctae scripturae non temerarios et superbos accusatores, sed diligentes et pios lectores desiderant.'

Why then would they rather say that the Old Testament contradicts the utterance of the Lord, . . . , and not that the New Testament contradicts itself? This would be sinful to say.⁷³

Whereas in the following section it is said:

Do they actually say that the Gospel contradicts the Gospel?⁷⁴

Each of these repetitions indicates that Augustine disproved the same argument of Adimantus twice in chapter 3. In all probability, Augustine wrote the first answer later, because in the first answer he summarizes his reply to the question; whereas the second answer is much more extensive.

In *Contra Adimantum* 12 we can find another double answer. Almost at the end of this chapter, Augustine starts a new paragraph with the words:

‘Or, if thus far, too less seems to be pointed out that the apostle said this sentence concerning the alteration that is coming, when he stated: *Flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God and corruptible cannot inherit incorruption* (1 Cor. 15:50), be attentive to what he exposed in the following part and what he added....’⁷⁵

In this sentence Augustine seems to have indicated that the following section should be construed as a repetition of his previous arguments. And indeed, in the concerning paragraph Augustine mentions similar arguments against Adimantus’ interpretation as he did before, emphasizing the importance of the context of the text that Adimantus singled out to criticize the Old Testament and as well propagating the allegorical meaning of the Old Testament, because Adimantus was interpreting them literally. These two features suggest that Augustine also conflated two answers in chapter 12.

⁷³ c. *Adim.* 3 (CSEL 25,1: 119, 1–4): ‘cur enim potius uetus testamentum dicunt aduersari huic sententiae domini, . . . et non ipsum nouum sibi aduersari? Quod nefas est dicere?’

⁷⁴ c. *Adim.* 3 (CSEL 25,1: 119, 23 f.): ‘numquid etiam euangelium euangelio dicunt esse contrarium?’

⁷⁵ c. *Adim.* 12 (CSEL 25,1: 142, 26 – 143, 2): ‘Aut si adhuc parum uidetur esse monstratum, quod sententiam istam propter immutationem quae futura est apostolus dixerit, cum ait: caro et sanguis regnum dei hereditate possidere non possunt neque corruptionem hereditate possidebit, adtendite, quid continui subiciat et adiungat . . .’

3. (*Parts of*) *sermons in Contra Adimantum*

Augustine discussed some of the arguments of Adimantus in church.⁷⁶ Apart from the fact that among Augustine's sermons we can find several dealing explicitly with Adimantus' *Disputationes*,⁷⁷ it is also quite probable that some of Augustine's replies in *Contra Adimantum* were originally (parts of) sermons. Some slight indications do seem to support this. Taken apart, they are certainly not very conclusive, but taken together they do confirm the claim that at least some passages in *Contra Adimantum* could well have been spoken originally during worship services.

First, it may be pointed out that in *Contra Adimantum* 13 Augustine uses an element borrowed from the liturgy to defend the Old Testament. In this chapter Augustine states that God's goodness is also found in the Old Testament. He supports this claim by citing this example:

... so often the goodness of God is found in the Old Testament. Who can count it? I only need to adduce one example which is sung every day in the Church: *Praise the Lord, for He is good, for His mercy endures for ever* (i.a. Ps. 106:1).⁷⁸

Second, the dialogic feature that is found in some chapters (whereas it is absent in some of the others) is another indication that some of Augustine's refutations in *Contra Adimantum* must have originated in a sermon.⁷⁹ Furthermore, a *reductio ad absurdum* in *Contra Adimantum* 12 would surely not have been out of place in a public refutation of

⁷⁶ retr. I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 64, 9–13): 'Aliquas sane earundem quaestionum popularibus ecclesiasticis sermonibus solui; adhuc etiam quibusdam non respondi; aliquae remanserunt, quae rebus aliis magis urgentibus praetermissae sunt, cumulo quoque obliuionis adiuncto.'

⁷⁷ See below Part D, section 3. *Sermons discussing 'Disputationes' not mentioned in Contra Adimantum.*

⁷⁸ c. *Adim.* 13 (CSEL 25,1: 147, 1–5): '... quotiens inuenitur bonitas dei in ueteri testamento, quis numerare sufficiat? unum tamen ponam, quod cotidie in ecclesiis cantatur: confitemini domino, quoniam bonus, quoniam in saeculum misericordia eius.'

⁷⁹ Cf. e.g.: c. *Adim.* 3 (CSEL 25,1: 119, 24 ff.): 'quod si dicunt hoc capitulum falsum esse et a corruptoribus scripturarum esse additum—nam hoc solent, quando non inueniunt quid respondeant, dicere'; c. *Adim.* 13 (CSEL 25,1: 146, 14 f.): 'miseri dicunt: sed illud aliud est. quibus respondemus: et hoc aliud est: noli metuere'; c. *Adim.* 15 (CSEL 25,1: 158, 16–23): 'fortassis aliquis eorum dicat: edissere ergo, quid significet ... nolo quia longum est ... nobis tamen ad hos refellendos satis est, quod ... non ego, sed apostolus dicit ...'; c. *Adim.* 17 (CSEL 25,1: 168, 27–169, 4): 'huic isti audeant obicere quaestionem et dicant, si possunt: quid est quod iussisti ut inimicos nostros diligamus, et de illis nos uindicare disponis? An forte contra uoluntatem suorum sanctorum facturus est eos, quos illi diligunt, puniendo atque damnando?'; *idem* (CSEL 25,1: 172, 4–7): 'fortassis dicant, sicut solent caeci iactare insana conuicia, meliorem fuisse Dauid qui pepercit inimico,

Adimantus' arguments. Here Augustine derides the Manichaeic belief in the reincarnation of the soul into animals. To this end, he points out the inconsistency of the Manichaeans when they said that human souls cannot transmigrate into very small animals. In order to show the absurdity of their opinions he says:

For they are sorely pressed (*when we say*): Why can a human soul return to a fox, but not to a weasel, despite the fact that a fox cub could well be smaller than a large weasel? Further, if it can return to a weasel, why not to a lizard? And if it can come to a lizard, why not to a locust, and then to a bee, and then to a fly, and on again to a bedbug and from there to a flea or any other even smaller animal?⁸⁰

Arguments such as these would certainly be appropriate on an occasion at which an audience is present. This also goes for exclamations that can be found in *Contra Adimantum* as well.⁸¹

4. *Contra Adimantum*: preliminary conclusion

We may conclude that *Contra Adimantum* is little more than a collection of arguments. Both an introduction and a conclusion are missing. Most of its 28 chapters might even have existed rather independently from any other argument in *Contra Adimantum*, because they all deal with one specific topic. Augustine consolidated them in one volume. The place of every chapter in *Contra Adimantum* was predetermined by their order in Adimantus' writing.

Even so, the collection is not complete, because some of the arguments of Adimantus were not refuted at all. Besides, there are also sermons dealing with Adimantus' *Disputationes* that Augustine did not consolidate in *Contra Adimantum*. On the other hand, some chapters contain more than one argument against a similar *Disputatio* of Adimantus.

quam deum qui dederit ei occidendi potestam'; *c. Adim.* 20 (CSEL 25,1: 177, 21 f.): 'nisi forte dicturi sunt in zonis habere pecuniam peccatum esse, in loculis autem non esse peccatum.'

⁸⁰ *c. Adim.* 12 (CSEL 25,1: 140, 5–12): 'nam uehementer urgentur, cur in uulpeculam reuolui anima humana possit et non possit in mustelam, cum catulus uulpeculae fortasse etiam minor sit quam magna mustela. deinde si in mustelam potest, cur in murem non potest? et si in istum potest, cur in stellionem non potest? et si in eum potest, cur in locustam non potest? deinde in apem, deinde in muscam, deinde in cimicem, atque inde usque in pulicem, et si quid est aliud multo minutius peruenire?'

⁸¹ E.g. *c. Adim.* 15 (CSEL 25,1: 156, 26 ff.): 'o hominem pessimum, securum de negligentia generis humani ad occultandas deceptiones suas!'

Contra Adimantum may be treated as an incomplete collection of arguments, or *opus imperfectum*, directed against Adimantus' *Disputationes*.

5. *Adimantus'* *Disputationes in Contra Adimantum*

In the *Retractationes* Augustine states that he actually did quote the words of Adimantus in his refutations.⁸² This applies at least to all those passages in which Augustine provides us with a full and literal quotation of those texts from the Old and the New Testament that Adimantus believed did indeed contradict each other. We are entitled to draw this conclusion because Augustine sometimes corrected and criticized the wording in the text that was quoted by Adimantus.⁸³ Moreover, in several other passages Augustine seems to have automatically corrected the text as it is quoted by Adimantus. When, e.g., Adimantus quoted from the Gospel and Augustine used the same passage in his own argument, the wording of the quotation is sometimes different.⁸⁴ The precision when he is quoting Adimantus' writing goes at least for those passages where the

⁸² *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 64, 5 f.): '... uerba eius ponens eis que reddens responsonem meam.'

⁸³ *c. Adim.* 16 (CSEL 25,1: 162, 15 f.): '... non quidem sic scriptum est, ut Adimantus ponit. non enim nominat ibi sabbatum apostolus'; 28 (CSEL 25,1: 187, 22–26): 'in qua quaestione quaerendum est, quid ei uisum fuerit uel in illa usione Esaias binas alas praetermittere, quibus uolabant Seraphim dicentes: sanctus, sanctus, sanctus dominus deus sabaoth, uel in apostoli uerbis non totum dicere. nam dixit apostolus ...'. Decret believes that Augustine did not criticize the accuracy of the texts quoted by Adimantus; see e.g. his '*Adimantum (Contra—)*', 93: '... il ne discute pas l'authenticité des textes utilisés'; *L'Afrique*, I p. 100: 'On notera aussi que le prêtre catholique ne discute pas l'authenticité des textes utilisés par son adversaire'. It is remarkable that (in II 75 n. 43) Decret even mentioned *c. Adim.* 16 as an example: 'Remarquons toutefois—...—qu'Augustin ne conteste pas la citation de *Gal* 4, 10–11 ... Augustin n'insistera pas sur ce point: 'sed puta esse de sabbato dictum.' In this note 83, one can see that the opposite is true. Also cf. Augustine's remark in *c. Adim.* 17 (CSEL 25,1: 164, 9): 'his uerbis de ueteribus libris ita commemoratis ...'

⁸⁴ In *c. Adim.* 10 (CSEL 25,1: 134, 12 ff.) Adimantus quotes from the Gospel: '*non iurabis, neque per caelum, quia sedes dei est, neque per terram, quia scabellum est pedum eius*'. In *c. Adim.* 18 (CSEL 25,1: 173, 4 f.), Augustine also refers to this verse: ' *nolite iurare neque per caelum quia thronus eius est, neque per terram quia scabellum est pedum eius*'. In *c. Adim.* 20 (CSEL 25,1: 178, 3 ff.) Adimantus reads: '*stulte, hac nocte a te animam tuam expetam; quae autem praeparasti, cuius erunt?*' Whereas Augustine quotes this texts in 9 (CSEL 25,1: 133, 8 f.) with a slight difference: '*stulte, hac nocte auferetur a te anima tua; haec quae praeparasti cuius erunt?*' In *c. Adim.* 25 (CSEL 25,1: 183, 23 ff.) Adimantus' quotation reads as follows: '*in resurrectione a mortuis neque nubent neque uxores ducent neque morientur sed sunt ut angeli dei*'. Augustine alludes to the same verse in *c. Adim.* 12 (CSEL 25,1: 141, 1 f.), but without *neque morientur*.

phrase *De eo quod scriptum est* can be found.⁸⁵ Sometimes the Bible texts are abbreviated, but it is doubtful whether this feature should be ascribed to Augustine alone, because there is good reason to suppose that in many cases it was already found in Adimantus' writing.⁸⁶ Therefore we may be certain that at least the quotations from the Bible, even in their wording, were taken from Adimantus' *Disputationes* indeed.

Nevertheless, it is still not entirely clear whether Augustine discussed all the texts quoted by Adimantus, because Augustine often interwove the words used by Adimantus in his own argument without first listing all Adimantus' biblical quotations. Therefore, as in chapter 18 and 20, passages quoted by Adimantus can sometimes be found at the end of the argument where one no longer expects to find them. *Contra Adimantum* 3 even provokes speculation about whether Adimantus quoted more fully than what we can find in Augustine's rendering. At the end of chapter 3, Augustine mentions *spadones* (= eunuchs), although in the texts already referred to these *spadones* were not mentioned at all. The chapter deals with marriage, so it is not entirely impossible that a passage such as *Mt.* 19:12 was quoted by Adimantus as well.

Besides, there could well be slight differences in the exactness of the rendering of Adimantus' words when we compare Augustine's answers in his sermons with his formal, written answers.⁸⁷

It is quite possible that the phrase *verba eius ponens* also qualifies *de eo, quod (in ...) scriptum est*. Almost every chapter starts with it, after which the quotations from the Old and the New Testament follow. The fact that Augustine reformulates the question—in order to clarify the point of the argument—gives us a good reason to think so.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ In some chapters Augustine uses an accusativus-cum-infinitivo to describe the texts quoted by Adimantus: 5 (2× quotation from the Gospel), 9, 12, 20 (citation from the apostle Paul), 22, 23 (quotation from the NT). However, even in those cases it is not possible to decide with certainty whether it was Augustine or Adimantus before him who is responsible for this feature.

⁸⁶ *c. Adim.* 1 (CSEL 25,1: 115, 3–5): 'De eo quod scriptum est: in principio fecit deus caelum et terram usque ad id quod scriptum est: et factum est uespere, et factum est mane dies unus'. See for other examples and a more profound analysis of Adimantus' renderings of the biblical texts, Ch. IV, Part B, sections 2 and 3.

⁸⁷ Cf. below Part D, section 2. *Sermons discussing 'Disputationes' refuted in Contra Adimantum as well.*

⁸⁸ *c. Adim.* 4 (CSEL 25,1: 122, 19f.): 'huic capitulo geneseos, quo maledictionem accepit Cain, ut terrae sterilitate puniretur ...'; 5 (CSEL 25,1: 124, 1–4): 'hunc locum Manichaei, quo scriptum est in genesi, hominem factum esse ad imaginem et similitudinem dei, ...'; 6 (CSEL 25,1: 126, 2f.): 'huic etiam loco, ubi de honorandis parentibus

As regards the *disputationes* refuted in *Contra Adimantum*, in every argument, with the exception of the last one, Adimantus presents a quotation from the Gospel which 'contradicts' a passage in the Old Testament. In the last chapter, only a quotation from the apostle Paul is mentioned. In five cases Adimantus quotes both from the Gospel⁸⁹ and from the apostle in order to demonstrate that there are contradictions between the Old Testament and the New Testament.⁹⁰

On occasions, Augustine cites—apart from Adimantus' biblical passages—some of Adimantus' arguments, at least in part. Recently, N.J. Baker-Brian published an overview of these arguments, which list he believed to be complete. His survey consists of three lines of reasoning he found in *Contra Adimantum* 10, 12 and 17.⁹¹ However, Baker-Brian's overview has some serious flaws. The first problem is that Baker-Brian's list certainly is not complete. For example, from *Contra Adimantum* 12 he only makes mention of the first argument concerning the blood and the soul⁹² but not the second one.⁹³ Apart from Adimantus' more convoluted arguments, Augustine regularly quotes some of the shorter arguments used by Adimantus to demonstrate the discrepancies between the Old and the New Testament. For example, in *Contra Adimantum* 1 Augustine says, concerning *Gen.* 1:

The most stupid Manichaeans consider this chapter of the Law to be contrary to the Gospel, saying: In *Genesis* it is written that God created

deus praecipit ...'; 8 (CSEL 25,1: 130, 10 ff.): 'huic loco Manichaei, quod in uetere lege par uindicta permittitur, et dicitur oculus pro oculo et dentem pro dente esse perdendum ...'

⁸⁹ In *Contra Adimantum* Augustine uses the singular form (*euangelium*) when he refers to the four Gospels. See chapter IV for a discussion of the methods and contents of the *Disputationes*.

⁹⁰ *c. Adim.* 1, 12, 14, 16, 25.

⁹¹ Baker-Brian, "... *quaedam disputationes Adimanti*"; 178 f.

⁹² *c. Adim.* 12 (CSEL 25,1: 138, 12–23): 'Si sanguis anima est, quomodo homines potestatem in eam non habent, cum de sanguine multa faciant siue excipientes et canibus uolucrisque in escam proponentes siue effundentes aut caeno lutoque miscentes? haec enim et alia innumerabilia sine difficultate homines de sanguine possunt facere. ideo isti quaerunt insultantes, quomodo, si sanguinis est anima, non possit hominis interfeutor nocere animae, cum tantam in eius sanguinem habeat potestatem.' Cf. Part F, *Disputatio* 12.

⁹³ *c. Adim.* 12 (CSEL 25,1: 139, 10–15): 'Insultare ergo ausus est populo Iudaeorum, quod secundum eorum intellectum, quo existimant sanguinem esse animam, parentum ipsorum animae, partim a serpentibus deuoratae, partim igne consumptae, partim in desertis atque asperis montium locis arefactae sint.' See Part F, *Disputatio* 12.

heaven and earth and light through himself, whereas in the Gospel it is written that the world was made through our Lord Jesus Christ . . .⁹⁴

Baker-Brian makes no mention of this kind of arguments, although these lines of reasoning sometimes contribute to our understanding of the form and intention of the *Disputationes*. Furthermore, as to the third argument mentioned by Baker-Brian, which he found in *Contra Adimantum* 17, it is doubtful whether this fragment should be ascribed to Adimantus. In Baker-Brian's translation it runs as follows:

Why have you ordered us to love our enemies (*Mt.* 5:44), and yet you require us to exact punishment from them (*Ex.* 23:22–24)?⁹⁵

When we take into account the context of this sentence and make some adjustments in the translation, it soon becomes clear that Adimantus could not have proposed it in this form. *Contra Adimantum* 17 is about the possible contradiction between Jesus' injunction to love one's enemies (*Mt.* 5:44) and the command in *Ex.* 23:22–24 to annihilate the inhabitants of Canaan.⁹⁶ In the section preceding the sentence quoted by Baker-Brian, Augustine names Jesus' parable of the widow and the unrighteous judge (*Lk.* 18:1–8) as an example that shows that Jesus also envisaged punishment for one's enemies.⁹⁷ Thereafter Augustine says:

They may venture to throw a question against this *passage* and say, if they can: How is it, that You have ordained that we should love our enemies and yet You determined to vindicate us against them? Or is He going to act against the wish of his holy ones with them, whom they love, in that He punishes and condemns (their enemies)?⁹⁸

This argument, which Baker-Brian believes to be of Adimantus, is only a hypothetical one and it originated in the mind of Augustine himself. It does not discuss a genuine antithesis between the Law and the Gospel (which is the usual *modus operandi* of Adimantus), but is in fact a

⁹⁴ *c. Adim.* 1 (CSEL 25,1: 115, 5–10): 'hoc capitulum legis aduersum esse euangelio stultissimi Manichaei arbitrantur dicentes in genesi scriptum esse, quod deus per se ipsum fecerit caelum et terram et lucem, in euangelio autem scriptum esse per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum fabricatum esse mundum.' See Part F for the entire reconstruction of the *Disputationes* and Ch. IV, Part D section 2. *Arguments quoted in full.*

⁹⁵ Baker-Brian, "... *quaedam disputationes Adimanti*", 179.

⁹⁶ See Part F, *Disputatio* 17.

⁹⁷ *c. Adim.* 17 (CSEL 25,1: 168, 18–27).

⁹⁸ *c. Adim.* 17 (CSEL 25,1: 168, 27 – 169, 4): huic isti audeant obicere quaestionem et dicant, si possunt: quid est, quod iussisti, ut inimicos nostros diligamus, et de illis nos uindicare disponis? an forte contra uoluntatem suorum sanctorum facturus est eoa, quos illi diligunt, puniendo atque damnando?

possible contradiction within the Gospel. It was Augustine's intention to demonstrate that the New Testament would ultimately contradict itself if it were to disagree with the Old Testament on the basis of the arguments proposed by Adimantus. In his defence of the Old Testament Augustine regularly followed this line of reasoning.⁹⁹

In the final paragraph of the present chapter, one may find a survey of what Augustine quoted from the *Disputationes*. In chapter IV, part D, section 2. *Arguments quoted in full*, the contents of Adimantus' arguments will be discussed.

D. *Disputationes disproved in sermons*

1. *Introduction*

Augustine discussed several of the disputations of Adimantus in his sermons.¹⁰⁰ In this section, an attempt will be made to identify which of Augustine's sermons are important in this context. Besides, we will consider the relevance of those sermons for the reconstruction of Adimantus' *Disputationes*.

At least five sermons must have been originally delivered with the purpose to refute Manichaean criticisms of the Scriptures. This can be deduced from the fact that Possidius, in his *Elenchus*, under the subtitle *Tractatus Adversus Memoratos* (= Manichaeos), has already identified no less than five sermons that Augustine originally delivered in response to the Manichaeans:

29. On: *In the beginning, God made heaven and earth, and: In the beginning was the Word.*
30. From what is written in Haggai the Prophet: *The gold is Mine and the silver is Mine, against those above.*

⁹⁹ E.g. c. *Adim.* 4 (CSEL 25,1: 123, 23 ff.): 'ut hoc modo, si possint, miseri intellegant et illa, quae detestantur in ueteri testamento de deo dicta usque adeo recta esse, ut etiam in nouo inueniatur, ...'; and c. *Adim.* 27 (CSEL 25,1: 187, 13 f.): 'qui autem oculo pio legit, et in nouo testamento inuenit quod isti accusant in uetere, en in uetere quod laudant in nouo.' Also cf. Part D, section 3. *Sermons discussing disputations not mentioned in Contra Adimantum.*

¹⁰⁰ See n. 2.

31. On the Day of the Lord according to Zephaniah the prophet, against those above.
32. On the spiritual offerings, against those above.
33. From what is written in Job: *Angels came in sight of God and the devil was in their midst*, and from the Gospel: *Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God*, against those above.¹⁰¹

Numbers 29, 30 and 33 turn out to be the sermons 1, 50 and 12. Both Decret and De Veer have already discussed them.¹⁰² The other two, *i.e.* 31 and 32, have not been identified with any of Augustine's sermons as yet.¹⁰³

Apart from the sermons already mentioned by Possidius, there are others in which Augustine refuted a *disputatio*. Scholars who studied this subject, such as Decret, De Veer and Bardy, have discussed some sermons that might have been delivered by Augustine to refute an argument from the *Disputationes*, but their suggestions are not very helpful.¹⁰⁴ However, with the help of a CD-ROM search on key words in *Contra Adiman-*

¹⁰¹ A. Wilmart (ed.), in: *MA*, vol. 2, Rome 1931, 149–233 (167): 29. De: In Principio fecit deus caelum et terram, et: In principio erat verbum; 30. Ex eo quod in Aggeo propheta scriptum est: Meum est aurum et meum est argentum, contra quos supra; 31. De die domini secundum Sophoniam prophetam contra quos supra; 32. De sacrificiis spiritualibus contra quos supra; 33. Ex eo quod in Iob scriptum est: Venerunt angeli in conspectu Dei et diabolus in medio eorum, et ex evangelio: beati mundo corde quia ipsi Deum videbunt, contra quos supra.

¹⁰² Cf. Decret, *L'Afrique*, II, 70 n. 8; A.C. de Veer, 'La date des sermons I, XII et L de saint Augustine', *REA* 15 (1969) 241–246.

¹⁰³ For these two sermons see Part E, section 2. *Contra Faustum*.

¹⁰⁴ Decret, *L'Afrique*, II, 70, n. 8, names *sermo* 152 and 153. G. Bardy, *Les Révisions* (BA 12), Paris 1950, mentions the *sermones* 50, 153 en 142 (in that order). De Veer ('La date des sermons I, XII et L', 243 n. 20) denies that Augustine directed s. 153 and s. 142 against Adimantus' work. S. 142 actually has nothing in common with *Contra Adimantum*. As regards to s. 152 and s. 153, it is also doubtful whether those sermons were directed especially against the *Disputationes*. In s. 152, Augustine gives an explanation of *Rom.* 7. He uses this occasion to confound the Manichaeans who insist that the Law is evil. However, nothing is said about a contradiction between the Old and the New Testament, which is typical of Adimantus' *Disputationes*. Probably Augustine attacks the Manichaeans in general and not particularly Adimantus. In s. 153 Augustine also discusses *Rom.* 7. He again defends the Law against the Manichaeans and says explicitly that Manichaeans assume that the Law and the Gospel contradict each other. Although this particular remark may have been made with Adimantus' work in mind, the context demonstrates quite clearly that Augustine's principal aim was to refute a mistaken exegesis of *Rom.* 7 by the Manichaeans. This sermon therefore provides us with no additional information.

tum,¹⁰⁵ we can identify even more sermons and writings of Augustine in which he discussed questions relating to Adimantus' *Disputationes*. Moreover, Dolbeau has edited some (parts of) rather recently found sermons¹⁰⁶ which we will also take into consideration.

The sermons studied here can be classified into three different categories. First, the sermons dealing with a similar disputation of Adimantus as are discussed in *Contra Adimantum*. In *sermo* 1, for example, Augustine discusses the same question as he had already commented upon in *Contra Adimantum* 1. The second consists of sermons in which Augustine refutes *disputationes* which had not been dealt with in *Contra Adimantum*. These sermons are of considerable importance, because they provide us with information about the *Disputationes* which cannot be found in *Contra Adimantum*. Some other sermons—they can be regarded as a third category—only have a short reference to Adimantus' work and methods. These sermons are of minor significance here, because they do not provide us with any new information about the subject matter of the *Disputationes*. The two other categories will be considered in the next two sections.

2. Sermons discussing disputations also refuted in *Contra Adimantum*

In both *sermo* 1 and *Contra Adimantum* 1, Augustine deals with the putative discrepancy between the first chapter of *Genesis* and the first

¹⁰⁵ Namely with *Cetedoc. Library of Christian Latin Texts*, CLCLT-2, Lovanii 1994. The words, *vet* test**, *vet* lib**, *vet* leg(x)**, *contrari**, *calumni**, *accusa**, *insidiar**, *manich(a)e** and *Adimant** have been searched for. The concept 'sermo' has been interpreted very widely. All the writings of Augustine which deal with questions of exegesis, have been examined. Research has been done on the following titles: *Adnotationes in Iob*, *De consensu evangelistarum*, *De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber*, *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim*, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, *De octo quaestionibus ex vetere Testamento*, *De sermone Domini in monte*, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, *Epistulae ad Romanos inchoata expositio*, *Expositio epistulae ad Galatas*, *Expositio quarundam propositionum ex Epistula ad Romanos*, *In Iohannis epistolam ad Parthos tractatus*, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus*, *Locutionum in Heptateuchum libri septem*, *Quaestiones evangeliorum*, *Quaestiones XVI in Matthaëum*, *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum libri septem*, *Sermones*. It is not possible to claim with certainty that all the sermons and treatises written in reaction to Adimantus have been identified. Augustine might have used other words as well in order to refute his opponent. In which case, however, it would be almost impossible to identify all the refutations or to demonstrate that Augustine originally wrote them in order to refute Adimantus. Furthermore, it is quite possible that not all of the sermons of Augustine have already been found. New fragments of sermons or even whole sermons are still being discovered.

¹⁰⁶ F. Dolbeau, *Augustin d'Hippone, Vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique. Retrouvés à Mayence, édités et commentés par F. Dolbeau*, Paris 1996.

chapter of *John*. Augustine's two refutations are not completely identical. Nevertheless, both arguments have much in common. Augustine's main argument in the sermon consists of the idea that the phrase *in principio* in *Genesis* should be construed as *per principium*, because Christ called Himself 'Principium' (*John* 8:25). Therefore those two texts should not be treated as if they were contradictory.¹⁰⁷

Most probably Augustine delivered the sermon before he wrote chapter 1 of *Contra Adimantum*,¹⁰⁸ because the line of reasoning in *Contra Adimantum* 1 is much more systematic than in the sermon. In *Contra Adimantum* 1 Augustine said that Adimantus should be refuted in three different ways, which he then proceeds to enumerate.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, in the sermon Augustine explains in great detail the reason why he was discussing this particular theme. This is missing in the first chapter of *Contra Adimantum*. When we take into account that Augustine discussed some of Adimantus' *Disputationes* twice because he had misplaced the first answer,¹¹⁰ then we may regard *Contra Adimantum* 1 as a second, more concise answer. Thus, Augustine may have written *Contra Adimantum* 1 as a substitute for the first answer.¹¹¹ Another possibility is that Augustine was not satisfied with the answer already given in the sermon and that he wrote a new one.

Whilst we are still on the subject of Adimantus' *disputatio*, we can also mention a remarkable difference between *Contra Adimantum* 1 and *sermo* 1. In the sermon Augustine treats the disagreement between *Gen.* 1:1 and *John* 1:1–3; in the first chapter of *Contra Adimantum*, however, Augustine discusses the putative contradiction between *Gen.* 1:1–5 on the one hand and *John* 1:10 in combination with *Col.* 1:15 f. on the other hand.¹¹² At first sight it is difficult to decide which of these two renderings of Adimantus' *disputatio* is the most exact. Nevertheless, the fact that Augustine explicitly says concerning *Contra Adimantum* that he was

¹⁰⁷ Cf. *s.* 2, 2 and 3.

¹⁰⁸ A. Kunzelmann, 'Die Chronologie der Sermones des hl. Augustinus', in: *MA*, vol. 2, 432, also opted for this possibility.

¹⁰⁹ *c. Adim.* 1 (CSEL 25,1: 115, 11 f.): 'tribus enim modis refelluntur. primo quia cum dicitur ...' (18 f.): 'deinde quia ubi dicitur, ...' (116, 4 f.): 'postremo, si propterea ...'

¹¹⁰ *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 64, 11 ff.): '... et in eo quibusdam quaestionibus non semel sed iterum respondi, quoniam quod primum responderam perierat et tunc inuentum est, cum iam iterum respondissem.'

¹¹¹ Cf. Part C section 1. *The Structure of Contra Adimantum*.

¹¹² De Veer, 'La date des sermons I, XII et L', 245, mentioned these differences, but not the fact that in *c. Adim.* 1 Augustine also discussed *Col.* 1:15 f. He argued that the direction in which Augustine wanted his answer to go, caused the differences.

quoting Adimantus' own words, means that *Contra Adimantum* must be the more precise rendering of the two texts quoted by Adimantus.¹¹³ Another indication confirming this supposition is that in *Contra Adimantum* 1 Augustine quoted from Adimantus' work *Gen.* 1:1–5 in the following way:

Concerning what is written: *In the beginning, God made heaven and earth;*
until what is written: *And it was evening and it was morning: the first day.*¹¹⁴

In the following argument, Augustine did not discuss the vers 5, which he quoted here, but was missed in the sermon. Like in s. 1, Augustine only considered the meaning of 'in the beginning, God made heaven and earth'. It is unlikely that Augustine should have taken the initiative to make the quotation longer than Adimantus intended it to be, whereas he did not discuss its contents. Furthermore, in a sermon, the preacher may be more inclined to mention only the most important line of a passage.

As to the different rendering of the quotation from *John* 1, it is also likely that *Contra Adimantum* 1 is a more precise rendering than the sermon. In the sermon Augustine discussed *John* 1:1–3. *John* 1 starts with the words 'In principio', just as in *Gen.* 1. It is quite probable that Augustine used *John* 1:1–3 instead of *John* 1:10 when addressing an audience, because their identical initial words are easily remembered. Furthermore, the first three verses of *John* could be treated as a summary of both *John* 1:10 and *Col.* 1:15 f.¹¹⁵ It is quite possible that in the sermon Augustine simplified the alleged contradiction between *Gen.* 1:1–5 and *John* 1:10 in combination with *Col.* 1:15 f. as it was found in the *Disputationes* and presented it as a contradiction between *Gen.* 1:1 and *John* 1:1–3.

In addition to the comparison between both of those answers, this sermon is also important because of its introduction. It indicates that Augustine started his refutation of the work of Adimantus because he once made a promise to his parish that he would do so.¹¹⁶

¹¹³ *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 64, 5): '... uerba eius ponens ...'

¹¹⁴ *c. Adim.* 1 (CSEL 25,1: 115, 3 ff.): 'De eo quod scriptum est: in principio fecit deus caelum at terram usque ad id quod scriptum est: et factum est uespere, et factum est mane dies unus.'

¹¹⁵ *c. Adim.* 1 (CSEL 25,1: 116, 9–15): 'quod autem etiam testimonium apostoli adiungunt, quod ait de domino nostro Iesu Christo: ipse est primogenitus totius creaturae; et omnia per ipsum facta sunt in caelis et in terris, uisibilia et inuisibilia et hoc capitulum aduersum esse dicunt genesi, ubi deus ita dicitur fecisse mundum, ut specialiter filius ibi non sit nominatus, uehementer errant.'

¹¹⁶ s. 1, 1 (CCL 41: 3, 10–14): 'Memini me fuisse pollicitum caritati uestrae, aduersus

In addition to *sermo* 1, two sermons from the ‘Mainzer Stadtbibliothek’ recently edited by Dolbeau, are highly relevant.¹¹⁷ In these sermons Augustine examines an alleged contradiction between the Old and the New Testament almost identical with those found in *Contra Adimantum*. The relationship between the Old and the New Testament, however, is not the main subject of those sermons, because Augustine only discusses the matter *en passant*.

One sermon is about the duty to honour one’s parents and not to despise them.¹¹⁸ Halfway through his argument, Augustine discusses an antithesis between the Old and the New Testament in the light of the question whether parents should be honoured or despised. This issue is also discussed in *Contra Adimantum* 6.¹¹⁹ In the sermon Augustine says:

... or—as the men of vanity put it: ‘Is it not another who gave the Law and another who propagated the Gospel? For in the Law it is written: *Honour your father and your mother* (Ex. 20:12), but in the Gospel: *Everyone who has not hated his father and his mother* (Lk. 9:59f.)’ Impossible! The one who gave the law and propagated the Gospel is one and the same person and surely not another. You know the Lord: He determined the times of the precepts in such a way that He did not ordain that which is contradictory. For, if you should think that the injunction that we must honour our father and mother, which is already read in the Old Testament, contradicts the injunction in the Gospel: [consider this] in the same Old Testament, it was written so that it would agree with the evangelical precept which we heard when what follows was read: *He who says to his father and mother: ‘I have not known you’, and he who did not recognize his sons, he has commemorated My covenant* (Dt. 33:9).¹²⁰

manicheorum stultas perniciosasque calumnias, quibus Veteri Testamento insidiantur, responsonem per nos non defuturam, quantum dominus donare dignatur.’

¹¹⁷ See n. 106.

¹¹⁸ Dolbeau, *Vingt-six sermons*, 84–99.

¹¹⁹ Cf. below Part F, *Disputatio* 6.

¹²⁰ Dolbeau, *Vingt-six sermons*, 94 (129–141): ‘... an—sicut quidam vani putant—alius est qui legem dedit et alius est qui evangelium propaguit, quoniam in lege scriptum est: *Honora patrem et matrem*, in evangelio: *Quisquis non oderit patrem et matrem?* Absit! Ipse est et legis lator et evangelii propagator ipse et omnino. Tu agnosce dominum: ne contraria praeciperet, tempora praeceptis distribuit. Nam si putas praeceptum quod iubemur honorare patrem et matrem, quia in veteri testamento prius legitur, contrarium esse praecepto evangelico, in eodem veteri testamento scriptum est tale aliquid quale in evangelio modo cum legeretur audivimus: *Qui dicit patri et matri: Non novi vos, et qui filios suos non agnoscit, ipse cogitavit testamentum meum.*’

Although the quotation from the Gospel differs from the one given in *Contra Adimantum* 6,¹²¹ it is quite obvious that Augustine must have had the same *disputatio* in mind when he discussed the contradiction between the Old and the New Testament in the liturgy. This can be deduced from the fact that both here and in *Contra Adimantum* 6 Augustine—in order to prove that the Old Testament contains the same prescriptions as the New—quotes the Old Testament passage which states that he who disregards his own family is actually maintaining God's covenant.¹²² Furthermore, immediately before the discussion of the antithesis between the Old and the New Testament, Augustine mentions a quotation from the Epistles containing an injunction to honour one's parents (*Eph.* 6:2 f.) as well.¹²³ This apostolic pronouncement is also mentioned in *Contra Adimantum* 6 in order to demonstrate the congruence between the Old and the New Testament.¹²⁴ So, Augustine uses precisely the same strategy in *Contra Adimantum* and the sermon. Furthermore, the fact that the contradiction which Augustine discussed in the sermon, is not between *Lk.* 9:59 f. and *Ex.* 20:12 as it is in *Contra Adimantum* 6, but between *Ex.* 20:12 and *Lk.* 14:26 f., has a natural reason. The subject of the sermon is *Lk.* 14:26 f., which passage obviously has the same message as *Lk.* 9:59 f., namely that parents take second place to the Kingdom of God.

The other sermon in Dolbeau's collection to be mentioned here, is the one about the woman who was healed after an illness which lasted eighteen years (*Lk.* 8:43–49), and the people who were crushed to death when a tower fell down upon them (*Lk.* 13:1–5).¹²⁵ In the sermon, Augustine discusses the alleged discrepancy between a passage from the Old Testament and another from the New. Augustine's argument closely resembles *Contra Adimantum* 8:

¹²¹ There the contradiction is between *Honora patrem tuum et matrem tuam* and the refusal of Jesus to allow the burial of one's father (*Lk.* 9:59 f.). See *c. Adim.* 6 (CSEL 25,1: 126, 1–8).

¹²² *c. Adim.* 6 (CSEL 25,1: 126, 26 – 127, 1): 'nam et in scriptures ueteribus habes positum: qui dicit patri aut matri non noui uos, et filios suos non agnoscit, ipse congnouit testamentum tuum.'

¹²³ Dolbeau, *Vingt-six sermons*, 93, 123 ff.

¹²⁴ *c. Adim.* 6 (CSEL 25,1: 126, 11–13): 'nam si uetere testamento contrarium est euangelium propter istam sententiam, incipit etiam apostolo esse contrarium, qui et filios monet, ut honorent parentes, et parentes ut diligant filios.'

¹²⁵ Dolbeau, *Vingt-six sermons*, 133–147.

An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, etc (Dt. 19:21). The Law has prescribed that everyone has to settle the things he has caused. On the other hand, when the Gospel says: *I say to you: Love your enemies* (Mt. 5:44), this is not said against the Law. Thus not a few are thinking that the mildness of the Gospel is in contradiction with hardness of the Law, as they falsely understand it. That is not correct. The Law shows how much you are in debt. The Gospel does not make you free of guilt, unless the Law has shown you that you are a debtor.¹²⁶

In *Contra Adimantum* 8 the alleged contradiction is between ‘an eye for an eye etc.’ and what Jesus says about this in the ‘Sermon on the Mount’ (Mt. 5:38 ff.).¹²⁷ In his sermon Augustine does refer to another passage from the ‘Sermon on the Mount’. Nevertheless, the main thrust of these two texts does not differ very much. So it is not inconceivable that Augustine, when referring to Adimantus’ *Disputationes*, made a trivial mistake when he quoted a text from the Gospel which differed slightly from the one Adimantus had already cited.

In all likelihood Augustine did not intend to deliver a comprehensive criticism of one of the *Disputationes* in these two sermons. The subject matter of the sermon could well have evoked strong associations with the discussion of the *Disputationes* which induced Augustine to consider it. Although the two sermons from the ‘Mainzer Stadtbibliothek’ do not provide us with new information, they are not irrelevant, because they clearly demonstrate the impact of the *Disputationes* on Augustine’s ministry as a preacher.

The influence of this struggle with Adimantus’ *Disputationes* can also be found in other sermons.¹²⁸ On occasions, Augustine brings up ideas

¹²⁶ Dolbeau, *Vingt-six sermons*, 147 (184–190): ‘*Oculum pro oculo, dentem pro dente*, etc. Statuit lex ut quisque quod fecerit patiat. Contra, evangelium cum dicit: *Ego dico vobis, diligite inimicos vestros*, non contra legem dicit, quomodo nonnulli male intellegentes opinantur quod evangelii mansuetudo contraria est legis asperitati. Non est sic. Lex, quid tibi debeatur, ostendit. Evangelium non te faceret remissorem, nisi ut lex tibi ostenderet debitorem.’

¹²⁷ *c. Adim.* 8 (CSEL 25,1: 130, 9–19). Cf. below Part F, *disputatio* 8.

¹²⁸ Cf. e.g. *en. Ps.* 34, s. 1. 7. There Augustine discusses the antithesis between temporal and eternal blessings. This question is also dealt with in *c. Adim.* 20 and 23. When Augustine identifies his opponents, he uses language which suggests that he must have been writing against the Manichaeans (CCL 38: 304, 1–5): ‘Sunt qui dicunt: Deus bonus, magnus, summus, invisibilis, aeternus, incorruptibilis, uitam aeternam nobis daturus est et illam incorruptionem quam in resurrectione promisit; ista uero saecularia et temporalia ad daemones pertinent, et ad potestates illas harum tenebrarum.’ This discription of

and arguments which are almost identical with those used in *Contra Adimantum*, but without any trace of polemics.¹²⁹ So it is well conceivable that the struggle with Adimantus' explanation of Holy Scripture provided Augustine with some weapons he could use in other situations. The similarities between the arguments in the sermons and the *Contra Adimantum* are of relevance to determine the precise date of these sermons, but they do not add anything new to what we already know about Adimantus' *Disputationes*. Therefore, it is not necessary to discuss those sermons on this occasion, because they do not give us new material for reconstructing the *Disputationes*.

3. Sermons discussing disputations not mentioned in *Contra Adimantum*

At least five sermons should be mentioned in which Augustine discusses a question parallel to, but not identical with, the arguments refuted in *Contra Adimantum*. In some cases Augustine obviously delivers his sermon—at least in part—in order to refute Adimantus, because he explicitly mentions his name. In other cases, however, Augustine makes no mention of the name of his opponent. This means that we must examine whether the antithesis did originate from Adimantus' *Disputationes*.

In the following section we will deal with sermons 12 and 50 (which have already been mentioned);¹³⁰ with sermons 2, 71 and 82; and with a sermon from the *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, i.e. the sermon on *Psalm* 145. Furthermore, the new collection of Dolbeau contains another sermon that could well have been delivered in order to refute a disputation of Adimantus. This sermon will be discussed at the end of this section.

God is reminiscent of Manichaean theology, as is his description of the darkness. Moreover, Augustine applies the same arguments to refute his opponents in the sermon that he had already used in *Contra Adimantum*.

¹²⁹ In *c. Adim.* 24 Augustine explains *Prov.* 6: 6 ff. in this way: the ant who collects food for the winter is the believing person who collects the word of God in good times. This explanation can also be found in *en. Ps.* 36; s. II, 11; 61, 16; XLVIII, s. I, 12; 66, 3. In *s. dom. m.* I, 20 (62 ff.), corporal punishment and the penalty of temporary death are discussed. Here Augustine uses almost the same argument as in *c. Adim.* 17, i.e. the apostles, just like Elijah, called for fire from heaven to punish the wicked (*Lk.* 9:54/2 *Ki.* 1); a citation from the *Acts of Thomas* about the man who was torn to pieces by a lion on account of Thomas; and, from the biblical *Acts of the Apostles*, the punishment of Ananias and Sapphira by Peter (*Acts* 5:1–11).

¹³⁰ See n. 102.

a. *Sermo* 12

Sermo 12 is certainly aimed against Adimantus' opinions, because Augustine mentions Adimantus explicitly.¹³¹ Apparently this sermon was a later one in his confrontation with the opinions of Adimantus, because in the introduction to the sermon, Augustine claims that he had already demonstrated satisfactorily that the Manichaeans acted deceitfully in their attacks on the Old Testament.¹³²

The subject of this sermon is the alleged contradiction between *Job* 1:6 (where it is said that the devil came into the sight of God and saw Him) and three passages from the New Testament: *Mt.* 5:8, which states that only those who are pure in heart shall see God; *John* 10:9/14:6, where it is said that Christ is the door to the Father; and the testimony of the apostle who says that neither principalities, nor authorities, nor yet powers have ever known God (cf. *Eph.* 3:10).¹³³ *Sermo* 12 is very interesting, because Augustine quotes the line of reasoning that Adimantus used when he formulated the contradiction between the Old and New Testament. Augustine calls it a syllogism:

If it is indeed the case, that only the pure in heart can see God, how could the devil have seen God with his utterly sordid and unclean heart? Or, how could he have entered the door, that is through Christ?¹³⁴

In the following sections of the sermon Augustine uses two different strategies in order to defend the Old Testament. First, he insists that the

¹³¹ s. 12, 2 (CCL 41: 166, 33–35): ‘Sed primo ab istis uellem quaerere, ubi Adimantus apud apostolum legerit—nam talium calumniarum iste conscriptor est—...’

¹³² s. 12, 1 (CCL 41: 165, 8–11): ‘In diuinis et sanctis ueteribus libris fraudulentissima fallacia manicheos insidiari, iam uestrae prudentiae, dilectissimi fratres, satis probatum esse confidimus. Offerimus tamen adhuc eorum dolos inspiciendos obtutibus cordis uestrae ...’

¹³³ idem (CCL 41: 165, 14–28): ‘“Apud Iob scriptum est”, inquit: “Ecce uenerunt angeli in conspectum dei, et diabolus in medio eorum. Et deus ait diabolo: Vnde uenis? qui respondens dixit: Circuiens totum orbem adueni.” “Hic”, inquit, “demonstratur diabolum non solum uidisse deum, sed etiam locutum esse cum eo. In euangelio autem dicit: Beati qui puro sunt corde, quoniam ipsi deum uidebunt. Et iterum dicit: Ego sum ianua, nemo potest uenire ad patrem, nisi per me.” ... “Iterum apostolus”, inquit, “testatur et confirmat dicens, quod neque principes, neque potestates, neque uirtutes deum cognouerunt.”

¹³⁴ idem (CCL 41: 165, 22–26): Deinde adiugunt ratiocinationem, dicentes: “Si igitur hi soli qui sunt puro corde uident deum, quoniam modo sordidissimo et immundissimo corde diabolus potuit uidere deum? Aut qualiter ianuam, hoc est, per Christum ingreditur?”

devil did not actually see God, although in *Job* it is said explicitly that the devil was indeed in sight of God ('in conspectum Dei'), together with the angels. Augustine explains this apparent discrepancy by saying that the phrase should be construed thus, that the devil was seen by God, but that he himself did not actually see God. In this way, the phrase in *Job* that says that the devil came in sight of God is not in contradiction with the New Testament.¹³⁵ After this explanation and a discussion on the question as to how God can communicate both with righteous people and sinners, Augustine attacks the opinions of the Manichaeans: they themselves believed that sinners saw Christ, for the devil is able to see the sun, which the Manichaeans consider as a kind of god¹³⁶ and the race of darkness had seen the divine substance before they were intermingled.¹³⁷ Consequently, Augustine concludes that it was ultimately the teachings of the Manichaeans that contradicted those New Testament texts quoted by Adimantus. When we look at Augustine's lines of reasoning, *sermo* 12 gives us—apart from additional information regarding the *Disputationes*—some useful knowledge about Manichaeism as well as Augustine's acquaintance with it.¹³⁸

b. *Sermo* 50

As to *sermo* 50, it can be concluded that it was delivered as a reaction to Adimantus' work, although his name was not mentioned. Augustine refers to the Manichaeans in general¹³⁹ and he discusses an alleged contradiction between a text from the Old and two from the New Testament in this sermon. Augustine quotes the 'quaestio' or 'accusatio' in full. He explicitly says before and after the question that it was in this precise

¹³⁵ See. s. 12, 2.

¹³⁶ This argument that, according to the Manichaean teachings about the sun, even sinners can see the divine substance, is also found in *en. Ps.* 25. In *En. II. sermo ad plebem* where Augustine says (cap. 3), explaining in which manner Christ is the Light (*CCL* 38: 143, 12 f.): 'non iste sol qui adoratur a paganis et Manichaeis, et uidetur etiam a peccatoribus.' Both sermons may have been delivered in the same period.

¹³⁷ Cf. s. 12, 8–12.

¹³⁸ Many polemical arguments of Augustine against the Christology of the Manichaeans are found: s. 12, 8–12.

¹³⁹ Namely in s. 50, 1 (*CCL* 41: 625, 4): 'De Aggeo propheta manichei calumniantur'; 7 (*CCL* 41: 129 f.): 'quem certe idem manichei ...'; 9 (*CCL* 41: 630, 175 f.): 'Quamquam manicheos proprio more prophetis dictis calumniari manifestum sit.'

way that the question was formulated.¹⁴⁰ This provides us with another fragment from Adimantus' *Disputationes*:

'In Haggai the prophet,' they say, 'it is written: *The gold is Mine and the silver is Mine* (*Hag.* 2:9). In the Gospel, however, our Redeemer called Mammon a species of unrighteousness (cf. *Lk.* 16:9). As regards its use, the blessed apostle, when writing to Timothy, says: *The love of money is the root of all evil: which, while some coveted after it, they have erred from the faith and pierced themselves with many sorrows* (*1 Tim.* 6:10).¹⁴¹

Augustine solves this problem by explaining how it comes about that silver and gold ultimately belong to the Lord. He also insists that the possession of gold is not wrong in itself but, rather, the abuse of it.

c. *Sermo* 2

Sermo 2 is of interest, because it contains an argument which is reminiscent of the discussions in *Contra Adimantum*. The subject matter is the temptation of Abraham by God as it is related in *Gen.* 22. In caput II Augustine considers the argument that it is inappropriate to claim that God tempts man:

Is God so ignorant of the facts, so unaware of the human heart, that He can only discover what is in man by tempting him?¹⁴²

Augustine describes the people against whom he directed his explanation, in the following terms:

Accordingly, brethren, in the first place, on account of those people who turn against the old Law, the Holy Scripture—for many people, who do not want to understand, are more swift in their wish to deride things that

¹⁴⁰ s. 50, 1 (*CCL* 41: 625, 8f.): 'ita proponunt quaestionem' and (*CCL* 41: 625, 15–18): 'Haec ipsorum est propositio quaestionis, uel potius ueterum scripturarum, per quas euangelium praenuntiatum est, ex ipso euangelio quod per eas praenuntiatum est, accusatio.'

¹⁴¹ s. 50, 1 (*CCL* 41: 625, 9–15): 'In Aggeo, inquit, 'propheta scriptum est: *Meum est aurum, et meum est argentum*; in euangelio autem, saluator noster *mammona* huius modi *iniquitatis* speciem appellauit, de cuius usu beatus apostolus ad Timotheum scribens: *Radix autem omnium malorum, inquit, et auaritia: quam quidam appetentes, auersi sunt a fide, et inseruerunt se doloribus multis*.' It is remarkable that the order gold-silver in the text used by the Manichaeans is the inverse of what we find in BHS and LXX, where first the silver and then the gold are mentioned. In the sermon, Augustine reversed that order to bring it into line with what we find in the dominant text tradition in 9 (*CCL* 41: 630, 177f.): 'inueniet non de hoc argento uel auro ...'

¹⁴² s. 2, 2 (*CCL* 41: 10, 52 ff.): 'Sic ergo ignarus est deus rerum, sic nescius cordis humani, ut temptando hominem inueniat?'

they do not understand than to examine those things and they are not humble examiners but arrogant accusers—on account of them, who want to accept the Gospel and reject the old Law, who think that it is possible to be on God's way and walk along it on one leg—therefore they are not wise scribes who bring forth old and new treasures—thus, on account of people like them, this question is to be answered first, so that they should not conceal themselves anywhere, or if they are not here, that anyone who is here, should have anything to answer people like them.¹⁴³

Several lines further on Augustine says that those people would never come to Christ as long as they maintained their fantastic Christological conceptions, because they do not honour Christ as He is preached in the Gospel. Rather, they venerate a concept of Christ which they contrived for themselves. According to Augustine, this means that they wear two disguises: one is their innate stupidity and the other their perverse opinion.¹⁴⁴

It is quite likely that Augustine directs this passage against the Manichaeans. They certainly rejected the Old Testament and insisted that they did indeed accept the New. They also had a Christology which differed from the Christology of the Catholics. Furthermore, Augustine also deals with the question of the putative ignorance of God in his *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos*.¹⁴⁵

It is, however, less certain whether Augustine directs this part of the sermon against Adimantus' *Disputationes*. The primary reason for the discussion of the subject was the reading of the Scriptures and it can not be ascertained that Augustine chooses this passage from Scripture

¹⁴³ idem (CCL 41: 10 f., 54–65): 'Primo itaque, fratres, propter illos qui aduersantur legi ueteri, scripturae sanctae; qui nonnulli, non intelligentes citius uolunt exagitare quod non intellegunt, quam quaerere ut intellegant; et non sunt humiles inquisitores, sed superbi calumniatores; propter hos ergo qui euangelium uolunt accipere et legem ueterem respuere; putantes in uia dei posse se esse, et recte uno pede ambulare, quoniam non sunt scribae eruditi in regno dei, qui proferunt de thesauro suo noua et uetera, propter hos ergo tales, ne qui forte hic lateant, aut et si hic non sunt, habeant qui adsunt quid talibus respondeant, breuiter soluenda est ista quaestio.'

¹⁴⁴ idem (CCL 41: 11, 77–83): 'Sed quia non transierunt ad Christum, in suo fantasmate remanserunt. Non enim colunt Christum, qualis praedicatur ex euangelio; sed qualem sibi ipsi finxerunt. Propterea super uelamen stultitiae suae naturalis, addunt alterum uelamen peruersae opinionis. Et quando per duplex uelamen poterit uideri quod lucet in euangelio?'

¹⁴⁵ *Gn. adu. Man.* II, XVI, 24 (CCL 91: 146, 22–25): 'Itaque iam interrogatur Adam non deo nesciente ubi esset, sed cogente ad confessionem peccati; non enim et dominus Iesus Christus tam multa quae interrogabat nesciebat.'

on purpose.¹⁴⁶ Furthermore, no quotation from the New Testament is mentioned which disagrees with anything in *Gen. 22*.

On the other hand, it is very relevant that Augustine, when describing his opponents, attributes so much importance to their critical attitude to the Old Testament. Apart from that, a chapter commenting on an ignorant God would not be inconceivable in Adimantus' *Disputationes*, because many of his *Disputationes* deal with the so-called inferior God of the Old Testament who, according to Adimantus, stands in sharp contrast with the God of the New Testament.¹⁴⁷ In *sermo 2* Augustine also uses words such as (arrogant) accuser which are frequently found in *Contra Adimantum*.¹⁴⁸ Another clue which confirms the hypothesis that this caput from *sermo 2* was originally directed towards Adimantus, is the counter-argument of Augustine. Augustine quotes a passage from the New Testament in order to demonstrate that there is no antithesis between the Old Testament and the New, namely *John 6* where it is written that Christ tempted his disciples, although He already knew what He was going to do (*John 6:5 f.*).¹⁴⁹ In *Contra Adimantum*, Augustine frequently employed the same strategy in order to refute the objections of his opponent.¹⁵⁰

Having considered all the relevant arguments, we can conclude that in s. 2, Augustine contradicts Manichaeic criticisms of the Old Testament resembling the theme of the *Disputationes*. In all probability, the subject of the sermon brought back memories of a debate about the putative contradiction between a passage in the Old Testament about divine

¹⁴⁶ s. 2,1 (CCL 41: 9, 1 f.): 'Notissima pietas patris nostri Abrahae reddita nobis est in memoriam per recentem lectionem.'

¹⁴⁷ Cf. below Ch. IV, Part D, section 1. *Subjects of the Disputationes*.

¹⁴⁸ In *Contra Adimantum* the term 'calumni*' occurs 17 times to give a description of the habit of Adimantus. E.g., in c. *Adim.* 2 (CSEL 25,1: 116, 25 f.): 'huic etiam loco Manichaei calumniam mouent, et dicunt nouo testamento aduersari quod in genesi scriptum est ...', and in 3 (CSEL 25,1: 118, 19 f.): 'huic rursus loco Manichaei calumniantur dicentes contra nouum testamentum esse.' While at the end of the third chapter (CSEL 25,1: 122, 13) it is said that the Holy Scriptures do not need 'superbos accusatores, sed diligentes et pios lectores'. Possidius also noticed the word *calumni**, because in his *Elenchus* he calls *Contra Adimantum: Contra Adimanti calumnias quaestiones diversae numero viginti octo* (ed. Wilmart, in: *MA*, vol. 1, 165).

¹⁴⁹ s. 2,2 (CCL 41: 11, 86–90): 'Ubi enim legimus temptantem Christum? Euangelium loquitur. Ait: Inquit Philippo, Habetis panes. Date illis manducare. Et sequitur euangelista: Hoc autem dicebat, temptans eum; ipse enim sciebat quid esset facturus.'

¹⁵⁰ See n. 99.

temptation and a testimony from the New Testament. Unfortunately, it is not possible to identify precisely which passages were quoted in order to establish this argument.¹⁵¹

d. *Sermo* 71

In *s.* 71 Augustine discusses the sin against the Holy Spirit (*Mk.* 3:28 f.). He mentions the various meanings of the word 'temptation' as an example to demonstrate that not every blasphemy has the same effects, because identical words could still have different meanings:

Because, like this, which is said: *God does not tempt (tentat) anybody (Jas. 1:13)*. It should not be construed as God does not tempt at all, but that He does not tempt in a certain way. Therefore, it is not false which is said: *The Lord your God proves (tentat) you (Dt. 13:3)*; and we are not urged to deny that Christ is God, or to say that the Gospel is wrong where we read that He asked His disciple, proving (tentans) him, because He knew what He would do (*John 6:5 f.*). Because, it is the temptation leading to sin with which God tempts nobody, and it is the temptation which proves the belief that God allows Himself to use. The same way, when we hear, *Anyone who blasphemes the Holy Spirit (Mk. 3:29)*, we need not to understand it as every kind of blasphemy, just like here, it is not meant as every kind of *tentatio*.¹⁵²

Augustine's treatment of this example presupposes that he had already considered the problem of divine temptation, and also that his hearers were well aware of this discussion, because this example does not consist of a single quotation which could have been used without thorough consideration. It is not entirely germane to the subject, even though it is a well-structured argument. Therefore it is quite likely that Augustine had already discussed the putative contradiction between *Dt.* 13:3 and *Jas.* 1:13. It is equally possible that it had already been put forward by Adimantus. Unfortunately, however, this is not completely clear by textual evidence.

¹⁵¹ Cf. below the discussion on *sermo* 71. It is equally possible that this criticism of *Gen.* 22 originated in another work of Adimantus; cf. Ch. V, Part B.

¹⁵² *s.* 71, 15 (*RB* 75 (1965) 79f.: 319–328): 'Sicut enim in eo quod dictum est *Deus neminem tentat*, non omni, sed quodam tentationis modo deus neminem tentare intelligendus est, ne falsum sit illud, quod scriptum est *Tentat uos dominus deus uester*, et ne Christum negemus deum, uel dicamus falsum euangelium, ubi legimus quia interrogabat discipulum tentans eum, ipse sciebat quid esset facturus—est enim tentatio adducens peccatum, qua deus neminem tentat; et est tentatio probans fidem, qua et deus tentare dignatur—ita, cum audimus *Qui blasphemauerit in spiritum sanctum*, non omne blasphemandi genus debemus accipere, sicut nec ibi omne tendandi.'

It may be argued against the claim that Augustine develops this line of thought against a disputation of Adimantus that the latter did not quote from *James* in any other passage. On the other hand, *Dt.13:3* is a passage from the Pentateuch dealing with the 'bad God' (so-called) of the Old Testament. This theme is discussed in many other chapters in the *Disputationes*.¹⁵³ Another point in favour of this argument is Augustine's line of reasoning. In *Contra Adimantum* Augustine regularly quoted a passage from the New Testament which has the same 'bad' things as those criticized in the text of the Old Testament, in order to demonstrate that, if the Old Testament is indeed in opposition to the New Testament for the reason alleged by Adimantus, then the New Testament must ultimately be self-contradictory.¹⁵⁴ In this particular sermon Augustine develops this line of thought the other way around. Neither of those two possibilities can be completely excluded, but I am inclined to accept that this contradiction was found in the *Disputationes* as well.

e. *Sermo* 82

Sermo 82 includes a discussion of the putative contradiction between a passage from the Old Testament and another from the New. Therefore, it is of relevance to discuss it in this section. The subject of the sermon is *Mt. 18:15*. Here it is said that, if one brother sins against another, the problem should be solved by mutual agreement. In caput V (8) Augustine refers to the first reading from the Scripture during the service, namely from *Prov. 10*. The tenth verse reads as follows:

He who deceitfully winks with his eyes heaps sadness upon people, he who has accused publicly, caused peace (*Prov. 10:10*).¹⁵⁵

Augustine is aware of the discrepancy between both passages, and some lines further he says:

Because if any unskilled insulter of the Holy Scriptures should say: Look here, both Testaments contradict each other. The Lord says: 'Reprimand him between you and him alone' (*Mt. 18:15*). Solomon says: 'He who has made an accusation in public, caused peace' (*Prov. 10:10*). So does God not know what He requires?¹⁵⁶

¹⁵³ Cf. Ch. IV, Part D, section 1. *Subjects of the Disputationes*.

¹⁵⁴ See n. 99.

¹⁵⁵ s. 82, V (8) (*PL* 38: 509): '*Annuens oculis cum dolo, congerit hominibus moestiam: qui autem arguit palam, pacem facit.*'

¹⁵⁶ s. 82, V (8) (*PL* 38: 509): '*Si enim aliquis imperitus et calumniator divinarum*

One may wonder whether it was fortuitous that both readings from Scripture were read during precisely the same service. Or that it was done deliberately. If the first possibility is correct then a well-known pattern can be found in this sermon, because Augustine follows precisely the same procedure he used elsewhere. If the second possibility is correct, we have identified yet another passage from the Old Testament excoriated by Adimantus. This putative contradiction, moreover, is not easy to find, because it requires a thorough knowledge of the Old Testament. Furthermore, it also demonstrates that Adimantus must also have been familiar with the Syriac or the LXX-tradition,¹⁵⁷ because only with those text traditions is it possible to establish a kind of contradiction with *Mt.* 18:15, for the simple reason that the Hebrew text tradition of *Prov.* 10:10 differs markedly from both the LXX and the Syriac versions.¹⁵⁸

Against the position that the argument was given in reaction to one of Adimantus' disputations, it can be argued that the introduction to this question in the sermon seems to be quite spontaneous and does not appear to have any special axe to grind:

As these things are thus, what does it mean what Solomon says, which we heard in the other reading today: 'He who deceitfully winks with his eyes heaps sadness upon people, he who has made an accusation in public, caused peace' (*Prov.* 10:10). If we have to accuse openly in order to cause peace, how can it be done by two persons mutually?¹⁵⁹

On the other hand, it can be mentioned that placing the Old and the New Testament in opposite of each other and mocking God, and further Augustine's use of the verb 'calumniari' to describe this procedure, are identical with those features in *Contra Adimantum*.¹⁶⁰ Augustine's counter-argument in the sermon also has parallels with the way he refuted the *Disputationes*. He cites a passage of the apostle Paul which

Scripturarum diceret, Ecce ubi sibi contradicunt duo Testamenta. Dominus dicit, *Corripe illum inter te et ipsum solum*. Salomon dicit, *Qui arguit palam, pacem facit*. Ergo nescit Dominus quid praecepit?

¹⁵⁷ Cf. pp. 64 f.

¹⁵⁸ The BHS has: קָרַץ עֵין יָתֵן עֲצָבָת וְאוֹרֵל שְׁפִתָּיִם יִלְבֹּט, which is found in the Vulgate as well: 'qui annuit oculo dabit dolorem stultus labiis verberabitur'. The LXX and the Syriac versions have texts parallel to that found in s. 82.

¹⁵⁹ s. 82, V (8) (*PL* 38: 509): 'Haec cum ita sint, quid est quod ait Salomon, quod hodie ex alia lectione primitus audivimus: *Annuens oculis cum dolo, congerit hominibus moestiam: qui autem arguit palam, pacem facit?* Si ergo *qui arguit palam, pacem facit*; quomodo, *Corripe illum inter se et ipsum solum?*'

¹⁶⁰ Concerning the mockery of God as an important topic in *Contra Adimantum*, see above, p. 29; cf. as well n. 139.

has the same meaning as the quotation from *Proverbs*. Then he says that we would expect the testimony of Paul to contradict *Mt.* 18:15 as well, if Adimantus were right and a contradiction in the New Testament is impossible.¹⁶¹ As already said, this refutation strategy occurs quite frequently in *Contra Adimantum*.¹⁶² The fact that so much attention is given to Paul in this particular *caput*,¹⁶³ suggests that the rebuttal of this contradiction was more than a simple preparatory exercise, but rather, that it had an anti-Manichaean thrust as well. Furthermore, another argument which supports the hypothesis that the content of the contradiction did come from Adimantus' *Disputationes* is that Adimantus knew the book *Proverbs*. For example, in *Contra Adimantum* 24 Augustine tells us that *Prov.* 6:6 ff. had been used by Adimantus for polemical purposes.¹⁶⁴ Furthermore, Adimantus also cited another text from *Mt.* 18. This confirms that he also knew this chapter.¹⁶⁵ Therefore the antithesis discussed in this sermon could well have been taken from the *Disputationes*.

f. *Enarratio in psalmum* 145

In the sermon on *Psalms* 145, Augustine refutes another putative discrepancy between the Old Testament and the New Testament, but without mentioning either the Manichaeans or Adimantus. When Augustine deals with the sixth verse of *Ps.* 145, he discusses the problem of whether God could possibly know every person among all the great works of His creation (*Ps.* 145:6). Augustine insists that this is possible and in order to prove his thesis, he reminds us that in *Ps.* 35:7 it is said that God cares for the well-being of man as well as animals. In the same *caput* of the sermon Augustine mentions what the apostle Paul says in *1 Cor.* 9:9, where, by means of a rhetorical question, it is claimed that God does not take care of the cattle. This seems to contradict *Ps.* 35. Augustine resolves this contradiction quite convincingly.¹⁶⁶ In the next chapter, however, he dis-

¹⁶¹ s. 82, V (8) (*PL* 38: 510): 'Jam non Salomonis liber cum Evangelio, sed Pauli apostoli Epistola videtur confligere.'

¹⁶² Cf. n. 99.

¹⁶³ s. 82, V (8) (*PL* 38: 509): 'Apostolum audi. Certe Apostolus minister est Novi Testamenti. Audi ergo apostolum Paulum ...'

¹⁶⁴ c. *Adim.* 24 (*CSEL* 25,1: 182, 11 ff.).

¹⁶⁵ See c. *Adim.* 7 (*CSEL* 25,1: 127, 10 ff.), where Adimantus' quotation from *Mt.* 18:22 is found: 'Non solum septies, peccanti fratri dimittendum, sed etiam septuagies septies.'

¹⁶⁶ en. *Ps.* 145, 13 (*CCL* 40: 2115, 41–48): 'Sic factus est homo, ut norit consulere iumentis suis; nec inde praecepto a Deo accepit, sed insinuatum est illi in mentem a Deo, ut possit et sine praecepta facere; fecit illum talem Deus. Sed quomodo regit pecus,

cusses it again. Apparently Augustine believes that he had not solved this problem once and for all. So he asks his congregation to consider what now follows:

Listen to me, dearly beloved. Anybody could say this to me: The New Testament tells us that God takes no care for the oxen; *Thou preservest man and beast* (Ps. 35:7) comes from the Old Testament. There are those who make ridicule and say that the two Testaments do not agree with each other. What shall I do to avoid that anybody might say that this is in the Old Testament and another thing in the New, and that he should require from me a sentence from the New Testament such as this one: *Thou preservest man and beast, O Lord* (Ps. 35:7)?¹⁶⁷

In the following lines Augustine cites *Mt.* 6:26, where it is said that God even feeds the birds which neither sow, nor mow, and *Mt.* 10:29–31 where Jesus insisted that not even a sparrow falls to the ground unless it is the will of the Father.¹⁶⁸

It is possible that in this section of the sermon on *Ps.* 145 Augustine was refuting a disputation of Adimantus. The first point that needs to be taken into consideration is the fact that a discussion of a possible discrepancy between *Ps.* 35:7 and a testimony of Paul the apostle is a rather strange feature in a sermon on *Ps.* 145. Augustine takes up the question even twice in the sermon. This may well be taken as an indication that an external reason urged Augustine to discuss this item thoroughly. Furthermore, Augustine used two biblical passages to demonstrate that the New Testament does imply that God also takes care of animals, which texts were also quoted in *Contra Adimantum*. Adimantus uses the passage

regendus est ab alio; ab eo a quo regitur, praeceptum accepit. Ad praecepti ergo tenorem, non est *de bobus cura Deo*; ad prouidentiam uniuersitatis, qua creauit omnia et mundum regit: *Homines et iumenta saluos facies, Domine*.

¹⁶⁷ idem, 14 (CCL 40: 2115, 1–8): 'Intendat Caritas uestra. Hic forte aliquis dicat mihi: De Nouo Testamento est, quia *De bobus non pertinet ad Deum; Homines et iumenta saluos facies, Domine*, de Veteri Testamento est. Sunt qui calumniantur, et dicant non sibi consonare ista duo Testamenta. Ne forte aliud dicat in Vetere, aliud in Nouo, et flagitet de me sententiam de Nouo talem qualis haec est: *Homines et iumenta saluos facies Domine*; quid facio?'

¹⁶⁸ idem (CCL 40: 2115, 9–21): 'In euangelio inuenio, quia omnia ista pertinent ad Deum, nemo erit iam qui contradicat. Numquid enim apostolus euangelio contrarius erit? Audiamus ipsum Dominum, principem et magistrum apostolorum: *Respicite, inquit, uolatilia caeli, quia non seminant, neque metunt, neque congregant in horrea; et Pater uester caelestis pascit illa*. Ergo et praeter hominem, animalia ista pertinent ad curam Dei, ut pascantur, non ut legem accipiant. Quod ergo ad dandam legem attinet, de bobus cura Deo non est; quod autem ad creanda, pascenda gubernanda et regenda, omnia ad Deum pertinent. *Nonne duo passeressse ueneunt* (Dominus Iesus Christus dicit), *et unus ex eis non cadet in terram sine uoluntate Patris uestri? Quanto magis uos pluris estis illis?*'

from *Mt.* 6,¹⁶⁹ whereas Augustine quotes from *Mt.* 10.¹⁷⁰ Augustine's use of the verb 'calumniari' is also important because it turns up regularly in *Contra Adimantum*.¹⁷¹ Furthermore, his argument that the apostle Paul would never have said anything which contradicts the Gospel,¹⁷² adds further weight to this hypothesis. Moreover, Adimantus knew the Old Testament *Psalms*, so it is quite probable that he constructed the putative antithesis between *Ps.* 35:7 and Paul's testimony.¹⁷³

g. *Sermo: De bono nuptiarum*

The sermon which deals with the question of whether it is good to be married, which can be found in the 'Mainzer Stadtbibliothek',¹⁷⁴ includes the debate on a putative contradiction between an agraphon which states that anybody who has not raised up seed in Israel is cursed¹⁷⁵ and a testimony of the apostle (*1 Cor.* 7:29). In the sermon Augustine defends the institution of marriage and tries to reconcile it with Paul's serious reservations on the subject of marriage. Augustine does not explicitly tell us that a contradiction between two passages had been alleged; nor does he use the typical vocabulary ('insidiare', 'fraus' etc.) as he did in other sermons when refuting the arguments of Adimantus. Nevertheless, the line of argument that Augustine develops here—namely that, in various epochs, different commandments had been given by God—is used in other cases to refute Adimantus' criticisms of the Old Testament in the *Disputationes*.¹⁷⁶ In the old dispensation this was the norm:

Cursed is he who has not raised up seed in Israel.¹⁷⁷

In the new dispensation, however, the norm is quite different:

¹⁶⁹ *c. Adim.* 4 (CSEL 25,1: 122, 27 – 123,3): 'nolite cogitare de crastino; nam crastinus dies ipse cogitabat sibi. respicite uolatilia caeli, quia non seminant neque metunt neque colligunt in horrea.'

¹⁷⁰ *c. Adim.* 26 (CSEL 25,1: 184, 28 – 185, 2): 'nonne duo passeress asse ueneunt et unus ex his non cadit in terram sune uoluntate patris vestri.'

¹⁷¹ See above, p. 29.

¹⁷² Cf. e.g. n. 99.

¹⁷³ Cf. P. Alfarc, *L'Évolution intellectuelle de saint Augustin*, Paris 1918, 189, who also mentioned this sermon in his analysis of Adimantus' *Disputationes*.

¹⁷⁴ Dolbeau, *Vingt-six sermons*, 69–84.

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Dolbeau, *Vingt-six sermons*, 72. He mentioned the possibility that we might be dealing with a negatively formulated quotation from Isaiah 31:9 (LXX). But see Ch. IV, Part B, section 2. *The Old Testament quotations*.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. above, n. 120.

¹⁷⁷ *idem*, 83 (174): 'Maledictus qui non suscitauerit semen in Israhel'.

The time is short. It still applies that those who have wives should live as if they did not have them (*1 Cor.* 7:29).¹⁷⁸

Although Augustine does not use the vocabulary he was accustomed to use when he discussed a putative contradiction between the Old and the New Testament, he obviously tried to explain an apparent difference between the Testaments by means of one of his regular arguments. This rather odd verse and its putative contradiction with *1 Cor.* 7:29 could well have originated in a *disputatio* of Adimantus, because this agraphon was known to Faustus¹⁷⁹ and Adimantus had already quoted *1 Cor.* 7 in another chapter of the *Disputationes*.¹⁸⁰ Moreover, Adimantus also introduced another rather odd text into the argument.¹⁸¹ All this suggests that the putative antithesis discussed in this sermon, most probably had its origin in the *Disputationes*.

E. *The Disputationes in other works of Augustine*

1. *Introduction*

Adimantus' thoughts actually permeate many of Augustine's writings. Apart from the exegetical passages in sermons and other writings discussed above, the influence of Adimantus' work can also be found elsewhere. In the first section (above), the most important and relevant works of Augustine have been referred to when we dealt with the prolegomena to *Contra Adimantum*.¹⁸² Those testimonies to Adimantus' work will be dealt with again in the following section to the extent that they are relevant for the reconstruction of the *Disputationes*.

¹⁷⁸ idem, 83 (175 f.): '*Tempus breve est, reliquum est ut et hi qui habent uxores tamquam non habentes sint.*'

¹⁷⁹ See p. 99; it is not really conceivable that Faustus hit upon this text independently, because he was a pagan before he became a Manichaean and was therefore probably not familiar with the biblical tradition apart from what he learned about it from the Manichaean tradition; cf. Ch. V, Part A, section 3. *The Contra Faustum and the Capitula*.

¹⁸⁰ c. *Adim.* 16 (CSEL 25,1: 161, 14–17): '*circumcisis quis uocatus est? non adducat preputium. in preputio quis uocatus est? non circumcidatur, quia preputium nihil est et circumcisio nihil est, sed obseruatio praeceptorum dei.*'

¹⁸¹ c. *Adim.* 19 (CSEL 25,1: 175, 8 f.): '*ego sum, qui diuitias do amicis meis et paupertatem inimicis.*'

¹⁸² See nn. 2, 12 and 16.

Here we first discuss *Contra Faustum*. In this very circumstantial book, in which Adimantus is mentioned seven times,¹⁸³ Augustine refuted Faustus' writing, called *Capitula*. The *Capitula* contains many passages from both the Old and the New Testament, as well as explanations of those texts. According to the introduction of *Contra Faustum*, Faustus regarded Adimantus as a very important teacher.¹⁸⁴ This means that *Contra Faustum* can be treated as an important source for our knowledge of Adimantus' exegesis of the Holy Scriptures. In chapter V, *Contra Faustum* will be discussed in more detail. Here it suffices to mention those parts which are obviously relevant to the *Disputationes*.

Two of Augustine's commentaries on the first chapters of *Genesis*, the *De Genesi aduersus Manichaei*, as well as the *De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim*, contain important sections which need be taken into consideration in this section.

2. *Contra Faustum*

Faustus' own words give proof of the fact that he held Adimantus in high esteem. In his introduction to the *Capitula*, which is quoted *in extenso* by Augustine in *Contra Faustum* 1, Faustus says:

Although sufficiently and even more than that, the errors of the Jewish superstition have been brought to light, and likewise the deception of the semi-Christians has abundantly been detected by the most learned Adimantus—the only person whom we have to study after our blissful father Manichaeus—it seems not unhelpful, dear brethren, to write for you these short and polished answers on account of the crafty and cunning statements from the conferences with us; by these, you yourselves should be equipped to answer them vigilantly, when they should want to surround you as well with deception by means of trifling questions, in accordance with the habit of their forefather, the serpent.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸³ Once by Faustus (see n. 185) and six times by Augustine: in *c. Faust.* 6, 6 four references (see n. 188) and in *c. Faust.* 16, 30 and 16, 31 each one reference (see n. 189).

¹⁸⁴ See n. 185.

¹⁸⁵ *c. Faust.* 1, 2 (CSEL 25,1: 251, 22 – 252, 7): 'Satis superque in lucem iam traductis erroribus ac Iudaicae superstitionis simul et semichristianorum abunde detecta fallacia a doctissimo scilicet et solo nobis post beatum patrem nostrum Manichaeum studendo Adimanto non ab re uisum est, fratres carissimi, haec quoque breuia uobis et concinna responsa propter callidas et astutas conferentium nobiscum propositiones scribere, quo cum idem uos ex more parentis sui serpentis captiosis circumuenire questiunculis uoluerint, et ipsi ad respondendum uigilanter eis sitis instructi.'

Faustus opens each chapter with a question posed by possibly a Catholic Christian, to which Faustus answered. When we compare Adimantus' *Disputationes* and Faustus' *Capitula*, many similarities can be found. At least 16 of the 32 *Capitula* include one biblical passage or topic which can also be found in the *Disputationes*.¹⁸⁶

Furthermore, in *Contra Faustum* Augustine refers twice to *Contra Adimantum* 15, which deals with the defilement of man.¹⁸⁷ First in *Contra Faustum* 6, 6:

... and that where the Lord says: *Not that which enters your mouth defiles you, but that which comes out* (Mt. 15:11). Because the Lord did not say that only to the multitude, as your Adimantus, whom Faustus celebrates chiefly as second to Manichaeus, wanted to understand it when he maligned the

¹⁸⁶ *c. Faust.* 4, 1: on circumcision, cf. *c. Adim.* 16; on meat, cf. *c. Adim.* 15; on the Sabbath, cf. *c. Adim.* 2, 16 and 22. On the Old Testament inheritance versus the spiritual inheritance, cf. *c. Adim.* 4, 15, 16, 17 and 19.

c. Faust. 5, 1: Mt. 19:29, cf. *c. Adim.* 3; Mt. 10:29/6:34, cf. *c. Adim.* 4, 20 and 24; Mt. 5:3–10, cf. *c. Adim.* 19, 27 and s. 12. *c. Faust.* 5, 3; Mt. 5:3–10, cf. *c. Adim.* 19, 27 and s. 12; Mt. 19:21, cf. *c. Adim.* 21.

c. Faust. 6, 1: on circumcision, cf. *c. Adim.* 16; on the Sabbath, cf. *c. Adim.* 2, 16 and 22; on meat, cf. *c. Adim.* 15.

c. Faust. 9, 1: Mt. 7:16f., cf. *c. Adim.* 26;

c. Faust. 10, 1: on the Old Testament heritage, cf. *c. Adim.* 4, 15, 16, 17 and 19.

c. Faust. 14, 1: Dt. 21:23, compare *c. Adim.* 21; Isa 31:9 (LXX)?, cf. Part D, section 3, g. *Sermo: De bono nuptiarum*; Mt. 19:26f. and *c. Adim.* 3.

c. Faust. 15, 1: on the Old Testament heritage, cf. *c. Adim.* 4, 15, 16, 17 and 19.

c. Faust. 16, 2: John 10, cf. s. 12. *c. Faust.* 16, 5: Dt. 21:23, cf. *c. Adim.* 21. *c. Faust.* 16, 6: Ex. 20:8f. and 35:2, cf. *c. Adim.* 2 and 16; John 5:17, cf. *c. Adim.* 2; Gen. 18:9–16, cf. *c. Adim.* 16; Mt. 23:15, cf. *c. Adim.* 16; Lev. 20:25, 11:14f. and Dt. 14:13, cf. *c. Adim.* 15; Mt. 15:11, cf. *c. Adim.* 15.

c. Faust. 17, 1: Dt. 28:13f./4:1/12:23, cf. *c. Adim.* 17, 18, 19 and 20.

c. Faust. 18, 2: on circumcision, cf. *c. Adim.* 16; on the Sabbath, cf. *c. Adim.* 2, 16 and 22; on meat, cf. *c. Adim.* 15; Mt. 15:11.

c. Faust. 19, 3: Mt. 5:33, cf. *c. Adim.* 10; Mt. 5:38f., cf. *c. Adim.* 8; Mt. 5:43, cf. *c. Adim.* 18. *c. Faust.* 19, 6: on the Sabbath, cf. *c. Adim.* 2, 16 and 22; on circumcision, cf. *c. Adim.* 16; on meat, cf. *c. Adim.* 15.

c. Faust. 20, 1: 1 Tim. 6:11, cf. *c. Adim.* 10.

c. Faust. 22, 4: Gen. 1:2, cf. *c. Adim.* 1; Gen. 2:16f., cf. *c. Adim.* 9; Gen. 3:9, cf. *c. Adim.* 9.

c. Faust. 30, 1: Lev. 20:25, 11:14f. and Dt. 14:13, cf. *c. Adim.* 15. *c. Faust.* 30, 4: Mt. 19:12, cf. *c. Adim.* 23.

c. Faust. 31, 1: Mt. 5:8, cf. s. 12.

c. Faust. 32, 3: on circumcision, cf. *c. Adim.* 16; on the Sabbath, cf. *c. Adim.* 2, 16 and 22; on meat, cf. *c. Adim.* 15. *c. Faust.* 32, 5: Dt. 21:23, vgl. *c. Adim.* 21; Isa. 31:9 (LXX)?, cf. Part D, section 3, g. *Sermo: De bono nuptiarum*; on circumcision, cf. *c. Adim.* 16; on the Sabbath, cf. *c. Adim.* 2, 16 and 22.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. *c. Adim.* 15 (CSEL 25,1: 154, 4–15).

Old Testament. For, when He left the multitude, He said the same things even more plainly and even more clearly to his disciples.¹⁸⁸

In *Contra Faustum* 16, 30f. this passage from Matthew about the defilement of man is also discussed. Augustine mentions Adimantus yet again.¹⁸⁹ These similarities demonstrate that, in the *Capitula*, Faustus was profoundly involved in a similar kind of discussion as was Adimantus when he wrote the *Disputationes*.

Although Faustus' writing clearly has much in common with Adimantus' *Disputationes*, it is difficult to make a choice between Adimantus' *Disputationes*, any of his other works, a work of Faustus himself, or any other writing when we examine which source(s) Faustus was using when he wrote a *capitulum*. This difficulty is caused by the fact that Faustus rarely, if ever, referred explicitly to Adimantus as his source for any specific subject.¹⁹⁰ Furthermore, not every criticism of the Old Testament can be ascribed to the *Disputationes* without further consideration. For example, one may be inclined to accept that Faustus borrowed the examples given in *Contra Faustum* 22,5 from the *Disputationes*. In this passage, Faustus enumerates a long list of shocking and blasphemous opinions about God which could be deduced from the Old Testament and he also names a whole series of crimes perpetrated by believers who lived during the Old Testament dispensation, such as David, Abraham, Moses etc.¹⁹¹ Hardly any of those examples can be found in Augustine's refutation of Adimantus' *Disputationes*, although they could have been used just in the *Disputationes*. We will see in due course that Faustus might have found these examples in *another* work of Adimantus.¹⁹²

Another complication when we look for new chapters from the *Disputationes* is caused by Faustus' practice of lifting the biblical argument he borrowed from Adimantus from its original context. This can be illustrated with the example of *Contra Faustum* 14. Here Augustine quotes and refutes one of Faustus' *capitula* on the question of why Faustus did

¹⁸⁸ *c. Faust.* 6, 6 (CSEL 25,1: 292f.): '... et illud ubi dominus ait: "non quod intrat in os uestrum, uos coinquit, sed quod exit". Quod non ad solas turbas dominus dixit, sicut vester Adimantus, quem post Manichaeum Faustus praecipue laudat, cum ueteri testamento calumniaretur, uoluit intelligi; sed etiam remotus a turbis, hoc idem discipulis suis euidenter et expressius elocutus est.' In his line of thought, Augustine mentioned Adimantus some three times more in *c. Faust* 6, however, without giving any additional information concerning Adimantus or his *Disputationes*.

¹⁸⁹ *c. Faust.* 16, 30f. (CSEL 25,1: 477, 24 – 478, 3 and 479, 19f.).

¹⁹⁰ Sometimes he refers to 'forefathers', without any specification; see e.g. Ch. V, n. 42.

¹⁹¹ See Ch. V, n. 46.

¹⁹² See Ch. V, Part B.

not accept Moses.¹⁹³ According to Faustus, Moses cursed Jesus and cannot therefore be accepted as trustworthy. The first curse Faustus mentions is from *Dt.* 21:23: 'Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree.'¹⁹⁴ This verse is also found in *Contra Adimantum* 21, where Adimantus quotes it as a putative contradiction with *Mt.* 16:24/19:21.¹⁹⁵ The antithesis with the New Testament disappeared in Faustus' argument. Unfortunately this makes it virtually impossible to reconstruct this putative contradiction if we were only dependent on what *Contra Faustum* tells us. It could even be argued that Faustus may have found *Dt.* 21:23 himself, because it is quoted in the New Testament (*Gal.* 3:13). Another 'curse' mentioned by Faustus in *Contra Faustum* 14, gives us good reason to suppose that Faustus did indeed use Adimantus' *Disputationes* when he wrote this *capitulum*: 'Cursed is he who has not begotten seed in Israel.'¹⁹⁶ This rather unusual verse was (in all probability) quoted by Adimantus in one of his *Disputationes* and Faustus almost certainly learned about this verse from Adimantus' *Disputationes*.¹⁹⁷ In this case, Faustus also deliberately overlooks the counterpart in the contradiction, which was mentioned in Augustine's sermon on marriage: *1 Cor.* 7:29.¹⁹⁸ This suggests that *Contra Faustum* 14 does demonstrate that Faustus was accustomed to reformulate his sources freely in order to buttress his own opinions. He detaches the Old Testament passage from its New Testament counterpart. Furthermore, he uses the Old Testament quotation as an example of Moses' curses, whereas Adimantus used it in order to emphasize the differences between the Old Testament and the New Testament teachings on marriage. The *modus operandi* of Faustus does make it even more difficult to reconstruct those parts of the *Disputationes* about which no additional information can be found elsewhere.

Now that we are aware of these complications, we must look at *Contra Faustum* in order to see what it can tell us about *Contra Adimantum*. When we examine *Contra Faustum* 18,1–3 carefully, we can describe the

¹⁹³ *c. Faust.* 14, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 401, 12): 'Faustus dixit: quare Moysen non accipitis?'

¹⁹⁴ *c. Faust.* 14, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 401, 20f.): 'ait enim maledictum esse omnem, qui pendet in lingo.'

¹⁹⁵ *c. Adim.* 21 (CSEL 25,1: 179, 25 – 180, 1): 'si uis perfectus esse, uende omnia quae possides et diuide pauperibus et tolle crucem tuam et sequere me.'

¹⁹⁶ *c. Faust.* 14, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 403, 18f.): '... dicens maledictum esse omnem, qui non suscitauerit semen in Israhel.'

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Part D, section 3, g. *Sermo: De bono nuptiarum*.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. concerning the two curses: *c. Faust.* 32, 5 (CSEL 25,1: 764, 22–25).

disputatio refuted in Augustine's sermon, which is mentioned by Possidius in the *Elenchus* as number '32. De sacrificiis spiritualibus contra quos supra'.¹⁹⁹ This sermon has not yet been rediscovered and as a consequence the argument of the *disputatio* that Augustine refutes in the sermon remains obscure. In *Contra Faustum* 18, Faustus' refutation of *Mt.* 5:17 ('I have not come to abolish the law, but to fulfil it') is discussed.²⁰⁰ In *Contra Faustum* 18, 2, Faustus lists a catena of Old Testament rules and regulations and, several lines further on, the words of Jesus alleged to contradict those rules. Faustus does so, in order to establish his claim that Jesus could not possibly have said that He came to fulfil the law. When we combine the references to the Old Testament with those to the New, we find the following contradictions:

Is it right to be circumcised (cf. *Gen.* 17:9–14), that is, to mark the shame with shame and believe that God is pleased by such sacraments?²⁰¹ ... you hear that Christ said that anyone who wants to be circumcised becomes a twofold son of hell (*Mt.* 23:15).²⁰²

Is it right to observe the Sabbath rest (cf. e.g. *Num.* 15:35) and entangle oneself in the fetters of the sodality of Saturnus?²⁰³ You see that He Himself (Christ) never observed the Sabbath and never gave orders for it to be observed (cf. e.g. *Mt.* 12:10–13).²⁰⁴

Is it right to satisfy the gluttony of the Jewish demon, for he is not God, with the sacrificing at one time of bulls, another time of rams, or even he-goats (cf. e.g. *Lev.* 1–7), not to mention even humans (cf. e.g. *Gen.* 22:2) and now exercise the practices for which we left the idols, in a more cruel way under the prophets and the law?²⁰⁵ Concerning the sacrifices, again He himself frequently says that God desires mercy and not sacrifice (*Mt.* 9:13; 12:7).²⁰⁶

¹⁹⁹ Ed. Wilmart, in: *MA* vol. 2, 149–233 (167). See above n. 101.

²⁰⁰ *c. Faust.* 18, 1 (*CSEL* 25,1: 490, 7 f.).

²⁰¹ *c. Faust.* 18, 2 (*CSEL* 25,1: 491, 3 f.): 'placet circumcidi, id est pudendis insignire pudenda et deum credere sacramentis talibus delectari?'

²⁰² *c. Faust.* 18, 2 (*CSEL* 25,1: 491, 14 ff.): '... christum dicentem audias dupliciter filium gehennae fieri eum, qui fuerit circumcises.'

²⁰³ *c. Faust.* 18, 2 (*CSEL* 25,1: 491, 5 f.): 'placet suscipere sabbatorum otium et saturniacis manus insertare catenis?'

²⁰⁴ *c. Faust.* 18, 2 (*CSEL* 25,1: 491, 16 f.): 'sabbatum uero nec ipsum seruasse uideas nec usquam mandasse seruandum.'

²⁰⁵ *c. Faust.* 18, 2 (*CSEL* 25,1: 491, 6–10): 'placet in ingluuiem iudaeorum daemonis—neque enim dei—nunc tauros, nunc arietes, nunc etiam horcos, ut non et homines dicam, cultris sternere, ac propter quod idola simus exosi, id nunc exercere crudelius sub prophetis ac lege?'

²⁰⁶ *c. Faust.* 18, 2 (*CSEL* 25,1: 491, 19 ff.): 'de sacrificiis item frequentem ipsius esse sermonem deum misericordiam uelle, non sacrificium.'

To conclude, is it right to judge the meat of some dead animals as clean, and to treat others as unclean and defiling (cf. *Lev.* 20:25), among which the flesh of the swine is the most defiling according to the law and the prophets (e.g. *Dt.* 14:8)?²⁰⁷ You hear Him again saying concerning food, that man is not defiled by anything which enters him through his mouth, but, rather, that which proceeds from his mouth pollutes (*Mk.* 7:14; *Mt.* 15:11).²⁰⁸

The subject matter of the first, the second and the last of these putative contradictions can be found in the *Disputationes*: *Contra Adimantum* 16 deals with circumcision; *Contra Adimantum* 2 and 22 deal with the Sabbath; whilst the distinction between clean and unclean food is dealt with in *Contra Adimantum* 15. It is quite possible that Faustus searched through the *Disputationes* when he was looking for arguments to confirm his understanding of *Mt.* 5:17. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the third putative contradiction, on the sacrifices of the Old Testament, originally came from the *Disputationes* as well; and it is possible that Augustine's sermon 'On spiritual offerings' was intended to refute the putative contradiction between a number of injunctions about the sacrifices in the Old Testament and the injunction of Jesus to the effect that God desires mercy and not sacrifices, which is found in *Mt.* 9:13 and 12:7.

The Old Testament elements in those four putative contradictions can also be found, among others, in *Contra Faustum* 4,1,²⁰⁹ 6,1,²¹⁰ and 32,3.²¹¹ In those *capitula* we can even find another Jewish practice that is—according to Faustus—not in agreement with the true Christian faith, *i.e.* the Jewish festivals. This justifies the tentative conclusion that Adimantus could well have identified another putative contradiction, namely one dealing with the Jewish festivals. This is not impossible given the fact that Augustine said that he did not refute all chapters of Adimantus' *Disputationes*.²¹² The contradiction could have been constructed on the basis of one of the regulations for the holy feasts such as *Dt.* 16 and, from the New Testament a passage like *Gal.* 4:10 f.²¹³

²⁰⁷ *c. Faust.* 18, 2 (CSEL 25,1: 491, 10 ff.): 'placet denique feralium ciborum quaedam existimare munda, quaedam in immundis et contaminates habere, ex quibus inquinatio- rum porcinam lex adserunt et prophetae.'

²⁰⁸ *c. Faust.* 18, 2 (CSEL 25,1: 491, 17 ff.): 'de cibis item adseuerantem audias nullo eorum inquinari hominem, quae in os ingrediuntur, sed ea potius, quae de ore procedunt, polluere.'

²⁰⁹ *c. Faust.* 4, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 268, 12–17).

²¹⁰ *c. Faust.* 6, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 284, 12–22).

²¹¹ *c. Faust.* 32, 3 (CSEL 25,1: 762, 8 – 763, 6).

²¹² See n. 2.

²¹³ Adimantus used *Gal.* 4:10 f. in another *Disputatio* as well, see Part F, *disputatio* 16.

As to the *disputatio* that Augustine refutes in the other unknown sermon mentioned by Possidius, *i.e.* ‘31. On the Day of the Lord according to Zephaniah’,²¹⁴ this putative contradiction could possibly be reconstructed the same way as ‘32. On the spiritual offerings.’ In *Contra Faustum* 5, Augustine quotes the *capitulum* of Faustus that deals with the question of whether he accepted the Gospel. Faustus solves this problem by insisting that he observes the commandments of the Gospel.²¹⁵ In the third section Faustus refers to the final judgement as it is described in *Mt.* 25:34 ff.²¹⁶ This parable of the sheep and the goats could have been construed as the New Testament opposite of ‘the day of the Lord according to Zephaniah.’ This is probable, because in *Contra Faustum* 5,3 the reference to the last judgement is preceded and followed by other sayings of the Lord that Adimantus quotes in his *Disputationes*, which may indicate that in this case as well Faustus borrowed from the subject-matter of the *Disputationes* in order to establish his position.²¹⁷ Nevertheless, in *Contra Faustum* 5, we do not find a list of Old Testament texts as the opposite of the passages from the New Testament, leave alone that *Zeph.* 1 is mentioned by Faustus on this occasion. Therefore, it is not possible to demonstrate conclusively that the putative contradiction that Augustine rejects in the sermon ‘on the day of the Lord according to Zephaniah’ was indeed between *Zeph.* 1 and *Mt.* 25:34 ff. Faustus could well have had other sources at his disposal from which he learned about *Mt.* 25.²¹⁸

3. De Genesi adversus Manichaeos

The purpose of this early writing of Augustine was to defend *Genesis* from the attacks of the Manichaeans by means of allegorical explanation. Augustine wrote it soon after his return to Roman Africa between 388 and 390.²¹⁹

²¹⁴ See n. 101.

²¹⁵ *c. Faust.* 5, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 271, 8 ff.): ‘Faustus dixit: Accipis euangelium? tu me interrogas, utrum accipiam, in quo id ipsum adparet, quia quae iubet obseuo.’

²¹⁶ *c. Faust.* 5, 3 (CSEL 25,1: 273, 23–27): ‘et in discretione agnorum ab haedis in iudicio dicturum se dicit iis, qui ad dexteram sunt: esuriui, et cibastis me; sitiui, et potastis me et cetera; propterea recipite regnum.’

²¹⁷ It deals with *Mt.* 5:3–10 which is found in *c. Adim.* 19, 27 and s. 12 and *Mt.* 19:21 quoted in *c. Adim.* 21. Cf. below Part F, resp. *disputatio* 19, 27, 29 and 21.

²¹⁸ *Mt.* 25:34 ff. played a major role in the Manichaean eschatology; see e.g. M. Hutter, ‘Mt 25:31–46 in der Deutung Manis’, *NT* 33, 3 (1991) 276–282.

²¹⁹ See Van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon*, 38; Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, 74 and D. Weber, ‘De Genesi aduersus Manicheos’, *AL* 3, 132–140 (132).

In the first book, caput XXII (33), Augustine discusses the statements of those Manichaeans who made mockery of the saying in the Old Testament that God really does need some rest. The occasion for this piece of mockery can be found in *Gen.* 2:1–3:

Let's see what they used to deride, more with impudence than with ignorance, what is written, that God, after He made the heaven and the earth and everything in it, rested on the seventh day and blessed that seventh day and kept it holy, because he rested from all his labours on that day (*Gen.* 2:1–3). Because they say: What a kind of work was it that made God need to rest? Or was He even exhausted and tired out because of the labours of six days? They even add the testimony of the Lord where He says: *My Father works until now* (*Joh.* 5:17). And, for this reason, they deceive many ignoramuses in their attempt to demonstrate that the New Testament does contradict the Old.²²⁰

The *modus operandi* of the Manichaean whom Augustine refutes here, is identical with that of Adimantus: he places a passage from the Old Testament and another from the New in opposition to each other and then proceeds to mock the Deity. Moreover, the subject agrees exactly with the contents of Adimantus' *disputatio* 2. The method of collecting texts from the Old and the New Testament is not known from other Manichaeans when they challenge the Old Testament. Apart from that, it is remarkable that the same passage from the New Testament is quoted here in order to deride *Gen.* 2 as was done in the *disputatio* refuted in *Contra Adimantum* 2. This proves that Augustine must have had an argument of Adimantus in mind when he wrote this section of *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos*. In addition to its importance for the debate on Augustine's knowledge of the *Disputationes*,²²¹ this passage from *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos* is also relevant because it shows us more precisely how Adimantus established the putative antithesis between *Genesis* 2 and *John* 5:17 in his argument.

²²⁰ *Gn. adu. Man.* I, XXII, 33 (CCL 91: 101, 1–11): 'Iam nunc videamus etiam illud quod solent maiore impudentia quam imperitia deridere, quod scriptum est deum consummato coelo et terra et omnibus quae fecit requiescisse die septimo ab omnibus operibus suis et benedixisse diem septimum et sanctificasse eum, quia requievit ab operibus suis. Dicunt enim: quid opus erat ut deus requiesceret? An forte operibus sex dierum fatigatus et lassatus erat? Addunt etiam domini testimonium, ubi ait: *pater meus usque nunc operator*, et hinc multos imperitos decipiunt, quibus persuadere conantur novum testamentum veteri testamento adversari.'

²²¹ See Part B, section 2 *The Manichaean years*.

4. De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim

In this anti-Manichaean writing Augustine discusses several themes that can also be found in *Contra Adimantum*. The book was written in circa 414. It is his second attempt to give a literal explanation of *Genesis*.²²² In any case, Augustine was already well informed by that time about Adimantus' arguments and ideas. So it is quite likely that, whenever he refutes an argument of the Manichaeans which is parallel to a contradiction discussed in *Contra Adimantum*, it was indeed written against the stance taken by Adimantus.

In *De Genesi ad litteram*, Augustine again mentions the putative contradiction between *John* 5:17 and *Gen.* 2 which he had already discussed in *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos* and *Contra Adimantum*. In book VII, 28 Augustine discusses this question.²²³ Although it does not provide us with any additional information, it does show us that this question was important to Augustine, either because he found it a rather difficult question, or his parish found it a highly convincing argument of the Manichaeans.

F. Adimantus' Disputationes: a reconstruction of its contents

We now present an overview of the contents of Adimantus' *Disputationes*. The Latin texts on which this 'reconstruction' is based and their English version are presented side by side in two columns. The Latin texts have been taken from *Contra Adimantum* unless indicated otherwise. In the footnotes, reference is made to both the biblical quotations and the editions of Augustine's writings. Words marked with [] may have been changed in form, but their contents come from Adimantus. Words that we print in italics were added by Augustine. Parts of sentences in the translation marked with () have been added for a better understanding of the text. The sequence of the first 28 disputationes is the same as in *Contra Adimantum*. The order of the chapters 29–34 is random due to a lack of indications regarding their place in Adimantus' writing.

²²² Cf. Van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon*, 39.

²²³ *Gn. litt.* VII, 28 (CSEL 28,1: 227, 10–14): 'curet quoque ostendere quomodo utrumque sit uerum, quod contrarium uideri potest, et deum in die septimo ab omnibus operibus suis requiesuisse, quod geneseos liber dicit, et usque nunc eum operari, quod dominus dicit.'

Disputatio 1

[De eo quod scriptum est:] in principio fecit deus caelum et terram usque ad id quod scriptum est: et factum est uespere, et factum est mane dies una.²²⁴ ... *dicentes* in genesi scriptum esse, quod deus per se ipsum fecerit caelum et terram et lucem, in euangelio autem scriptum esse per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum fabricatum esse mundum, ubi dictum est: et mundus factus est per ipsum, et mundus illum non cognouit.²²⁵ [quod autem testimonium apostoli *adiugunt* ...] Ipse est primogenitus totius creaturae; et omnia per ipsum facta sunt in caelis et in terris, uisibilia et inuisibilia [et hoc capitulum aduersum esse *dicunt* genesi, ubi deus ita dicitur fecisse mundum, ut specialiter filius ibi non sit nominatus].²²⁶

[Concerning what is written:] In the beginning, God made the heaven and the earth until what is written: and it became evening, and it became morning, the first day. ... *They say that* in Genesis, it was written that God created the heaven and the earth and the light through himself, whereas in the Gospel it is written that the world was constructed through our Lord Jesus Christ, where it is said: And the world was made through Him and the world knew Him not. [... and *they add* the testimony of the apostle:] He is the Firstborn of all creation; and all things were made through Him in heaven and on earth, both visible and invisible. [*They say*: This chapter is the opposite of Genesis, where in such a way it is said that God made the earth, that in particular the Son had not been mentioned by name on that occasion].

Disputatio 2

[De eo quod scriptum est:] et consummauit deus die sexto omnia opera sua, quae fecit, et in septimo requieuit ab eisdem omnibus operibus suis quae fecerat.²²⁷ Quid opus erat ut deus requiesceret? an forte operibus sex dierum fatigatus et lassatus erat?²²⁸ [*dicunt* nouo testamenti aduersari, quod in genesi scriptum est deum septimo die requieuisse ab omnibus operibus suis, quae fecit, quoniam dominus in euangelio dicit:] Pater meus usque modo operatur.²²⁹

[Concerning what is written:] And on the sixth day, God finished all the works that He had made; and on the seventh day He rested from all these works that He had made. What a kind of work was it that made God need to rest? Or was He even exhausted and tired out because of the labours of six days? [*They say*: What is written in Genesis that God rested at the seventh day from all the works that He had made contradicts the New Testament, because the Lord says in the Gospel:] My Father works up to now.

²²⁴ CSEL 25,1: 115, 3–5. Cf. *Gen.* 1:1–5.

²²⁵ CSEL 25,1: 115, 7–11. Cf. *John* 1:10.

²²⁶ CSEL 25,1: 116, 9–15. Cf. *Col.* 1:15b–16a.

²²⁷ CSEL 25,1: 116, 22–24. Cf. *Gen.* 2:1 f.

²²⁸ *Gn. adu. Man.* I, XXII, 33; *CCL* 91:6 f.

²²⁹ CSEL 25,1: 116, 25 – 117, 2. Cf. *John* 5:17.

Disputatio 3

[De eo quod scriptum est in genesi:]
 et dixit deus: non est bonum solum
 hominem esse; faciamus ei adiutorium.
 et inmisit deus Adae somnum, et
 obdormiuit; et sumpsit unam de costis
 eius, ex qua formauit Euam, quam
 adduxit ad Adam et ait: ideo relinquet
 homo patrem et matrem, et adhaerebit
 uxori suae.²³⁰ [... *dicentes* contra nouum
 testamentum esse istam sententiam, qua
 deus scribitur et formasse mulierem
 et uiro coniunxisse, propterea quia
 in euangelio dicit dominus:] omnis
 qui reliquerit domum aut uxorem aut
 parentes aut fratres aut filios propter
 regnum caelorum, septies tantum accipiet
 in hoc tempore et in futuro saeculo
 possidebit uitam aeternam.²³¹

[Concerning what is written in Genesis:]
 And God said: It is not good for man
 to be alone; let us make a helper for
 him. And God sent a sleep upon Adam
 and he fell asleep; and He took one of
 his ribs, out of which He formed Eve,
 whom He brought to Adam and He
 said: Therefore, a man should leave his
 father and mother and he shall cleave
 to his wife. [... *They say*: This sentence,
 where it is written about God that He
 fashioned a woman and married her with
 a man, contradicts the New Testament;
 because in the Gospel, the Lord says:]
 Everyone who has left his house, or
 wife, or parents, or brothers, or sons on
 account of the kingdom of heavens, will
 receive sevenfold in this time and in the
 age to come he will possess the eternal
 life.

Disputatio 4

[De eo quod scriptum est in genesi:]
 et dixit deus ad Cain: quid fecisti? uox
 sanguinis fratris tui clamat ad me de
 terra. nunc maledictus es tu a facie terrae,
 quae absorbit et recepit sanguinem
 fratris tui ex caede manus tuae; te
 enim operari necesse est terram, quia
 steriles tibi fructus dabit.²³² [*dixerunt*
 huic capitulo illud in euangelio esse
 contrarium, quod dominus ait discipulis
 suis:] nolite cogitare de crastino; nam
 crastinus dies ipse cogitabit sibi. respicite
 uolatilia caeli, quia non seminant neque
 metunt neque colligunt in horrea.²³³

[Concerning what is written in Genesis:]
 And God said to Cain: What have you
 done? The voice of your brother's blood
 cries to Me from the ground. Now, you
 are cursed by the face of the earth that
 has swallowed up and received the blood
 of your brother from the murder of your
 hand: you shall till the earth and it shall
 give you fruitless harvests. [*They said that*
 the following, which the Lord said to his
 disciples in the Gospel is in contradiction
 with that chapter:] Do not think about
 tomorrow; because the day of tomorrow
 will think of itself. Consider the birds of
 the air, because they do not sow, neither
 mow, nor collect into barns.

²³⁰ CSEL 25,1: 118, 13–18. Cf. *Gen.* 2:18–24.

²³¹ CSEL 25,1: 118, 19–26. Cf. *Mt.* 19:29.

²³² CSEL 25,1: 122, 14–19. Cf. *Gen.* 4:10 ff.

²³³ CSEL 25,1: 122, 25 – 123, 3. Cf. *Mt.* 6:34 and 26.

Disputatio 5

[De eo quod scriptum est in genesi:] faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram.²³⁴ [hunc locum *Manichaei*, quo scriptum est in genesi hominem factum esse ad imaginem et similitudinem dei, propterea *dicunt* nouo testamento esse contrarium, quia dominus in euangelio dicit Iudaeis:] uos ex patre diabolo estis et desideria patris uestri facere uultis; ille homicida erat ab initio et in ueritate non stetit, quia ueritas in eo non est.²³⁵ [et quod alio loco Iudaei] serpentum genera et uiperarum [appellantur].²³⁶

[Concerning what is written in Genesis:] Let us make a man after our image and likeness. [*The Manichaeans say that* the chapter in Genesis, where it is written that man has been made after the image and likeness of God is in opposite to what the New Testament says, because the Lord says in the Gospel to the Jews:] You are of your father the devil, and you want to do the desires of your father; he was a murderer from the beginning and has not remained in the truth, because there is no truth in him. [And in another passage, He named the Jews] a generation of serpents and vipers.

Disputatio 6

[De eo quod scriptum est in exodo:] honora patrem tuum, et matrem tuam.²³⁷ [huic etiam loco, ubi de honorandis parentibus deus praecepit, illum euangelii locum *Manichaei dicunt* esse contrarium, ubi dominus cuidam dicenti:] 'ibo primum, ut sepeliam patrem meum' [respondit:] sine mortuos mortuos suos sepeliant; tu autem ueni, et adnuntia regnum Dei.²³⁸

[Concerning what is written in Exodus:] Honour your father, and your mother. [*The Manichaeans say that* this contradicts the passage in which God enjoins us to honour our parents, what the Lord has answered in a passage of the Gospel to someone who said:] 'I will go first, in order that I should bury my father'; (He answered him): Let the dead bury their dead; but you, go and proclaim the kingdom of God.

Disputatio 7

[De eo quod scriptum est in exodo:] ego sum deus zelans, retribuens filiis tertiae et quartae generationis, parentum peccata, qui me oderunt.²³⁹ [huic loco *Manichaei* illud de euangelio *dicunt* esse contrarium,

[Concerning what is written in Exodus:] I am a jealous God, visiting the sins of the parents who hate me, unto the third and the fourth generation. [*The Manichaeans say that* the following sentence from

²³⁴ CSEL 25,1: 124, 1 f. Cf. *Gen.* 1:26.

²³⁵ CSEL 25,1: 124, 2–8. Cf. *John* 8:44.

²³⁶ CSEL 25,1: 124, 8 ff. Cf. *Mt.* 23:33.

²³⁷ CSEL 25,1: 126, 1 f. Cf. *Ex.* 20:12.

²³⁸ CSEL 25,1: 126, 2–8. Cf. *Lk.* 9:59 f.

²³⁹ CSEL 25,1: 127, 4 ff. Cf. e.g. *Ex.* 20:5.

quod dominus dicit:] estote benigni sicut pater uester caelestis qui solem suum oriri facit super bonos et malos²⁴⁰ [et illud aliud, quod item dominus ait:] non solum septies peccanti fratri dimittendum sed etiam septuagies septies.²⁴¹

the Gospel, which the Lord says, is in contradiction with that passage (from Exodus:)] Be kind-hearted, like your heavenly Father, who makes his sun rise over the good and the evil [and that other passage, where the Lord said likewise:] You must not only forgive your brother seven times, but even seventy times seven.

Disputatio 8

[De eo quod in exodo scriptum est:] Oculum pro oculo, dentem pro dente [et cetera talia].²⁴² [..ipse dominus haec duo sibi ueluti aduersantia atque contraria in euangelio demonstrauerit. ipse enim ait:] audistis, quia dictum est antiquis: oculum pro oculo et dentem pro dente; ego autem dico uobis, non resistere malo sed si quis te percusserit in maxillam, praebe illi et alteram, et quicumque uoluerit tecum iudicio contendere et tunicam tuam auferre, dimitte illi et pallium.²⁴³

[Concerning what is written in Exodus:] An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth [and more like that], [.. the Lord himself, has demonstrated in the Gospel that these two (testaments)²⁴² are like opponents and contrary to each other. For He himself said:] Listen, because it was said to them of old: An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say to you not to resist the evil one, but if any man will smite you on your cheek, turn the other one unto him as well, and whoever wants to drag you into the court and take your tunic, let him have the cloak as well.

Disputatio 9

[De eo quod scriptum est, quod locutus est deus cum Adam et Eua et cum serpente et cum Cain et ceteris antiquis, inter quos etiam et nonnullis adparuisse scribitur, et ab eis uisus esse non uno, sed multis scripturarum locis, in quibus et locutus esse deus cum hominibus inuenitur, et nonnullis adparuisse].²⁴⁵ [dicunt omnia contraria esse nouo testamento, quoniam dominus dicit:] deum nemo uidit unquam nisi unicus

[Concerning what is written, that God spoke to Adam and Eve and to the snake and to Cain and to other men of old; it is even written about some among them, that He appeared unto them and that He was seen by them; not in one passage, but in many in Scriptures it is found that God has spoken to humans and appeared to some of them.] [They say that all these places contradict the New Testament, seeing that the Lord says:] No man has

²⁴⁰ CSEL 25,1: 127, 6–9. Cf. Mt. 5:45.

²⁴¹ CSEL 25,1: 127, 10 ff. Cf. Mt. 18:22.

²⁴² CSEL 25,1: 130, 9 f. Cf. Ex. 21:24.

²⁴³ CSEL 25,1: 130, 10–20. Cf. Mt. 5:38–40.

²⁴⁴ Cf. CSEL 25,1: 130, 20 f.

²⁴⁵ CSEL 25,1: 131, 13–18. Cf. Gen. 2–4 et al.

filius, qui est in sinu patris; ille adnuntiavit nobis de eo.²⁴⁶ [et iterum quod dicit Iudaeis:] nec uocem illius aliquando audistis nec faciem eius uidistis nec uerbum eius habetis in uobis manens, quia ei, quem ille misit, non credidistis.²⁴⁷

ever seen God, apart from the one and only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father. He has informed us about Him. [And again, what He said to the Jews:] You have neither heard his voice, nor seen his face, nor do you have his word abiding in you, because you have not believed Him whom He sent.

Disputatio 10

[De eo quod scriptum est, quod locutus est deus Moysi et dixit illi:] loquere ad filios Israhel: sumite primitias ab omni homine, quas mihi destinatis, hoc est aurum, argentum, aeramentum, purpuram, byssum, coccum, pilos caprinos, pelles rubeas agnorum, ligna integra, oleum ad inlumptionem, thymiamata, lapides pretiosos, hoc est, beryllos; et constituite tabernaculum in quo comorari uobiscum possim.²⁴⁸ [huic scripturarum loco illud in euangelio *dicunt* esse contrarium, quod ait dominus:] non iurabis, neque per caelum, quia sedes dei est, neque per terram, quia scabellum est pedum eius.²⁴⁹ quomodo ille deus, cuius caelum sedes, et terra scabellum pedum eius est, in tabernaculo habitat, quod ex auro uel et argento et aere et purpura et pilis pecorum, pellibusque constructum est?²⁵⁰ [*adhibentes etiam* testimonium apostolum Paulum, quia dicit deum lucem habitare inaccessibilem . . .]²⁵¹

[Concerning what is written, that God has spoken to Moses and said to him:] Say to the sons of Israel: Take from every man the firstlings, and you must set them aside for Me, that is: gold, silver, brassware, purple, cotton, scarlet, goat's hair, tanned lamb's hides, whole pieces of timber, oil for the lamps, perfumery, precious stones, that is beryl; and build the tabernacle, where I can dwell in your midst. [*They say that* this place in the Scriptures is contradicted by what the Lord said in the Gospel:] You shall not swear, neither by heaven, for it is the seat of God, nor by the earth, for it is the stool of his feet.

How could that deity whose throne is the heaven and whose footstool is the earth, live in a tabernacle which is constructed of gold or silver and brass and purple and hairs and skins of small farm animals? [*And they add even* the testimony of the apostle Paul, who says that God dwells in an inaccessible light.]

Disputatio 11

[De eo quod in exode scriptum est:] ne adoraueritis deos alienos [et iterum:]

[Concerning what is written in Exodus:] You shall not worship alien gods [and

²⁴⁶ CSEL 25,1: 131, 18–21. Cf. *John* 1:18.

²⁴⁷ CSEL 25,1: 131, 21–24. Cf. *John* 5:37.

²⁴⁸ CSEL 25,1: 134,3–10. Cf. *Ex.* 25:2–8.

²⁴⁹ CSEL 25,1: 134, 11–14. Cf. *Mt.* 5:34 f.

²⁵⁰ CSEL 25,1: 134, 16–19.

²⁵¹ CSEL 25,1: 134, 19 f. Cf. *1 Tim.* 6:16.

deus uester zelans appellatur, zelans enim zelauit.²⁵² [et ideo *dicunt* ista euangelio esse contraria, quoniam dominus dicit:] Pater iuste, et mundus te non cognouit.²⁵³

again:] Your God is called jealous, for He really is jealous. [*They say that this contradicts the Gospel, since the Lord says:*] Righteous Father, and the world has not known you.

Disputatio 12

[De eo, quod scriptum est non esse manducandum sanguinem, quod anima carnis sit sanguis. huic sententiae ueteris legis *Manichaei* ex euangelio illud *obponunt*, quod dicit dominus non esse timendos eos, qui occidere possunt corpus, animae autem nocere non possunt.]²⁵⁴ Si sanguis anima est, quomodo homines potestatem in eam non habent, cum de sanguine multa faciant siue excipientes et canibus uolucrisque in escam proponentes siue effundentes aut caeno lutoque miscentes? haec enim et alia innumerabilia sine difficultate homines de sanguine possunt facere. *ideo isti quaerunt insultantes*, quomodo, si sanguis est anima, non possit hominis interfector nocere animae, cum tantam in eius sanguinem habeat potestatem. [*addunt etiam*, quod ait apostolus Paulus:] quia caro et sanguis regnum dei non possidebunt: *et dicunt*: si sanguis est anima, sicut Moyses dicit, nulla inuenietur anima posse regnum dei adipisci.²⁵⁵ [*insultare ergo ausus est* populo Iudaeorum, quod secundum eorum intellectum, quo existimant sanguinem esse animam, parentum ipsorum animae partim a serpentibus deuoratae, partim igni consumptae, partim in desertis atque asperrimis montium locis arefactae sint.]²⁵⁶

[Concerning what is written that the blood is not to be eaten because the soul of the flesh is the blood. *The Manichaeans place against* these sentences of the old law, one from the Gospel, where the Lord says, that we should not fear those who have the power to kill the body, but cannot harm the soul. If blood is the soul, how may men not have any power over it, for they do many things with blood: they either collect it and give it to dogs and birds as their food, or they pour it out and mix it with mud and sludge. For men can do all these and untold other things with blood without any difficulty. *Thus, they ask deridingly*: If blood is the soul, how does it come about that the murderer of a man is unable to damage the soul, since he has such a power over his blood? [*They even add* the saying of the apostle Paul:] For flesh and blood cannot possess the Kingdom of God. *And they say*: If the soul consists of blood, as Moses says, it would not be possible to find any soul that obtains the Kingdom of God. [(...) According to the view of the Jewish people, which maintains that blood is the soul, the souls of their parents have been partly devoured by snakes, partly consumed by fire, partly dehydrated in the deserts and the most rough places on the mountains.]

²⁵² CSEL 25,1: 135, 16–19. Cf. *Ex.* 20:5/34:15.

²⁵³ CSEL 25,1: 135, 26 – 136,2. Cf. *John* 17:25.

²⁵⁴ CSEL 25,1: 138, 8–12. Cf. *Lev.* 17:12 ff. and *Mt.* 10:28.

²⁵⁵ CSEL 25,1: 138, 12–23. Cf. *1 Cor.* 15:50.

²⁵⁶ CSEL 25,1: 139, 10–15.

Disputatio 13

[De eo, quod scriptum est in deuteronomio:] uidete, ne obliuiscamini testamentum dei uestri quod conscripsit et faciatis uobis effigies et imagines. addidit etiam dicens: deus uester ignis est edax et deus zelans.²⁵⁷ [huic autem legis capitulo etiam illud *obponunt*, ubi quidam accessit ad dominum et ait illi:] magister bone, quid faciens possidebo uitam aeternam? cui respondit Iesus: quid me interrogas de bono? nemo bonus nisi unus deus²⁵⁸ [ut ex hoc uidelicet *contraria ista esse arbitremur*, quia in lege dicitur: deus ignis edax, et: deus zelans, in euangelio autem: nemo bonus nisi unus deus.]²⁵⁹

[Concerning what is written in the book of Deuteronomy:] Look, lest you forget the testament of your God which He has written down, and make statues and images. He has even added, saying: Your God is a consuming fire and a jealous God. [Against this chapter of the law *they place* the section where somebody went to the Lord and said unto Him:] Good Master, what shall I do to possess everlasting life? Jesus answered him: Why do you ask me what is good? No one is good, but God alone. [By this we should believe that it is evident that both are contraries, because in the Law it is said: God is a consuming fire, and: A jealous God, but in the Gospel: No one is good, but God alone.]

Disputatio 14

[De eo, quod scriptum est in deuteronomio:] secundum desiderium animae tuae occide et manduca omnem carnem iuxta uoluptatem, quam dedit tibi dominus. caue autem, ne sanguinem manduces, sed effunde tamquam aquam super terram.²⁶⁰ [his uerbis legis *Adimantus* contrarium esse arbitrat, quod in euangelio dominus ait:] Non grauentur corda uestra cruditate et uinolentia et curis saecularibus²⁶¹ [et quod ait apostolus:] bonum est non manducare carnem neque bibere uinum²⁶² [et iterum:] non potestis mensae domini participare et mensae daemoniorum.²⁶³ [propterea et illum

[Concerning what is written in Deuteronomium:] Slaughtering according to the desire of your soul and eat every kind of meat with the pleasure which the Lord gave you. However, beware lest you eat the blood, but pour it out like water upon the earth. [*Adimantus* considers the following what the Lord said in the Gospel to be contrary to those words from the law:] Let your hearts not be overburdened by gluttony and wine bibbing and the cares of these times. [And what the apostle says:] It is good, not to eat meat, nor to drink wine [and again:] You can not partake of the table of the Lord and the table of the demons.

²⁵⁷ CSEL 25,1: 144, 10–13. Cf. *Dt.* 4:23 f.

²⁵⁸ CSEL 25,1: 144, 25 – 145, 2. Cf. *Mk.* 10:17 f. and parallel places.

²⁵⁹ CSEL 25,1: 145, 2–5.

²⁶⁰ CSEL 25,1: 148, 1–5 Cf. *Dt.* 12:15 f.

²⁶¹ CSEL 25,1: 148, 5–8. Cf. *Lk.* 21:34.

²⁶² CSEL 25,1: 148, 8 f. Cf. *Rom.* 14:21.

²⁶³ CSEL 25,1: 148, 9 ff. Cf. *1 Cor.* 10:21.

loco *commemorauerunt*, ubi apostolus ait:] quae immolant gentes, daemoniis immolant et non deo.²⁶⁴

[And *they mention* what the apostle says:] What pagans sacrifice, they sacrifice to the demons and not to God.

Disputatio 15

[De eo, quod in leuitico scriptum est:] separate a mundo inmundum et nemo manducet carnem cameli, asini et leporis et porci et aquiliae et milui et corui et uulturis et reliquorum.²⁶⁵ in euangelio *inquit* dicit ad turbam dominus:²⁶⁶ audite et intellegite, nihil est ingrediens in hominem, coinquinans eum; sed ea quae procedunt de eo, coinquinant.²⁶⁷

[Concerning what is written in Leviticus:] Discriminate between clean and unclean, and nobody should eat the flesh of the camel and the ass and the hare and the pig and the eagle and the kite and the raven and the vulture and carrion. *He says:* In the Gospel, the Lord says to the crowd: Hear and understand, nothing what enters man defiles him, but what comes out of him defiles.

Disputatio 16

[De eo, quod scriptum est in deuteronomio:] obserua et sanctifica diem, quem praecepit tibi dominus. sex diebus laborabis et facies omne opus tuum; septima uero die sabbati epulare domino deo tuo nullum faciens opus ipse tu, aut filius tuus aut filia tua aut puer tuus aut puella tua, bos tuus et asinus tuus omnia iumenta tua et colonus tuus. sic autem quiescat seruus tuus et ancilla tua quemadmodum et tu. memento, quoniam seruus fuisti in Aegypto et eruit te dominus deus tuus in manu potenti et brachio excelso. idcirco praecepit tibi dominus custodire diem septimum.²⁶⁸ [et iterum in genesi scriptum est, quemadmodum Abrahae de circumcisione loquitur:] testamentum meum custodi, inquit, tu et semen tuum, quod erit post te. hoc est testamentum meum, quod seruabis inter me et te

[Concerning what is written in Deuteronomy:] Observe and sanctify the day, which the Lord has commanded you. Six days shall you labour and do all your work; however, on the seventh day, the sabbath, you shall feast unto the Lord your God, doing no work, neither you yourself, nor your son, nor your daughter, nor your manservant, nor your maidservant, your ox and your ass, any of your cattle, and your colonist. In this way, your servant and housemaid shall rest like you. Remember that you were a slave in Egypt and that the Lord your God has plucked you out with a powerfull hand and an upstretched arm. For that reason the Lord commanded you to keep the seventh day. [And again, in Genesis it is written just as He spoke to Abraham concerning circumcision:] Keep my testament, he says, you and your seed who will come

²⁶⁴ CSEL 25,1: 152, 14 ff. Cf. 1 Cor. 10:20.

²⁶⁵ CSEL 25,1: 154, 4 ff. Cf. Lev. 20:25, 11:14 f. and Dt. 14:13 f.

²⁶⁶ CSEL 25,1: 156, 15 f.

²⁶⁷ CSEL 25,1: 154, 13 ff. Cf. Mk. 7:14/Mt. 15:11.

²⁶⁸ CSEL 25,1: 159, 8–19. Cf. Dt. 5:12–15.

et semen tuum; omne masculinum circumcides in carne praeputii ipsorum; et sit hoc signum testamenti inter me et uos. octaua autem die circumcidetis omnes masculos in gente uestra, ut etiam dominatum et comparatum circumcidatis praeter alienigenam: et hoc erit testamentum in gente uestra. et omnis masculus qui non circumcidet praeputium suum, perdet animam suam de media plebe, quia testamentum meum dissoluit.²⁶⁹ [... contraria esse euangelio *dicit* de proselyto:] uae uobis, scribae et pharisaei hypocritae, qui circumitis mare et terram, ut faciatis unum proselytum; et cum feceritis, erit filius gehennae multo plus quam estis uos.²⁷⁰ [*commemorat enim* dicentem apostolum:] circumcisis quis uocatus est? non adducat praeputium. in praeputio quis uocatus est? non circumcidatur, quia praeputium nihil est, et circumcisio nihil est, sed obseruatio praeceptorum dei.²⁷¹ [et quod dicit:] dies obseruatis, et sabbata et solemnitates; timeo uos, ne frustra laborauerim in uobis.²⁷²

after you. This is my testament between me and you and your seed which you shall observe: you shall circumcise every male in the flesh of his foreskin. And this will be the sign of the testament between me and you. On the eight day you shall circumcise all male in your family, so that you shall circumcise everyone who is of your household and who is bought, except for the stranger: and this will be my testament in your family. And every male, who does not circumcise his foreskin, he shall lose his soul from amidst the people, for he has obliterated my testament. [... *He declares*: This contradicts what the Lord says in the Gospel about the proselyte:] Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites who encompass sea and land, in order to make one proselyte; and when you have made him (a proselyte), he shall be much more a son of hell than you are. [*For he mentions* what the apostle says:] Is anybody called as a circumcised? Let him not become uncircumcised. Is anybody called uncircumcised? let him not be circumcised, because the foreskin is nothing and the circumcision is nothing, but the observance of the commandments of God. [And what he says:] You observe days and sabbaths and festivals, I am afraid that I have labored over you in vain.

Disputatio 17

[De eo, quod scriptum est in exodo:] si aure audieris uocem meam, et facies quaecumque praecipio tibi, odero odientes te et contristabo contristantes te; praecedet te angelus meus, et adducet te ad Amorrhaeos et Pherezaeos et Chananaeos et Iebusaeos et Gergesaeos,

[Concerning what is written in Exodus:] If you will listen with your ear to my voice, and do whatsoever I command you, then I shall hate those who hate you and afflict those who afflict you; and my angel shall precede you and he shall lead you to the Amorites and the Perizzites and the Canaanites and the Jebusites

²⁶⁹ CSEL 25,1: 159, 19 – 160, 3. Cf. *Gen.* 17:9–14.

²⁷⁰ CSEL 25,1: 160, 5–9. Cf. *Mt.* 23:15.

²⁷¹ CSEL 25,1: 161, 13–17. Cf. *1 Cor.* 7:18 f.

²⁷² CSEL 25,1: 162, 13 f. Cf. *Gal.* 4:10 f.

et occiditis illos. deos eorum ne adoraueritis neque opera ipsorum, sed euerisione euertitis illos, et delete eorum memoriam.²⁷³ [*his uerbis de ueteribus libris ita commemoratis tamquam contrarium obponit Adimantus quod in euangelio scriptum est dicente domino:*] ego autem dico uobis, diligite inimicos uestros. benedicite, qui uobis maledicunt, et benefacite iis qui uos oderunt, et orate pro iis qui uos persequuntur.²⁷⁴

and the Gergasites, and you shall put them to dead. You shall not worship their gods, nor do their works, but you shall overthrow them with destruction, and obliterate their memory. [*Adimantus, having rendered these words of the Old Books thus, places as their opposite, that which is written in the Gospel where the Lord says:*] But I say unto you: Love your enemies. Bless those who curse you and do well to those who hate you, and pray for those who persecute you.

Disputatio 18

[De eo, quod in deuteronomio scriptum est:] si aure audieris uocem domini dei tui, benedictus es in agro tuo, benedictus es in prato tuo, benedictus fructus uentris tui et fructus terrae tuae et generationes iumentorum tuorum et armentum bouum tuorum et grex ouium tuarum; benedictus es in introitu tuo et egressu.²⁷⁵ [*huic capitulo illud dicunt in euangelio esse contrarium:*] si quis uult me sequi, abneget semet ipsum sibi et tollat crucem suam et sequatur me. quid enim prode est homini, si totum mundum lucretur, animae autem suae detrimentum patiat? aut quam dabit homo commutationem pro anima sua?²⁷⁶ [*illum contrarium esse putauerunt huic loco ueteris testamenti, quod dominus ait:*] omnis, qui confusus fuerit me aut uerba mea in gente ista adultera et peccatrice, et filius hominis confundetur illum, cum uenerit in gloria patris sui et laude sanctorum angelorum suorum.²⁷⁷

[Concerning what is written in Deuteronomy:] If you listen with your ear to the voice of the Lord, your God, you will be blessed in your field, blessed in your meadow, blessed the fruit of your womb, and fruit of the earth and the offspring of your beasts of burden, and the herd of your cattle and the flock of your sheep; you are blessed in your coming in and your going out. [*They say that the following from the Gospel is in opposite of that chapter (of Deuteronomy):*] If any person wants to follow me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me. For what benefit has a man, when he wins the whole world, but suffers the loss of his soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? [*They consider this, what the Lord said, to be in contradiction with that passage of the Old Testament:*] Every one who will be ashamed of me or my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man will be ashamed of him, when he comes in the glory of his Father and the praise of his holy angels.

²⁷³ CSEL 25,1: 164, 1–8. Cf. Ex. 23:22–24.

²⁷⁴ CSEL 25,1: 164, 9–14. Cf. Mt. 5:44.

²⁷⁵ CSEL 25,1: 172, 15–21. Cf. Dt. 28:1–6.

²⁷⁶ CSEL 25,1: 172, 21–26. Cf. Mt. 16:24–26.

²⁷⁷ CSEL 25,1: 174, 20–33. Cf. Mk. 8:38.

Disputatio 19

[De eo, quod scriptum est in lege:] ego sum, qui diuitias do amicis meis et paupertatem inimicis.²⁷⁸ [huic sententiae illud *obpununt*, quod dominus dicit:] beati pauperes spiritu, quoniam ipsorum est regnum caelorum²⁷⁹ [et:] uae uobis diuitibus, quia percepistis consolationem uestram.²⁸⁰

[Concerning what is written in the law:] I am the one, who gives wealth to my friends and poverty to my enemies. [Against this sentence, *they oppose* that one which the Lord utters:] Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of heavens. And: Woe to you who are rich, for you have received your consolation.

Disputatio 20

[De eo, quod scriptum est in lege:] Si ambulaueritis in lege, et praecepta mea custodieritis, dabo pluuias tempore suo et producet terra fructus suos et arbores poma et uindemiae tuae messibus succedent et satio uindemiis: et saturabimini et sedebitis in pace in terra uestra et dormietis et non erit qui uos terreat; et perdam omnem beluam ex terra uestra et persequemini inimicos uestros, et cadent ante uos in gladio; et insequentur quinque ex uobis centum et centum ex uobis persequentur decem milia et concident inimici uestri ante uos in gladio: et ueniam et benedicam uos et multiplicabo uos et disponam uos. manducabitis uetus, quod inueterauit, et proicietis uetus ante nouum.²⁸¹ [sed tamen quod etiam huic loco de nouo testamento *dicunt* esse contrarium illud uidelicet, quod dominus ait:] nolite portare aurum neque argentum neque nummos in zonis uestris, non peram in uia neque duas tunicas, neque

[Concerning what is written in the law:] If you will walk in the law, and keep my commandments, I shall give the rains in their season and the earth will bring forth its increase and the trees the fruit and your grapes will reach harvest and I shall satisfy your wine harvests. And you will become satisfied and live in peace in your land and sleep and no one shall terrify you; and I shall destroy all the beasts of prey from your land; and your enemies will be pursued, and they will fall on their own swords before you; and five from you shall pursue a hundred, and a hundred from you shall pursue ten thousand, and they shall cut your enemies into pieces before you with the sword. And I shall come and bless you and multiply you and put order in your lives. And you shall eat what comes to maturity, which he allowed to grow old, and you will put aside the old for the new. [*They say*: It is clearly in opposite of this chapter, that from the New Testament, what the Lord said:] Do not carry gold or silver, nor money in your purses, nor a bag for the journey, nor two coats, nor shoes, nor a staff; for

²⁷⁸ CSEL 25,1: 175, 8 f. Uncertain.

²⁷⁹ CSEL 25,1: 175, 9 ff. Cf. *Mt.* 5:3.

²⁸⁰ CSEL 25,1: 175, 12 f. Cf. *Lk.* 6:24.

²⁸¹ CSEL 25,1: 176, 21–177, 8. Cf. *Lev.* 26:3–10.

calciamenta neque uirgam; dignus est enim operarius mercede sua.²⁸² [*addunt etiam* de illo diuite, cui deus dixerat:] stulte, hac nocte a te animam tuam expetam; quae autem praeparasti, cuius erunt? [et *dicunt* non minus huic capitulo legis esse contrarium, cum in isto inanitas inrisa sit uanae laetitiae, quia incerta illa pro certis habuit, populo autem Israhel certam faciebat illam pollicitationem omnipotentia pollicentis.]²⁸³ [... *isti adiecerunt quasi* contrarium ueteri testamento, quod apostolus loquitur deum non pugna et dissensione, sed pace delectari.]²⁸⁴

the workman is worthy of his hire. [*They even add* that one about the rich one, to whom God says:] You fool, this night, I shall require your soul; but the things you have prepared, whose shall they be? [And *theys say*: (This section) is no less in contradiction with that chapter of the Law, since it derides the vanity of empty joy, for he treated those uncertain things as certain; whereas, the omnipotence of the promiser made that promise certain for the people of Israel.] [... *They add as if it were* against the Old Testament what the apostle says, that God does not delight in fighting and dissension but in peace.]

Disputatio 21

[De eo quod scriptum est in deuteronomio:] maledictus omnis, qui in ligno pependerit.²⁸⁵ [... huic sententiae contrarium, quod ex euangelio *Adimantus obponendum putauit* ubi dominus dixit:] si uis perfectus esse, uende omnia quae possides, et diuide pauperibus et tolle crucem tuam et sequere me.²⁸⁶

[Concerning what is written in Deuteronomy:] Cursed is every one who will hang upon a tree. [... *Adimantus supposed that* (the following passage) from the Gospel, where the Lord spoke, *should be placed* in opposite of the sentence from *Deuteronomy*.] If you want to be perfect, sell all that you possess, and divide it up amongst the poor and take up your cross and follow me.

Disputatio 22

[De homine, quem lapidari deus iussit, qui sabbato inuentus est ligna colligere.]²⁸⁷ [... dominus in euangelio ubi hominis manum aridam sanauit die sabbati ...]²⁸⁸

[Concerning the man whom God ordered to be stoned, who was found gathering wood on the sabbath] (This contradicts the chapter) [in the Gospel where the Lord healed the withered hand of a man, on the sabbath day.]

²⁸² CSEL 25,1: 177, 11–16. Cf. *Mt.* 10:9f.

²⁸³ CSEL 25,1: 178, 3–9. Cf. *Lk.* 12:20.

²⁸⁴ CSEL 25,1: 179, 9ff. Cf. *1 Cor.* 14:33.

²⁸⁵ CSEL 25,1: 179, 21f. Cf. *Dt.* 21:23 (and *Gal.* 3:13).

²⁸⁶ CSEL 25,1: 179, 23 – 180, 1. Cf. *Mt.* 16:24/19:21.

²⁸⁷ CSEL 25,1: 181, 11f. Cf. *Num.* 15:32ff.

²⁸⁸ CSEL 25,1: 181, 12f. Cf. *Mt.* 12:10–13.

Disputatio 23

[De eo, quod scriptum est:] mulier tua sit ut uinea frondescens et filii tui ut nouellae oliuarum in circuitu mensae tuae et uidebis filios filiorum tuorum; et scies, quia hoc modo benedici tur homo, qui timet dominum.²⁸⁹ [hoc *putant* contrarium esse, quod in euangelio dominus de spadonibus ait, qui se ipsos castrant propter regnum caelorum.]²⁹⁰

[Concerning what is written: Your wife shall flourish like a vine, and your sons like fresh olive branches around your table; and you shall see the sons of your sons; and you shall know that the man is likewise blessed who fears the Lord. [*They suppose that* this is contrary to the saying of the Lord in the Gospel about the eunuchs who castrate themselves for the sake of the kingdom of heavens.]

Disputatio 24

[De eo, quod scriptum est apud Salomonem:] imitare formicam et intueri diligentiam eius, quia ab aetatis tempore usque ad hiemem colligit sibi alimonia.²⁹¹ [illud *Adimantus* ex euangelio *dicit* aduersum esse huic sententiae, ubi dominus ait:] nolite cogitare de crastino.²⁹²

[Concerning what is written by Solomon:] Imitate the ant and consider its diligence, because from the time of the summer until winter, it gathers foodstuffs for itself. [*Adimantus says that* contrary to this sentence, is the one from the Gospel where the Lord said:] Do not think about tomorrow.

Disputatio 25

[De eo, quod scriptum est in Osee:] da illis uentrem uacuum et ubera arida; mortifica semen uentris ipsorum, ne pariant.²⁹³ ... *Adimantus posuit ex euangelio quod* in resurrectione a mortuis neque nubent neque uxores ducent neque morientur sed sunt ut angeli dei.²⁹⁴

[Concerning what is written in Hosea:] Give them an empty womb and dry breasts; kill of the semen in their wombs, lest they give birth ... *Adimantus has taken from the Gospel*: At the resurrection from the death, they shall neither be married, nor take unto themselves wives, nor die, but they are like the angels of God.

Disputatio 26

[De eo, quod scriptum est in Amos propheta:] si fieri potest, ut ambulantes

[Concerning what is written in the Prophet Amos:] If it should come to pass,

²⁸⁹ CSEL 25,1: 182, 1–5. Cf. Ps. 127:3 f.

²⁹⁰ CSEL 25,1: 182, 7 f. Cf. Mt. 19:12 f.

²⁹¹ CSEL 25,1: 182, 11 ff. Cf. Prov. 6:6–8.

²⁹² CSEL 25,1: 182, 13 ff. Cf. Mt. 6:34.

²⁹³ CSEL 25,1: 183, 13 ff. Cf. Hos. 9:14 ff.

²⁹⁴ CSEL 25,1: 183, 22–25. Cf. Mt. 22:30.

duo in uia minime se agnoscant, et leo sine praeda ad catulum suum reuertatur; si decidet auis sine aucupe in terram; si tendunt muscipulam sine causa, ut nihil capiant; si dabit sonum tuba in ciuitate, ut plebs non terratur: ita etiam malum aliquod in ciuitate non perpetratur, quod dominus non faciet.²⁹⁵ [... *Adimantus obicit* dixisse dominum:] arbor bona fructus bonos facit; mala autem arbor malos fructus facit.²⁹⁶

that two people walking at the way, barely know each other, and the lion returns to his young without a prey; if a bird should fall upon the earth without a trap; if they should set a trap without a cause, so that they take nothing; if the trumpet should sound off in the town and the people were not terrified: likewise, no kind of evil enters into the town which the Lord did not make. [*Adimantus throws against (that passage the following sentence which) the Lord has spoken:*] A good tree makes good fruit; but an evil tree makes evil fruit.

Disputatio 27

[De eo, quod in Esaia propheta scriptum est:] Ego sum deus, qui facio pacem, et constituo mala.²⁹⁷ [... est ergo Esaia contrarium euangelium, *sicut putat* ... *Adimantus*, ubi dominus dicit:] beati pacifici, quia filii dei uocabuntur.²⁹⁸

[Concerning what is written in Isaiah the prophet:] I am God who makes peace and constitutes evil. [*Adimantus opined that* ... Isaiah is contrary to the Gospel, where the Lord says:] Blessed are the peace makers, for they shall be called the sons of God.

Disputatio 28

[De eo, quod scriptum est in Esaia:] et factum est, eo anno, quo mortuus est Ozias rex: uidi dominum sedentem in sede altissima; et plena erat domus gloriae ipsius et in circuitu Seraphim stabant senas alas habentes, et binis quidem operiebant faciem ipsius, binis uero pedes.²⁹⁹ [huic loco *obponit Adimantus* quod ait apostolus:] Regi autem saeculorum inuisibili honor et laus in saecula.³⁰⁰

[Concerning what is written in Isaiah:] And it came to pass in the same year that Uzziah the king died, that I saw the Lord, sitting on a high seat; and the house was filled with his glory and Seraphim were standing in a circle, having six wings, and with two every one covered their faces, and with two their feet. [*Adimantus places in opposite* of this passage the apostle, who says:] Now, unto the invisible King of the ages, be honour and praise in eternity.

²⁹⁵ CSEL 25,1: 184,14–21. Cf. Amos 3:3–6.

²⁹⁶ CSEL 25,1: 185,5–8. Cf. Mt. 7:17.

²⁹⁷ CSEL 25,1: 186, 13 f. Cf. Isa. 45:7.

²⁹⁸ CSEL 25,1: 186, 28 – 187, 1. Cf. Mt. 5:9.

²⁹⁹ CSEL 25,1: 187, 15–20. Cf. Isa. 6:1 f.

³⁰⁰ CSEL 25,1: 187,20 ff. Cf. 1 Tim. 1:17.

Disputatio 29

Apud Iob scriptum est, *inquiunt*: Ecce uenerunt angeli in conspectum dei, et diabolus in medio eorum. et deus ait diabolo: unde uenis? qui respondens dixit: circuiens totum orbem adueni.³⁰¹ Hic, *inquiunt*, demonstratur diabolus non solum uidisse deum, sed etiam locutum esse cum eo. In euangelio autem dicit: beati qui puro sunt corde, quia ipsi deum uidebunt.³⁰² Et iterum dicit: ego sum ianua, nemo potest uenire ad patrem, nisi per me.³⁰³ *Deinde adiungunt ratiocinationem, dicentes*: Si igitur hi soli qui sunt puro corde uident deum, quonam modo sordidissimo et immundissimo corde diabolus potuit uidere deum? aut qualiter ianuam, hoc est, per Christum ingreditur? Iterum apostulus, *inquiunt*, testa tur et confirmat, dicens quod neque potestates neque principes neque uirtutes deum cognouerunt.³⁰⁴

In the book of Job it is written, *they say*: Behold, angels have come in sight of God and the devil was in their midst. And God said to the devil: Whence did you come? And he, answering, said: I arrive from going round the whole earth. Here, *they say*, it is demonstrated that the devil not only saw God, but had even spoken to Him. In the Gospel, however, He says: Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. And again He says: I am the door, no one can come to the Father, except through Me. *Then they add the reasoning, saying*: If it is indeed the case, that only the pure in heart can see God, how could the devil have seen God with his utterly sordid and unclean heart? Or, how could he have entered the door, that is through Christ? Again, the apostle, *they say*, testifies and confirms this, saying that neither princepalities, nor authorities, nor yet powers have known God.

Disputatio 30

In Aggeo, *inquiunt*, propheta scriptum est: meum est aurum, et meum est argentum;³⁰⁵ In euangelio autem, saluator noster mammona huius modi iniquitatis speciem appellauit.³⁰⁶ De cuius usu beatus apostulus ad Timotheum scribens: radix autem omnium malorum, inquit, et auaritia: quam quidam appetentes, auersi sunt a fide, et inseruerunt se doloribus multi.³⁰⁷

In Haggai the prophet, *they say*, it is written: The gold is mine and the silver is mine. In the Gospel however, our Redeemer called the Mammon a species of unrighteousness. As to its use, the blessed apostle wrote to Timothy: The love of money, he says, is the root of all evil: which while some coveted it, they have erred from the faith and pierced themselves with many sorrows.

³⁰¹ s. 12,1; CCL 41: 165,14–17. Cf. *Job* 1:6.

³⁰² s. 12,1; CCL 41: 165, 18–20. Cf. *Mt.* 5:8.

³⁰³ s. 12,1; CCL 41: 165, 21 f. Cf. *John* 10:9/14:6.

³⁰⁴ s. 12,1; CCL 41: 165,22–28. Cf. *Eph.* 3:10.

³⁰⁵ s. 50,1; CCL 41: 625, 9 f. Cf. *Hag.* 2:9.

³⁰⁶ s. 50,1; CCL 41: 625. Cf. *Lk.* 16:9.

³⁰⁷ s. 50,1; CCL 41: 625. Cf. *1 Tim.* 6:10.

Disputatio 31

[Placet in ingluuiem Iudaeorum daemōnis—neque enim dei—nunc tauros, nunc arietes, nunc etiam horcos, ut non et homines dicam, cultris sternere, ac propter quod idola simus expositi, id nunc exercere crudelius sub prophetis ac lege?]³⁰⁸ [de sacrificiis item frequentem ipsius esse sermonem deum misericordiam uelle, non sacrificium.]³⁰⁹

[Is it right to satisfy the gluttony of the Jewish demon—for he is not God—by the sacrificing on this occasion bulls, on another occasion rams, or even he-goats, not even to mention human beings, and now perform the practices for which we left the idols, in a more cruel way under the prophets and the law?] [Again, concerning the sacrifices, He himself frequently says that Gods desires mercy and not sacrifices.]

Disputatio 32

[De die Domini secundum Sophoniam prophetam]³¹⁰ [Mt. 25:31 ff.?

On the day of the Lord according to Zephaniah the prophet. [Mt. 25:31 ff.?³¹⁰

*Disputatio 33*³¹²

[De Nouo Testamento est, quia De bobus non pertinet ad Deum; Homines et iumenta saluos facies, Domine, de Veteri Testamento est.]³¹³

[The New Testament assumes that God takes no care of the cattle; Thou preservest man and beast belongs to the Old Testament.]

*Disputatio 34*³¹⁴

Maledictus qui non suscitauerit semen in Israhel.³¹⁵ . . . Tempus breue est, reliquum est ut et hi qui habent uxores tamquam non habentes sint.³¹⁶

Cursed is he who has not raised up seed in Israel. (This contradicts the apostle:) The time is short, it remains that they who have wives, should live as those who have not.

³⁰⁸ Thus rendered by Faustus. *c. Faust.* 18,2; *CSEL* 25,1: 491, 6–10.

³⁰⁹ idem, 19 ff. Cf. *Mt.* 9:13 and 12:7.

³¹⁰ Possidius, ‘Tract. adv. M., *Elenchus*, 31 (*MA* 2, 167). Cf. *Zeph.* 1:14 f.

³¹¹ Cf. above, Part E, section 2 *Contra Faustum*.

³¹² See for discussion on this chapter from the *Disputationes* above, Part D, section 3, f. *Ennaratio in Psalmum* 145.

³¹³ *En. in Ps.* 145, 14; *CCL* 40: 2115, 1–4. Cf. *Ps.* 35:7 and *1 Cor.* 9:9.

³¹⁴ See for the discussion on this *Disputatio* Part D, section 3, g. *Sermo: De bono nuptiarum*.

³¹⁵ Uncertain, but cf. *Isa.* 31:9 (LXX).

³¹⁶ F. Dolbeau, *Augustin d’Hippone, Vingt-six sermons au peuple d’Afrique. Retrouvés à Mayence*, Paris 1996, 281. Cf. *1 Cor.* 7:29.

*Possible other fragments from the Disputationes**De tentatione dei*

Tentat uos dominus deus uester.³¹⁷ Sic ergo ignarus est deus rerum, sic nescius cordis humani, ut temptando hominem inueniat?³¹⁸ Deus neminem tentat.³¹⁹

On the testing by God

Your Lord, God, is testing you. Is God so ignorant of the facts, so unaware of the human heart, that He can only discover what is in man by tempting him? (This contradicts the New Testament, where it is said:) God puts nobody to the test.

De pace

[Ecce ubi sibi contradicunt duo Testamenta. dominus dicit]: 'Corripi illum inter te et ipsum solum,' [Salomon dicit:] 'Qui arguit palam pacem facit.' Ergo nescit dominus quid praecepit?³²⁰

On peace

[See where the two Testaments contradict each other. The Lord says:] Reprimand him between you and him alone. [Solomon says:] He, who has made an accusation in public, caused peace. So does God not know what He requires?

On the festivals

[Dt. 16 and Gal. 4:10 f.??]³²¹

³¹⁷ See for this fragment Part D, section 3, c. *Sermo* 2 and d. *Sermo* 71; s. 71,15; *RB* 75 (1965) 79 f.: l. 321. Cf. *Dt.* 13:3.

³¹⁸ s. 2, 2; *CCL* 41: 10, 52 ff.

³¹⁹ Cf. s. 71, 15; *RB* 75 (1965) 79 f. Cf. *Jas.* 1:13.

³²⁰ See for this fragment Part D, section 3, e. *Sermo* 82; s. 82 V (8); *PL* 38: 509. Cf. *Mt.* 18:15 and *Prov.* 10:10.

³²¹ See above, Part E, section 2 *Contra Faustum*.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF THE *DISPUTATIONES*: ITS METHOD, CONTENTS, AND PURPOSES

A. Introduction

In chapter III we discovered that the Manichaean missionaries whom Augustine encountered discussed many of the subjects criticized in the *Disputationes*. Furthermore, it seemed to be quite probable that Augustine did study this work of Adimantus himself in order to collect arguments for his own missionary activities when he was a Manichaean *Auditor*.¹ So it is reasonable to suppose that the *Disputationes* had a missionary purpose. If this observation—which needs to be substantiated by a thorough analysis of the subject matter—turns out to be correct, we have only addressed the first of many questions about the *Disputationes* such as: How does the debate about the Old Testament and New Testament passages relate to the message of Mani? What can reasonably be inferred from the *Disputationes* about the importance of the Old Testament and the New Testament to the Manichaeans? Was the method of antithetical exegesis just intended to demonstrate the inconsistency or even the sheer absurdity of Catholic Christian beliefs, or anything else? Further, we may mention the problem of the relationship of Adimantus' *Disputationes* and Marcion's *Antitheses*. In chapter II, we came across the fact that both books have much in common² and it is tempting to claim that Marcion influenced Adimantus. If Adimantus depended on Marcion when he wrote his *Disputationes*, the question arises: What should be regarded as specifically Manichaean in the *Disputationes*? In this chapter we start to examine these and other questions.

The reconstruction of the *Disputationes* consists mainly of biblical passages. Therefore, in the following section, we will examine the texts in

¹ See Ch. III, part B, section 2. *The Manichaean years*.

² See Ch. II, part B, section 1. *Adimantus' background*.

these quotations. We have already observed that Augustine sometimes criticized Adimantus' reproduction of a biblical passage, because he knew another form of the text.³ We will examine these and the others of Adimantus' quotations from Scripture. The task is mainly to describe Adimantus' treatment of the quotations from both the Old and New Testament by means of examining the variations we can find in Adimantus' rendering of the texts. By means of a close observation of the texts *per se* we should be able to draw some important conclusions about Adimantus' attitude towards the biblical texts, and perhaps we may also find some indications about the kind of textual tradition which he was quoting.

One of the most striking features of the *Disputationes* is that Adimantus set biblical passages from, on the one hand, the Old Testament, and, on the other hand, the New Testament in an antithetical framework. In the third section of this chapter the possible origin (which may well have been Marcion's *Antitheses*) and the implications of this method will be discussed, especially with respect to the significance attached to the Old and New Testament. Furthermore, we attempt to describe several other aspects of Adimantus' exegetical method. Augustine repeatedly rebuked the exegetical skills and methods of Manichaeans in general and of Adimantus in particular. These observations of Augustine could well be important for a thorough examination of Adimantus' way of dealing with the Scriptures. Therefore, Augustine's reproaches are taken into account as well.

In the fourth section, the Old Testament themes that Adimantus criticized in the *Disputationes* are the main point to be discussed. An analysis of the subjects chosen by Adimantus, compared with those in dispute in the *Antitheses*, will enable us to formulate some conclusions about Adimantus' intentions with the *Disputationes*. Adimantus' arguments that Augustine quoted in full are all crucially important, because they clarify several more of Adimantus' purposes. They will be discussed in the second part of the fourth section.

In the fifth section, we will summarize and evaluate the results of this analysis.

³ See Ch. III, n. 83.

B. Bible texts

1. Method and limitations

Making a comparison between Augustine's reproduction of Adimantus' biblical arguments and the other textual traditions of Holy Scripture is a rather precarious enterprise. In all likelihood, Adimantus' *Disputationes* was translated and copied more than once. This process could well explain some of the variants in the biblical passages in the version of the *Disputationes* known to Augustine. Furthermore, we do not know precisely where Adimantus started to write the *Disputationes*, nor which language he used. It may have been written in Syriac, or in Greek, or perhaps even in Coptic. Therefore, the biblical quotations may well have been taken from a codex that was written in any of those three languages. If a variant in a biblical text is found, it is not always possible to establish where it came from. Any difference we find could be ascribed to the particular codex of the Bible that Adimantus was using, to Adimantus himself—whether or not he was acting intentionally—, or to the translators and/or copyists of the *Disputationes*.⁴ Therefore, prudence is called for when we examine the variants in the textual tradition.

In addition, questions about the various textual traditions and different translations are a field of research all on its own. It would go far beyond the scope of this study to examine all of the relevant points. In this section, we compare Adimantus' texts with the most important critical editions of the Old and the New Testament in their original languages. Because of its importance for scientific text criticism, the Septuagint will also be taken into account. Therefore, in the following parts, Adimantus' quotations from the Old Testament will be compared with Rahlfs' critical edition of the Septuagint⁵ and the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible which is edited in the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.⁶ The texts from the Gospel and the Pauline Corpus will be compared with the critical Greek edition of the New Testament by Nestle and Aland.⁷ The variant readings given in these editions will also be taken into consideration. Often,

⁴ Cf. Augustine, *c. Adim.* 28 (CSEL 25,1: 188, 8f.): 'aut si forte mendosos codices legerat, aut iste mendosus est, ubi nos ipsum Adimantum legimus ...'

⁵ A. Rahlfs (ed.), *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta lxx interpretes*, Stuttgart 1979.

⁶ K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Stuttgart 1977.

⁷ E. Nestle and K. Aland (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*, Stuttgart 1990⁴.

Bible texts under discussion will be reproduced according to the Vulgate as well, to facilitate a quick comparison with Adimantus' renderings of the text, which are handed down in Latin.⁸

This procedure will ultimately give us a reliable overview of the characteristic features of Adimantus' reproduction of passages from Scripture, and some light could well be shed on the sources he used.

In order to avoid misleading conclusions, we will only discuss the biblical passages of those chapters from the *Disputationes* that we were able to reconstruct with reasonable certainty. Consequently, we will not take into account the last three of his arguments: *i.e.* 'On the testing by God', 'On peace', and 'On the festivals'.⁹ Furthermore, *Disputatio* 31 was actually rendered in the wording of Faustus, and from *Disputatio* 32 we only have the Old Testament subject matter.¹⁰ So, both of these two *Disputationes* are also left out in the following two sections.

2. *The Old Testament quotations*

One of the most striking features of the renderings of the passages from the Old Testament to which Adimantus has drawn our attention, is that many are shortened or even paraphrased. The first example is found in *Contra Adimantum* 1. This chapter from *Contra Adimantum* was in all likelihood Augustine's second and—from the beginning—written attempt to reply to Adimantus' first *disputatio*.¹¹ Here, it is clearly indicated that the text is reproduced in a summarized form:

Concerning what is written: *In the beginning, God made the heaven and the earth, until what is written: and it became evening, and it became morning, the first day (Gen. 1:1–5).*¹²

In this case, it is most obvious to suppose that Augustine was responsible for the condensing of the biblical quotation. This may be concluded from the fact that, in the following line, Augustine renders Adimantus' interpretation of the first five verses from *Genesis* in the following way:

⁸ R. Weber *et al.* (eds.), *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, Stuttgart 1994⁴.

⁹ See p. 121.

¹⁰ See p. 120.

¹¹ See Ch. III, Part D, 2. *Sermons discussing disputations also refuted in Contra Adimantum*.

¹² *c. Adim.* 1 (CSEL 25,1: 115, 3–5): 'De eo quod scriptum est: in principio fecit deus caelum et terram usque ad id quod scriptum est: et factum est uespere, et factum est mane dies una.'

The most stupid Manichaeans consider this chapter of the Law to be contrary to the Gospel, saying: In Genesis, it is written that God created the heaven and the earth and the light through himself, whereas in the Gospel it is written that the world was constructed through our Lord Jesus Christ.¹³

From these sentences, we may conclude that Adimantus did not only refer to the creation of the heaven and the earth, but as well to the creation of light in his *disputatio*. This is indicative, because the creation of light is found in vers 3, which had not been cited in full in Augustine's reproduction of Adimantus' quotation. It is unlikely that Adimantus should have left out the creation of light in his rendering of the text, while mentioning it in his argument. Besides, this first example is an exception in that the writer indicates explicitly, and rather formally, that the text had been condensed: he points out exactly from where and till where the text is taken into consideration. In the other cases, this is not found in this same manner.¹⁴ Therefore, it is most likely to ascribe the condensing of *Gen.* 1:1–5 to Augustine.

In most, if not all, other cases in which texts are not quoted in full, we may observe a thematical selection of sentences or passages, which eclectic use we probably should ascribe to Adimantus. E.g. in *Disputatio* 3, Adimantus discusses the creation of Eve as it is rendered in *Gen.* 2:18–24. The verses 19 and 20, however, are passed over in silence.¹⁵ These two verses were not essential for Adimantus' argument, as we may conclude from Augustine's rendering of this argument. Augustine's paraphrase of Adimantus' words demonstrate that, in *Disputatio* 3, Adimantus intended to criticize the creation of Eve and the injunctions with respect to marriage:

The Manichaeans insult this passage as they say that this sentence, where it is written about God that He fashioned a woman and married her with a man, contradicts the New Testament ...¹⁶

¹³ *c. Adim.* 1 (CSEL 25,1: 115, 5–10): 'hoc capitulum legis aduersum esse euangelio stultissimi Manichaei arbitrantur dicentes in genesi scriptum esse, quod deus per se ipsum fecerit caelum et terram et lucem, in euangelio autem scriptum esse per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum fabricatum esse mundum.'

¹⁴ In other cases, one sometimes finds words like 'et cetera'; see e.g. n. 18.

¹⁵ *c. Adim.* 3 (CSEL 25,1: 118, 13–18): 'De eo quod scriptum est in genesi: et dixit deus: non est bonum solum hominem esse; faciamus ei adiutorium. et inmisit deus Adae somnum et obdormiuit; et sumpsit unam de costis eius, ex qua formauit Euam, quam adduxit ad Adam et ait: ideo relinquet homo patrem et matrem et adhaerebit uxori suae.'

¹⁶ *c. Adim.* 3 (CSEL 25,1: 118, 19–21): 'huic rursus loco Manichaei calumniantur dicentes contra nouum testamentum esse istam sententiam, qua deus scribitur et formasse mulierem et uiro coniunxisse ...'

The two verses that had been left out relate the story of the names-giving of the animals by Adam, which is not very germane to the subject of the *disputatio*. Besides, the rendering of the text of *Genesis* has a kind of deviation that can be regarded as a customary for Adimantus.¹⁷ The combination of these features makes it probable that this eclectic use of phrases from the biblical passage should be ascribed to Adimantus.

Another example of this thematical selection of sentences from biblical passages may be found in *Disputatio* 8. Here, the question of retaliation is under discussion and Adimantus merely quotes 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth' from *Ex.* 21:24, not mentioning the hand and the foot.¹⁸ It is highly probable that Adimantus does so under influence of *Mt.* 5:38 ff., which text he places in opposite of *Ex.* 21:24.¹⁹

The thematical approach to quoting Old Testament texts can be observed as well in *Disputatio* 11, where Adimantus exerts his criticism of the jealousy of God. In order to establish his position, he cites from two *Exodus* passages, namely *Ex.* 20:5 and 34:15. From both these texts, he merely renders one sentence.²⁰ Furthermore, in e.g. *Disputatio* 9, Adimantus discusses the fact that, in the Old Testament, God regularly appeared to human beings and talked to them. In this case, Adimantus presents not a precise quotation, but a paraphrase, referring to the phenomenon in general terms.²¹

¹⁷ See pp. 130 f.

¹⁸ See *c. Adim.* 8 (*CSEL* 25,1: 130, 9 ff.): 'De eo quod in exodo scriptum est: Oculum pro oculo, dentem pro dente et cetera talia.' Augustine's summary of Adimantus' argument does not indicate another point from *Exodus* that should have been discussed by Adimantus (*CSEL* 25,1: 130, 10 ff.): 'huic loco Manichaei, quod in uetere lege par uindicta permittitur et dicitur oculum pro oculo et dentem pro dente esse perdendum, sic calumniantur ...'

¹⁹ Cf. nn. 27 and 30.

²⁰ *c. Adim.* 11 (*CSEL* 25,1: 135, 16–19): 'De eo quod in exode scriptum est: ne adoraueritis deos alienos et iterum: deus uester zelans appellatur, zelans enim zelauit.' Augustine explicitly stated that is was found thus in his codex (*CSEL* 25,1: 135, 25 ff.): 'ne adoraueritis deos alineos. addunt etiam illud propter hoc dictum esse: deum uester zelans appellatur; zelans enim zelauit.'

²¹ *c. Adim.* 9 (*CSEL* 25,1: 131, 13–18): 'De eo quod scriptum est, quod locutus est deus cum Adam et Eua et cum serpente et cum Cain et caeteris antiquis: inter quos etiam et nonnullis adparuisse scribitur, et ab eis uisus esse, non uno, sed multis scripturarum locis, in quibus et locutus esse deus cum hominibus inuenitur et nonnullis adparuisse.' See for this feature as well, *Disp.* 12 and 22.

Adimantus' practice to condense and/or paraphrase his quotations from the Old Testament could well explain the rather mysterious 'verse' found in *Disputatio* 19:

Concerning what is written in the Law: I am the one, who gives wealth to my friends and poverty to my enemies.²²

In the Old Testament, some passages can be found which, at first sight, seem to be like this one, but none of them resembles it completely.²³ It is significant that no specific book of the Bible is mentioned as its source. The quotation is actually introduced with the words '*in lege*'. Probably, Adimantus referred paraphrasing to what he believed to be a typical feature of the Old Testament.²⁴

The same may be concluded regarding the Old Testament 'quotation' in *Disputatio* 34 on the curse that befalls every man who does not beget seed in Israel, which 'verse' could not satisfactorily be identified.²⁵ It may well have to be treated as a paraphrasing by Adimantus, because fertility was considered as a blessing from God in the Old Testament and infertility as a curse.²⁶

In many cases, Adimantus summarized and paraphrased the Old Testament part of his *disputatio* without substantially influencing the

²² *c. Adim.* 19 (CSEL 25,1: 175, 8f.): 'De eo, quod scriptum est in lege: ego sum qui diuitias do amicis meis, et pauperitatem inimicis.'

²³ Decret (*L'Afrique manichéenne* II, 75, n. 44) names as possible origins of this remarkable quotation two texts: *Prov.* 22:2 (Vulg.: 'dives et pauper obviaverunt sibi utriusque operator est Dominus') and *1 Kings* 3:13 (Vulg.: 'sed et haec quae non postulasti dedi tibi divitias scilicet et gloriam ut nemo fuerit similis tui in regibus cunctis retro diebus'). The first text does deal with the fact that God makes both the rich and the poor, but there is no reference to friends or enemies. The second text, also mentioned by Jourjon (*Six traités antimanchéens*, 340), is a promise made to Solomon, without any connection with poverty and enemies of God. Therefore, it is not likely that one of these two texts was Adimantus' source.

Decret (*Adimantum Manichei discipulum (Contra—)*, AL I, 91) suggests as well *Prov.* 3:13–15 (Vulg.: 'Beatus homo qui invenit sapientiam et qui affluit prudentia. Melior est adquisitio eius negotiatione argenti et auro primo fructus eius. Pretiosior est cunctis opibus et omnia quae desiderantur huic non valent comparari') in a survey of texts quoted by Adimantus. Decret is probably mistaken, because Augustine adduced this text against Adimantus in *c. Adim.* 19.

Jourjon (*Six traités antimanchéens*, 340) mentions as another possible text *Prov.* 6:11 (Vulg.: 'et veniet tibi quasi viator egestas et pauperies quasi vir armatus'), and even used it in the French translation as a section marker. This text, however, has a meaning differing completely from the text given by Adimantus.

²⁴ Cf. n. 21.

²⁵ Cf. Ch. III, n. 175.

²⁶ See for fertility e.g. *Ps.* 126:3 and 127:3–6; for infertility e.g. *Dt.* 28:18.

meaning of the passage he quoted, such as the examples rendered above—and many more could have been mentioned—clearly demonstrate. Evidently, the last two paraphrases from *Disputatio* 19 and 34 do have an interpretative character; but, they are arguably apposite descriptions of several typical Old Testament features. Therefore, we may cautiously claim that Adimantus did not intend to confound the meaning of the Old Testament whenever he summarized or paraphrased an Old Testament quotation.

In addition to the paraphrasing of the Old Testament texts, we also may observe that Adimantus regularly reproduced his citations from the Hebrew Bible according to their New Testament renderings. This is obviously the case in *Disputatio* 21, where *Dt.* 21:23 is quoted. Actually, however, Adimantus cites *Gal.* 3:13:

Concerning what is written in Deuteronomy: Cursed is everyone who will hang upon a tree.²⁷

Probably, this also goes for *Disputatio* 3, where Adimantus quotes *Gen.* 2:18–24. Although he is shortening this particular passage, Adimantus adds two words as well:

Concerning what is written in Genesis: And God said: It is not good for man to be alone; let us make a helper for him. And God sent a sleep upon Adam and he fell asleep; and He took one of his ribs, out of which He formed Eve, whom He brought to Adam. And He said: Therefore, a man should leave his father and mother and he shall cleave to his wife.²⁸

The phrase ‘and He said’ (*et ait*), is not found in the Hebrew, Greek or Latin texts of *Genesis*. It may have been added under influence of the New Testament version of this passage in *Mt.* 19:4f. where *et dixit* is found, which is almost the same as *et ait*.²⁹ Short renderings such

²⁷ *c. Adim.* 21 (CSEL 25,1: 179, 21 f.): ‘De eo, quod scriptum est in deuteronomio: maledictus omnis qui in ligno pependerit.’ *Dt.* 21:23 however runs (Vulg.): ‘Non permanebit cadaver eius in ligno sed in eadem die sepelietur quia maledictus a Deo est qui pendat in ligno et nequaquam contaminabis terram tuam quam Dominus Deus tuus dederit tibi in possessionem.’

²⁸ *c. Adim.* 3 (CSEL 25,1: 118, 13–18): ‘De eo quod scriptum est in genesi: et dixit deus: non est bonum solum hominem esse; faciamus ei adiutorium. et immisit deus Adae somnum et obdormiuit; et sumpsit unam de costis eius, ex qua formauit Euam, quam adduxit ad Adam et ait: ideo relinquet homo patrem et matrem et adhaerebit uxori suae.’

²⁹ The punctuation of *Mt.* 19:4f. is not certain. Nestle-Aland treats verse 4 and verse 5 as two separate sentences, so that the phrase ‘*et dixit*’ functioned as an introduction to the following quote from *Gen.* 2:24. In this case, the subject of ‘*et dixit*’ is Jesus. If verse 4 and 5 belonged to each other, than ‘*et dixit*’ follows a quotation from *Gen.* 2:22 and, as a consequence, the subject is God. A.F.J. Klijn, *Edessa, de stad van de apostel Thomas*,

as ‘Honour your father and your mother,’³⁰ which are longer in the Old Testament, may have been shortened because of their much better known, condensed parallels from the New Testament.

Thus far, such alterations in the quotations from the Old Testament did not give Adimantus any advantage in his biblical polemic. Only one alteration with possibly a tendentious quality occurs. In *Disputatio* 14, Adimantus writes:

Concerning what is written in Deuteronomy: Slaughter according to the desire of your soul and eat every kind of flesh with the same lust that the Lord gave unto you. Take care not to eat the blood, but pour it out like water on the earth (*Dt.* 12:15 f.).³¹

Instead of the reading ‘according to the blessing that the Lord gave unto you’ (*iuxta benedictionem quem dedit tibi dominus*), Adimantus has ‘according to the pleasure ...’ (*iuxta voluptatem ...*). *Voluptas* may have had a negative meaning (lust) and this word is not found in the texteditions that we have made use of.³² So it could be concluded that Adimantus altered this word in order to make the text all the more offensive to his audience. Augustine did not explicitly criticize this rendering of the text, but he needed several lines to explain that the desire given by the Lord does not denote unlimited greed.³³ Therefore we can conclude that the notion of *voluptas* given by the Lord was certainly a problem to Augustine.

3. *The New Testament quotations*

As was the case with passages from the Hebrew Bible, Adimantus sometimes paraphrased passages from the New Testament as well. This is, e.g.,

Baarn 1962, 99, says that the reading of this text in the Diatessaron is: ‘And Adam said ...’, in order to avoid insinuating that either God or Jesus should be held responsible for the marriage commandment.

³⁰ In *c. Adim.* 6 (*CSEL* 25,1: 126, 1 f.): ‘honora patrem tuum, et matrem tuam’. In *Ex.* 20:12, it is followed by ‘ut sis longevus super terram quam Dominus Deus tuus dabit tibi’ (*Vulg.*).

³¹ *c. Adim.* 14 (*CSEL* 25,1: 148, 1–5): ‘De eo, quod scriptum est in deuteronomio: secundum desiderium animae tuae occide et manduca omnem carnem iuxta uoluptatem quam dedit tibi dominus. cave autem ne sanguinem manduces, sed effunde tamquam aquam super terram.’

³² See nn. 5, 6 and 8.

³³ *c. Adim.* 14 (*CSEL* 25,1: 148, 18 ff.): ‘inmoderatam enim uoluptatem non dedit tibi dominus sed quanta sustentationi naturae salutique sufficiat.’

clearly the case with the second quotation from the Gospel (*Mt.* 18:22) that Adimantus introduced into his polemic in *Disputatio* 7.³⁴

A harmonising tendency can also be observed in his quotations from the Gospel. A good example is found in *Disputatio* 13, where Adimantus quotes from the Gospel like this:

Good Master, what shall I do to possess everlasting life? Jesus answered him: Why do you ask me what is 'good'? No one is good, but God alone.³⁵

None of the three synoptic Gospels has precisely this wording, but from each of the three Gospels specific elements have been borrowed.³⁶ This suggests that Adimantus had been familiar with a Gospel harmony. If this is indeed the case, the *Diatessaron of Tatian* is the most likely candidate, because this Gospel harmony extended a far-going influence on the Syriac churches. This is all the more likely because some variant renderings in the quotations from the Gospels by Adimantus have parallels in the *Diatessaron*.³⁷ According to Gilles Quispel,³⁸ a variant from the *Diatessaron* on *Mt.* 22:30 may be found in *Contra Adimantum* 25:

In the resurrection from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, nor die, but are as the angels of God.³⁹

The phrase 'nor die' (*neque morientur*) cannot be found in the synoptic Gospels, but it does appear in the *Diatessaron*.

Nevertheless, from Augustine's *Contra Faustum* we learn that the Manichaean Faustus discussed all four canonical Gospels, which, moreover,

³⁴ *c. Adim.* 7 (CSEL 25,1: 127, 10–12): 'et ilud aliud, quod item dominus ait non solum septies peccanti fratri dimittendum sed etiam septuagies septies.' The first part of the saying of the Lord is a summary of the foregoing discussion between Jesus and Peter and is not found with those precise words in any of the three synoptic gospels. Other possible examples could well be those in *Disp.* 5, 12, 22 and 23.

³⁵ *c. Adim.* 13 (CSEL 25,1: 144, 26 – 145, 2): 'magister bone, quid faciens possidebo vitam aeternam? cui respondit Iesus: quid me interrogas de bono? nemo bonus, nisi unus deus.'

³⁶ See *Mk.* 10:17f., *Mt.* 19:16f., and *Lk.* 18:18f. *Magister bone, quid faciens vitam aeternam possidebo?* is only found in *Lk.* (*Mk.* e.g. has *percipiam* in stead of *possidebo*, *Mt.* *habeam* and other differences); *Quid me interrogas de bone?* only occurs in *Mt.* (*Lk.* and *Mk.*: *Quid me dicis bonum*); *Nemo bonus, nisi unus Deus* is only found in (*Mt.*: *Unus est bonus*, *Lk.*: ... *solus Deus*).

³⁷ The problems related to the study of the *Diatessaron* are highly complicated. For a good survey see W.L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron. Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1994.

³⁸ G. Quispel, *Tatian and the Gospel of Thomas. Studies in the History of the Western Diatessaron*, Leiden 1975, 68 n. 22.

³⁹ *c. Adim.* 25 (CSEL 25,1: 183, 24f.): 'in resurrectione a mortuis neque nubent neque uxores ducent neque morientur, sed sunt ut angeli dei.'

he may well have learned from Adimantus.⁴⁰ So we cannot be completely certain about the use of Tatian's *Diatessaron* among the Manichaeans.⁴¹ We may cautiously assume that the Manichaeans knew the *Diatessaron*⁴²—and therefore preserved some readings from that Gospel harmony in their writings—but it should probably not be treated as the exclusive source of their knowledge of the Gospels.

A remarkable feature of the quotations from the New Testament is the fact that Adimantus regularly conflates two or more passages into one quotation. The first example can be found in *Disputatio* 4. In Adimantus' words, the Gospel quotation runs as follows:

Do not think about tomorrow; because the day of tomorrow will think of itself. Consider the birds of the air, because they do not sow, neither mow, nor collect into barns.⁴³

In fact, this quotation is a conflation of *Mt.* 6:34 and *Mt.* 6:26 (in that order). An identical example is found in *Disputatio* 21, where Adimantus combines *Mt.* 16:24 and *Mt.* 19:21 in this way:

If you want to be perfect, sell all that you possess, and divide it up amongst the poor and take up your cross and follow me.⁴⁴

Sometimes, Adimantus introduces only a few words from other texts in his reproduction of a verse from the New Testament. For example, in *Disputatio* 1, where he cites a saying of the apostle Paul with the following words:

He is the Firstborn of all creation; and all things were made through Him in heaven and on earth, both visible and invisible.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ See Ch. V, part A, section 3. *The Contra Faustum and the Capitula*.

⁴¹ M. Tardieu strongly denies the possibility that the Manichaeans made use of the *Diatessaron*; see his, 'Principes de l'exégèse Manichéenne du Nouveau Testament', in: idem, *Les règles de l'interprétation*, Paris 1987, 123–146 (esp. 126 f., n. 16).

⁴² See e.g. W. Sundermann, 'Christliche Evangelientexte in der Überlieferung der iranisch-manichäischen Literatur', *MIO* 14 (1968) 386–405 (esp. 389–394) and J. van Oort, '*Secundi Manichaei Epistula*: Roman Manichaean Biblical Argument in the Age of Augustine', in: idem et al. (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001, 161–173. Cf. as well n. 29.

⁴³ *c. Adim.* 4 (CSEL 25,1: 122, 26 – 123, 3): 'nolite cogitare de crastino; nam crastinus dies ipse cogitabit sibi. respicite uolatilia caeli, quia non seminant neque metunt neque colligunt in horrea.'

⁴⁴ *c. Adim.* 21 (CSEL 25,1: 179, 23 – 180, 1): 'si uis perfectus esse, uende omnia quae possides, et diuide pauperibus, et tolle crucem tuam et sequere me.'

⁴⁵ *c. Adim.* 1 (CSEL 25,1: 116, 11–15): 'ipse est primogenitus totius creaturae; et per ipsum facta in caelis et in terris, uisibilia et inuisibilia.'

This sentence corresponds exactly with *Col.* 1:15b–16a apart from the words ‘and all things have been *made through* Him.’ In *Col.* 1:16a we find: ‘*because* all things have been *created in* Him.’⁴⁶ Although the meanings of these two lines have much in common, their wording is not perfectly identical, and the differences cannot be traced back to any textual tradition. The words that are different run exactly parallel with *John* 1:3.⁴⁷ Since Adimantus quoted already *John* 1:10 in *Disputatio* 1, the most obvious conclusion is that, in this case, Adimantus conflated words from *Colossians* 1 and *John* 1.⁴⁸

Although the example just cited might be regarded as questionable because of the close resemblance between the putatively confused sentences, the following passage from the Gospel in *Disputatio* 8 does provide us with an unmistakable example of this procedure, because Adimantus reproduces *Mt.* 5:38–40 with the following words:

Listen, because it was said to them of old: an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say to you not to resist the evil one, but if any man will smite you on your cheek, turn the other one unto him as well, and whoever wants to drag you into the court and take your tunic, let him have the cloak as well.⁴⁹

The phrase ‘to them of old’ (*antiquis*) is not found in this particular context, but it was, in all likelihood, taken from *Mt.* 5:21. A similar conflation of words from two texts occurs in *Disputatio* 16 where Adimantus cites the following words of the apostle:

You observe days and sabbaths and festivals, I am afraid that I have laboured over you in vain.⁵⁰

This phrase has much in common with *Gal.* 4:10. However, the word ‘Sabbaths’ is not found in that passage. There we find ‘months and times and years.’ In *Contra Adimantum* 16, Augustine also observes that Adi-

⁴⁶ *Col.* 1:16a: ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; (Vulg.: ‘quia in ipso condita sunt universa.’)

⁴⁷ *John* 1:3: πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν; (Vulg.: omnia per ipsum facta sunt et sine ipso factum est nihil quod factum est).

⁴⁸ Cf. Ch. III, Part D, section 2. *Sermons discussing disputations also refuted in Contra Adimantum.*

⁴⁹ *c. Adim.* 8 (CSEL 25,1: 130, 10–20): ‘audistis, quia dictum est antiquis: oculum pro oculo et dentem pro dente; ego autem dico uobis, non resistere malo sed si quis te percusserit in maxillam, praebe illi et alteram, et quicumque uoluerit tecum iudicio contendere et tunicam tuam auferre, dimitte illi et pallium.’

⁵⁰ *c. Adim.* 16 (CSEL 25,1: 162, 13 f.): ‘dies obseruatis et sabbata et sollemnitates; timeo uos, ne frustra laborauim in uobis.’

mantus' quotation was not exact, without giving a possible reason or citing a source for this lack of agreement.⁵¹ It could well have had its origin in *Col.* 2:16, where the same problem is discussed from a rather different angle and especially the Sabbath is mentioned.⁵² *Disputatio* 29 provides us with the last clear example of the conflation of two texts⁵³ when Adimantus quotes from *John*:

I am the door, no one can come to the Father, except through Me.⁵⁴

The saying of Jesus is not found in this precise form in the Gospels. In fact, it consists of sayings taken from *John* 10:9 and *John* 14:6.

These differences in Adimantus' reproduction of New Testament passages demonstrate that he regularly conflated words from several verses in the New Testament in a highly associative way. This practice creates the impression that Adimantus cited *ad lib.* from the New Testament, which suggests that he must have had a thorough knowledge of New Testament traditions.

The hypothesis that Adimantus regularly cited off the cuff (as it were), is supported by two defective quotations from the Pauline Corpus. In *Disputatio* 28 Adimantus criticizes *Isa.* 6:1, for which he cites the following words of the apostle Paul:

Now, unto the invisible King of the ages, be honour and praise in eternity.⁵⁵

The text that seems to be the closest is *1 Tim.* 1:17; but, this is longer than Adimantus' rendering. In *Contra Adimantum* 28, Augustine notices that Adimantus did not quote the text of the apostle Paul in full:

... that he (Adimantus) did not quote the words of the apostle in full. For thus said the apostle: However, to the King of the Ages, the invisible, the incorruptible, the only God, be honour and glory in the age of ages.

⁵¹ *c. Adim.* 16 (CSEL 25,1: 162, 15–18): 'non quidem sic scriptum est, ut Adimantus ponit. non enim nominat ibi sabbatum apostolus. dicit enim: dies obseruatis et annos et tempora; timeo uos, ne frustra laborauerim in uobis.'

⁵² *Col.* 2:16: Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν βρώσει καὶ ἐν πόσει ἢ ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων (Vulg.): 'nemo ergo uos iudicet in cibo aut in potu aut in parte diei festi aut neomeniae aut sabbatorum.'

⁵³ A less obvious example is *Disp.* 14, where Adimantus quoted *Lk.* 21:34 (CSEL 25,1: 148, 23 f.). Here he used 'curis saecularibus' instead of 'curis huius vitae'. Adimantus' rendering could well have been influenced by *Mt.* 13:22.

⁵⁴ *s.* 12, 1 (CCL 41: 165, 21 f.): 'ego sum ianua, nemo potest uenire ad patrem, nisi per me.'

⁵⁵ *c. Adim.* 28 (CSEL 25,1: 187, 25 – 188, 1): '... uel in apostolic uerbis non totum dicere. nam dixit apostolus: regi autem saeculorum inuisibili, incorruptibili, soli deo honor et gloria in saecula saeculorum.'

Augustine wonders whether Adimantus deliberately omitted the word ‘incurruptible’, or whether he had defective codices.⁵⁶ It is much more likely, however, that Adimantus, in this case being only interested in the problem of the visibility of God, simply cites what he remembered as being relevant for this subject.

In *Disputatio* 29 we find a paraphrased quotation from the apostle Paul:

Again, the Apostel (...) testifies and confirms this, saying that neither principalities, nor authorities, nor yet powers have known God.⁵⁷

In *sermo* 12, which Augustine dedicated to the refutation of this *Disputatio*, Augustine feels constrained to investigate the origin of those words. Augustine wonders where Adimantus could possibly have read it, because it contradicts *Mt.* 18:10 where we can read that the angels do see the face of God. Augustine mentions *1 Cor.* 2:6ff. as a possible source, which possibility he, however, rejects.⁵⁸ The only two New Testament passages which contain the words ‘principality, authority and power’ (*principatum, potestatem* and *virtutem*) in the same sequence are *1 Cor.* 15:24⁵⁹ and *Eph.* 1:21.⁶⁰ However, there are still some striking dif-

⁵⁶ *c. Adim.* 28 (CSEL 25,1: 187, 22 – 188, 9): ‘in qua questione quaerendum est ... uel in apostolic uerbis non totum dicere. nam ita dixit apostolus: regi autem saeculorum inuisibili, incorruptibili, soli deo honor et gloria in saecula saeculorum. ... in apostolo autem forte uidit, quod si dixisset: incorruptibili deo, responderetur illi, quod nunc istis dicimus: quid ergo incorruptibili deo factura erat gens tenebrarum, si cum ea pugnare nolisset? aut, si forte mendosos codices legerat aut iste mendosus est, ubi nos ipsum Adimantum legimus ...’

⁵⁷ *s.* 12, 1 (CCL 41: 165, 26ff.): ‘Iterum apostulus, (inquiunt,) testatur et confirmat, dicens quod neque potestates neque principes neque uirtutes deum cognouerunt.’

⁵⁸ *s.* 12, 2 (CCL 41: 166, 33–48): ‘Sed primo ab istis uellem quaerere, ubi Adimantus apud apostolum legerit—nam talium calumniarum iste conscriptor est—uellem ergo diceret ubi legerit testantem apostolum et confirmantem, ut dicit, quod neque principes neque potestates neque uirtutes deum cognouerunt, cum dominus etiam hominum in se credentium dicat angelos quotidie uidere faciem patris. Nisi forte illud quod Paulus apostulus ait: *Sapientiam loquimur inter perfectos, sapientiam autem non huius saeculi, neque principium huius saeculi, qui euacuantur. Sed loquimur dei sapientiam in mysterio, quae abscondita est, quam praefinuit deus ante saecula in gloriam nostram, quam nemo principum huius saeculi cognouit. Si enim cognouissent, numquam dominum gloriae crucifixissent?* Si istum locum iste conscribere cogitabat, cur addidit potestates et uirtutes, quod non ibi dictum est; et detraxit, *huius saeculi*, quod dictum est?’

⁵⁹ *1 Cor.* 15:24: εἶτα τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ, ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν. (Vulg.: ‘deinde finis cum tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri cum euacuauerit omnem principatum et potestatum et uirtutem.’)

⁶⁰ *Eph.* 1:21: ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου, οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

ferences. Adimantus uses plural forms, whereas in the aforementioned passages the singular forms have been used. Furthermore, it is rather difficult to explain how the phrase ‘have not known’ (*non cognoverunt*), which is found in Adimantus’ text, could possibly be connected with either of these two passages. A more likely possibility could well be *Eph.* 3:10.⁶¹ Although the word ‘powers’ (*virtutes*) is not found here, the text speaks of ‘making known’, which presupposes a previous unawareness. Of all the New Testament passages, this one has the most in common with Adimantus’ reproduction of Paul’s words. Furthermore, it is possible that ‘powers’ (*virtutes*) originated from either *1 Cor.* 15:24 or from *Eph.* 1:21 and that Adimantus introduced it associatively into the quotation.

For the time being, we can say that Adimantus’ rendering of the New Testament documents certainly does reveal a thorough knowledge of that material. Adimantus’ acquaintance with the New Testament documents triggered off an associative and creative process in his mind for the application of this knowledge in order to reject the Hebrew Scriptures.

Although Adimantus cited the New Testament like this, he rarely, if ever, manipulated the texts in order to corroborate his own arguments. Only two examples can be identified. The first is in *Disputatio* 4, which discusses the difference between the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament on the subject of worldly goods. The first part of the passage from the Gospels reads as follows:

Do not think about tomorrow, because the day of tomorrow will think of itself (*Mt.* 6:34).⁶²

Not even thinking about tomorrow is a far more difficult assignment than not caring about tomorrow, which can be found in the original text.⁶³ The

(Vulg.: ‘supra omnem principatum et potestatum et virtutem et dominationem et omne nomen quod nominatur non solum in hoc saeculo sed in futuro.’)

⁶¹ *Eph.* 3:10: ἵνα γνωρισθῆ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ. (Vulg.: ‘ut innotescat principibus et potestatibus in caelestibus per ecclesiam multiformis sapientia Dei.’)

⁶² *c. Adim.* 4 (CSEL 25,1: 122, 26 – 123, 3): ‘nolite cogitare de crastino; nam crastinus dies ipse cogitabit sibi. respicite uolatilia caeli, quia non seminant neque metunt neque colligunt in horrea.’

⁶³ *Mt.* 6:34: μὴ οὖν μερομνήσητε εἰς τὴν αὔριον, ἡ γὰρ αὔριον μερομνήσει ἑαυτῆς· ἀρκετὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ κακία αὐτῆς. (Vulg.: nolite ergo esse solliciti in crastinum crastinus enim dies sollicitus erit sibi ipse sufficit diei malitia sua.)

second example is in *Disputatio* 16. Here, the Old Testament command to circumcise is examined. Adimantus places *Mt.* 23:15 over against its opposite:

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites who encompass sea and land, in order to make one proselyte; and when you have made him a proselyte, he shall be much more a son of hell than you are!⁶⁴

Two differences are striking. The first is that the proselyte will be ‘much more’ instead of ‘twofold more’ a son of hell. The second, even more telling, is that the proselyte becomes a son of hell for the simple reason that he has been circumcised. In the canonical tradition, however, the scribes and Pharisees will turn him into a son of hell after he has already been circumcised.⁶⁵ These changes are remarkable in an argument against Jewish circumcision.

We might conclude with respect to these two *Disputationes* that, during the heat of the debate, Adimantus probably overstated his case, which induced him to intensify the original thrust of those texts.

C. Exegetical methods of the *Disputationes*

1. *The methodological application of ‘antitheses’*

In every *disputatio* Adimantus cited one or more texts from the Old Testament, against which he set at least one text from the New Testament in opposition. Many of the antitheses are closely related to a single text or passage and discuss one subject, such as circumcision. Sometimes, however, Adimantus is more interested in a recurring feature that can be found in the Old Testament. For example, in *Disputatio* 9 he mentioned that in several passages in the Old Testament it says that God really did appear to human beings and even spoke to them.⁶⁶ On other occasions, however, the antitheses deal with more than one topic. In *Disputatio* 16 Adimantus discussed the observance of the Sabbath and the practice of

⁶⁴ c. *Adim.* 16 (CSEL 25,1: 160, 6–9): ‘uae uobis, scribae et pharisaei hypocritae, qui circumitis mare et terram, ut faciatis unum proselytum; et cum feceritis, erit filius gehennae, multo plus quam uos.’

⁶⁵ ... *multo plus quam uobis estis*, in stead of ... *duplo quam vos*, and: *et cum feceritis, erit filius gehennae* instead of *et cum fuerit factus facitis eum filium gehennae*.

⁶⁶ Cf. *Disp.* 9.

circumcision on the basis of two different OT-passages. Furthermore, one passage from the Old Testament can have two or more themes which are the opposite of the New Testament passages.⁶⁷

All of the antitheses are between the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament, and never between two passages from the Old or two passages from the New Testament. In every case Adimantus quoted the Old Testament passage(s) first and then proceeded to contrast it with one or more passages from the New Testament.

As regards to the method that Adimantus applied in his *Disputationes*, we may observe a striking similarity with Marcion's *Antitheses*. Marcion, who believed in two Gods—*i.e.* the demiurge who created the universe and the supreme God—distinguished between the influence of both Gods in the Holy Scriptures. Marcion believed that the Jewish Scriptures in their entirety must have been the revelation of the demiurge, for which reason he rejected them. Marcion not only criticized those Scriptures, but he even treated the authoritative tradition of the apostles (and their immediate followers) with suspicion. He claimed that they had been corrupted by Jewish tendencies. Therefore, Marcion constructed his own canon, which consisted only of ten Epistles of Paul (excluding *Hebrews* and the *Pastoral Epistles*) and the *Gospel of Luke*. According to Marcion, all the other writings in the New Testament were influenced by the Jewish belief in the demiurge and his laws. Even the Epistles of Paul and the *Gospel of Luke* were corrupted (to a certain extent) by this belief. Therefore, Marcion attempted to purify the text of his own canon.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Cf. *Disp.* 20 which discusses the antitheses between *Lev.* 26:3–10—in which passage the Lord promised Israel good harvests in the promised land, abundant supplies and a glorious victory over their enemies—and *Mt.* 10:9 f. on the prohibition for the disciple to take any provisions with them on the road; *Lk.* 12:20 on the rich fool and his harvest and the saying of the apostle Paul that God is not pleased by fighting and confusion, but by peace (*1 Cor.* 14:33).

⁶⁸ For Marcion and his *Antitheses*, see A. von Harnack, *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholische Kirche*, Leipzig 1924². The work is still without rival, because Harnack thoroughly examined virtually all of the evidence (according to B. Aland, 'Marcion/Marcioniten', *TRE* 22, 89–101 (89f.)). Recently, Harnack's work has been re-edited in the series 'Bibliothek Klassischer Texte', Darmstadt 1996. In this edition, Harnack's 'Neue Studien zu Marcion' have been added to the original book.

See further, G. May, 'Marcion in Contemporary Views', *SecCent* 6,3 (1987/88), 129–151 (132f.), and idem, 'Marcions Genesis Auslegung und die "Antithesen"', in: D. Wyrwa

In his *Antitheses*, Marcion strove to construct the justifications for his purification of the canon, by identifying contradictions between the Bible of the Jews and his own collection of canonical writings.

Many scholars opine that Adimantus borrowed the antithetical explanation of Scripture from Marcion.⁶⁹ Indeed, it is almost impossible to avoid the conclusion that Marcion's *Antitheses* must have provided Adimantus with the methods he applied in the *Disputationes* because of the striking similarities between both works. This is all the more likely, because Marcion was well known in Manichaean circles. It is even possible that he was lionized as one of the forerunners of Mani.⁷⁰

However, in the *Disputationes* Adimantus was quite selective in his use of the antithetical method, because he merely constructed antitheses

et. al. (eds.), *Die Weltlichkeit des Glaubens in der Alten Kirche. Festschrift für Ulrich Wickert zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Berlin-New York 1997, 189–198 (194f.). In the summer of 2001 a conference on Marcion was held in Germany. The proceedings of this conference were published by Gerhard May *et al.* (eds.), *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung*, Berlin-New York 2002.

⁶⁹ See especially S.N.C. Lieu, 'An Early Byzantine Formula for the Renunciation of Manichaeism—The "Capita VII contra Manichaeos" of (Zacharias of Mitylene). Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary', in: idem, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1999², 270: 'The work of Adimantus seems to have been modelled on the *Antitheses* of Marcion in that both tried to deny the authority of the Old Testament by citing apparently contradictory passages from the New Testament'; idem, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*, 92: 'The method which he adopts is undoubtedly borrowed from Marcion's *Antitheses* which was refuted by Tertullian. It is not improbable that Addas was a Marcionite prior to his joining the new sect of Mani.'

See further W.H.C. Frend, 'The Gnostic-Manichaean Tradition in Roman North Africa', *JEH* 4 (1953) 13–26, on which study see below pp. ***; R. Merkelbach, 'Manichaica (1–3)', *ZPE* 56 (1984), 51–53; W.A. Löhr, 'Die Auslegung des Gesetzes bei Markion, den Gnostikern und den Manichäern', in: G. Schöllgen & C. Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann*, Münster 1996, 77–95 (89); J. van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon: A Study into Augustine's City of God and the Sources of his Doctrine of the Two Cities*, Leiden-New York-Copenhagen—Köln 1991, 38.

⁷⁰ Namely in *Kephalaia* 1,13 (translation: I. Gardner, *The Kephalaia of the Teacher. The edited Coptic Manichaean texts in translation with commentary*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1994, 19): '[A]t this time also, in the last church, a righteous [m]an / of truth app[ea]red, belonging to the kingdom. He reinforced [... / ...] they cared for the church of our master according to [their / capacity; bu]t they too were raised up to the lan[d of / light]. The 'righteous man' has been identified with 'Marcion' by most commentators; e.g., A. Böhlig, 'Christliche Wurzeln im Manichäismus', in: idem, *Mysterion und Wahrheit. Gesammelte Beiträge zur spätantiken Religionsgeschichte*, Leiden 1968, 202–221 (208 ff.); cf. C. Marksches, 'Die valentinianische Gnosis und Marcion', in: May, *Marcion*, 159–175 (175, n. 82).

between the Old and the New Testament. Marcion's *Antitheses*, however, did as well have antitheses between passages from the New Testament and also between parts of the Old Testament.⁷¹

The antithetical method of exegesis practised by Adimantus raises some crucial questions about his precise intentions. Did he simply want to demonstrate the incoherence of the Catholic Christian Canon, or something else? The way in which Adimantus constructed the antitheses (*i.e.* parts of the New Testament are used in order to castigate the Old Testament part of the Christian Canon and not vice versa, or intra) suggests that Adimantus especially intended to vent his disapproval of the Old Testament by using this antithetical method of explanation. If this really were the case, it would indicate indirectly that the Old Testament was important at least to the extent that it was worth criticism. This raises the question of what Adimantus thought about the origin of the Old Testament.⁷² Should it be regarded as an outmoded and inferior revelation, subsequently surpassed by a new revelation from another God, like Marcion intended to demonstrate in his *Antitheses*?⁷³ In that case, the writers of the Old Testament were plain ignorant. Another possibility is that the Old Testament should be treated as an intentionally misleading

⁷¹ This may be concluded from Tertullian's discussion of the *Antitheses*. Concerning the New Testament, see *Adv. Marc.* iv, 4: 'Si enim id evangelium quod Lucae refertur penes nos (viderimus an et penes Marcionem) ipsum est quod Marcion per *Antitheses* suas arguit ut interpolatum a protectoribus Iudaismi ad concorporationem legis et prophetarum, qua etiam Christum inde configerent, utique non potuisset arguere nisi quod invenerat.' (Edition and translation: E. Evans, *Tertullian, 'Adversus Marcionem.' Books I-III*, Oxford 1972, 268). Harnack, *Marcion*, 78 ff., also mentions that in the *Antitheses* Marcion most probably dealt with all of the four Gospels and the Pauline Corpus. With regard to the Old Testament, see e.g. *Adv. Marc.* ii, 21: 'Sic et in ceteris contrarietates praeceptorum ei exprobras ut mobili et instabili, prohibentis sabbatis operari et iubentis arcam circumferri per dies octo, id est etiam sabbato, in expugnatione civitatis Hiericho.' (Evans, 143 f.).

⁷² Augustine regularly made mention of what he inferred from Adimantus' method. E.g. s. 1, 1 (*CCL* 41: 3, 16-20): 'Audent quippe illi huiusmodi dolos praetendere incautis, ut dicant aduersari sibi scripturas Noui et Veteris Testamenti, ita ut una fide retineri utrumque non possit. Et ipsa principia libri Geneseos et euangelii cata Iohannem sibimet inimica persuadere molientes, quasi ex aduersa fronte committunt.' Cf. also *c. adv. leg.* II, 12, 42 (*CCL* 49: 131, 1322-1326): '... ubi de utroque testamento velut inter se contraria testimonia proferuntur uersipelli dolositate, uelut inde ostendatur utrumque ab uno deo esse non posse, sed alterum ab altero. Contra hoc autem malignum machinamentum iam olim scripsimus ...'

⁷³ See e.g. Harnack, *Marcion*, 30 f.; Aland, 'Marcion/Marcioniten', 93 and May, 'Genesisauslegung', 189.

description of reality, instigated by evil powers. To decide between those alternatives, we need first to discuss the contents of the *Disputationes*, which will be done in part D.

Another clue about Adimantus' intentions may be found in the New Testament parts of the antitheses. Adimantus' method of discussing the Old Testament demonstrates that he could use—even independently of the Manichaean writings—passages from the New Testament to assess the truth of the Hebrew Bible. This might indicate that Adimantus considered at least some parts of the New Testament to be trustworthy. However that may be, the Manichaeans' attitude towards the New Testament was rather ambiguous, which also applies to Adimantus.⁷⁴ With respect to the *Disputationes*, one can still doubt whether the New Testament was beyond the reach of all possible criticism, because in *Contra Adimantum* Augustine sometimes refutes the Manichaeans' opinion that at least some parts of the Gospel must have been added by forgers of the Scriptures.⁷⁵ Before we are able to infer from Adimantus' antithetical method what he intended to do with the New Testament passages in the *Disputationes*, we need first to examine whether Augustine directed his criticism against the Manichaeans' opinion about the falsification of the New Testament in general, or against a specific remark in Adimantus' *Disputationes* that Augustine did not quote in full.

Augustine's first remark about the Manichaeans' objections to the Gospel can be found in *Contra Adimantum* 3. Augustine quotes *Mt.* 19: 3–9 at this point in his argument in order to defend the institution of marriage against Adimantus' criticisms. After quoting the passage from the Gospel, Augustine goes on to say:

Do they even say that the Gospel contradicts the Gospel? What it does mean when they say that this chapter is false and that it was added by corrupters of the Scriptures—which they usually say when they can find nothing to say in response.⁷⁶

The most probable reason for Augustine's remarks is not an actual occurrence of such a criticism of the New Testament by Adimantus, but a

⁷⁴ See Ch. V, Part C.

⁷⁵ Cf. also Decret, *L'Afrique* I, 101.

⁷⁶ *c. Adim.* 3 (CSEL 25,1: 119, 24–27): 'numquid etiam euangelium euangelio dicunt esse contrarium? quod si dicunt hoc capitulum falsum esse et a corruptoribus scripturarum esse additum—nam hoc solent, quando non inueniunt, quid respondeant, dicere.'

pre-emptive strike (so to say) to safeguard his own argument. Augustine knew that the Manichaeans used arguments such as these whenever passages from Scripture contradicted their own opinions. Apart from that, in the same chapter Augustine wonders why the Manichaeans usually say that the Old Testament is in opposition to the New Testament, rather than the other way round, namely that the New Testament contradicts itself.⁷⁷ By saying this, Augustine already suggests that in *Contra Adimantum* 3, Adimantus did not use this way of criticizing the New Testament.

In *Contra Adimantum* 15, Augustine mentions the Manichaeans' habit of insisting that parts of the New Testament should be treated as spurious.⁷⁸ The course of this argument, however, makes it quite clear that Augustine uses a rhetorical gambit that had not been provoked by anything in the writings of Adimantus.

In *Contra Adimantum* 17, Augustine mentions that the Manichaeans did not accept the *Acts of the Apostles*,⁷⁹ which he probably says to let his readers know that he was well aware of what the Manichaeans thought about that particular book. Because, Augustine's remark can be found in a rather long introduction to a quotation from *Acts* that Augustine wanted to use when he was attacking the opinions of Adimantus.

In short: we can say that the three chapters of *Contra Adimantum* in which Augustine mentions the Manichaean criticism of the New Testament give us no reason to conclude that Adimantus did indeed criticize one or more passages from the New Testament in the *Disputationes*. This is striking, because it was a well-known practice among Manichaeans. Furthermore, as we observed above, Marcion certainly criticized parts of the New Testament in his *Antitheses*, which work seems to have influenced Adimantus' *Disputationes*. The absence of any criticism of the New Testament may be construed as an indication of Adimantus'

⁷⁷ *c. Adim.* 3 (CSEL 25,1: 119, 1–4): 'cur enim potius uetus testamentum dicunt adversari huic sententiae domini, qua dicit relinquendam esse uxorem propter regnum caelorum et non ipsum nouum sibi aduersari? quod nefas est dicere.'

⁷⁸ *c. Adim.* 15 (CSEL 25,1: 155, 6–9): 'an forte dicturi sunt, sicut solent dicere, cum scripturarum eos urget auctoritas, hoc capitulum a corruptoribus scripturarum insertum esse euangelio?'

⁷⁹ *c. Adim.* 17 (CSEL 25,1: 169, 27 – 170, 6): '... qua potestate et Petrus apostolus usus est in eo libro, quem isti non accipiunt, quoniam manifeste continet paracliti aduentum, id est consolatoris sancti spiritus, quem lugentibus misit, cum ab eorum oculis ipse ascendisset in caelum. consolator enim tristibus mittitur secundum illam eiusdem domini sententiam: beati lugentes, quoniam ipsi consolabuntur. ipse etiam dixit: tunc lugebunt filii sponsi, cum ablati fuerit ab eis sponsus. in illo ergo libro ...' It is generally known that the Manichaeans did not accept this book.

missionary intentions. It is probable that Adimantus refrained from criticizing either the Gospels or the Pauline Corpus in order to win the trust of Catholic Christians. Furthermore, the fact that Adimantus did not criticize the New Testament in the *Disputationes*, together with his actual use of passages from this part of the Holy Scriptures as the touchstone of the Hebrew Scriptures, seems to justify the conclusion that he treated at least some parts of the New Testament as a revelation of the truth. This hypothesis will be tested in the analysis of the topics chosen by Adimantus and the way he discussed them, about which more in due course.⁸⁰

2. *The literal sense*

One of Augustine's strategies when defending the unity of the Old and New Testament, was to take refuge in allegorical explanations of some of the Old Testament passages which were criticized by Adimantus. This kind of explanatory strategy can be found in e.g. *Contra Adimantum* 12,⁸¹ 24⁸² and 25.⁸³ Augustine even claimed on occasions that the Manichaeans—*i.e.* Adimantus—did not understand the real intention of a passage for the simple reason that they ignored the metaphorical language spoken by the prophet. For example, in *Contra Adimantum* 23, Augustine says:

Concerning what is written: Your wife shall become fruitful like a vine, and your sons like fresh olive branches around your table; and you shall see the sons of your sons; and you shall know that this is how the man is blessed who fears the Lord (*Ps.* 127:3 f.). The Manichaeans do not understand that this prophetic saying, through an allegory, serves to predict the church; and they think that it is contrary to the Lord's saying in the Gospel about the eunuchs who castrate themselves for the sake of the kingdom of heavens (*Mt.* 19:12 f.).⁸⁴

⁸⁰ See Part D.

⁸¹ *c. Adim.* 12 (*CSEL* 25,1: 143, 20–27): 'tamen illud quod lex dicit fundendum esse sanguinem nec in escam adsumendum, quia sanguis est anima, in signo esse positum dicimus sicut alia multa et paene omnia scripturarum illarum sacramenta signis et figures plena sunt futurae predicationis, quae iam per dominus Iesum Christum declarata est. sic est enim sanguis anima, quomodo petra erat Christus, sicut dicit apostolus: bibebant enim de spiritali sequente petra, petra autem erat Christus.'

⁸² *c. Adim.* 24 (*CSEL* 25,1: 182, 13 f.): 'neque hoc intellegunt Manichaei spiritaliter esse accipiendum ...'

⁸³ *c. Adim.* 25 (*CSEL* 25,1: 183, 16 f.): 'et haec prophetica locutio est utique figurata.'

⁸⁴ *c. Adim.* 23 (*CSEL* 25,1: 182, 1–8): 'De eo, quod scriptum est: mulier tua sit ut uinea frondescens et filii tui ut nouellae oliuarum in circuito mensae tuae et uidebis filios filiorum tuorum; et scies, quia hoc modo benedicatur homo, qui timet dominum.'

Augustine rightly observes that Adimantus construed every Old Testament passage literally. For example, when we read in the Old Testament that the blood must be treated as the soul, Adimantus interpreted this passage as a plain description of reality.⁸⁵ Although it is obvious that the literal sense provides the best opportunity to scoff at the contents of the Old Testament, and therefore, not too much should be concluded from Adimantus' literal interpretation of the Old Testament, it still is of importance to be mentioned. Because, throughout the history of Christian exegesis, interpreting the Hebrew Bible merely in a literal way is rather unusual, even for them who were critical of the Old Testament, but it was typical of Marcion.⁸⁶ Therefore, this feature may be treated as a further indication of the Marcionite influence on Adimantus.

3. *Did Adimantus ignore the context?*

Augustine repeatedly complained that Adimantus neglected the context of the biblical passages he was quoting. Of interest is Augustine's remarkable designation of Adimantus' work in *sermo* 12: 'machinamenta'.⁸⁷ It is probably Augustine's reflection of Adimantus' rather unintelligent way of dealing with texts and hunting for contradictions. According to Augustine, Adimantus picked the words that would, at first sight, be effective for his purpose, without taking into consideration their context.⁸⁸ In *sermo* 50 Augustine says:

I believe it to be clear to you, dearly beloved brethren, that the sect of the Manichaeans is not acting credibly but deceitfully with ignoramuses, because they do not prefer the Scriptures as a whole, but prefer the New to the Old Scriptures. They, however, must single out the sentences which they urge to show that they are contradictory one with another, when they want to deceive the ignoramuses. However, there is no sentence (which one could take) from the New Testament, either from the apostle or from

hoc per prophetam figurate dictum ad significationem ecclesiae pertinere Manichaei non intellegunt et putant contrarium esse, quod in euangelio dominus de spadonibus ait, qui se ipsos castrant propter regnum caelorum.'

⁸⁵ See *Disp.* 12.

⁸⁶ See P. Nagel, 'Die Auslegung der Paradieserzählung in der Gnosis', in: K.-W. Tröger (ed.), *Altes Testament—Frühjudentum—Gnosis*, Berlin 1980, 49–70 (esp. 51 and 57–70); Harnack, *Marcion*, 260*; and Aland, 'Marcion/Marcioniten', 92.

⁸⁷ s. 12, 8 (CCL 41: 170, 186 ff.): 'Et machinamenta quidem manicheorum, . . . , multis modis soluta esse perspicitis . . .'

⁸⁸ Cf. also Decret, *L'Afrique*, I, 101.

the Gospel, with which they could not do that; so that a book can seem to be in opposition to itself with any sentence, if it is not read diligently in its whole context.⁸⁹

Thus, Augustine gives his audience to believe that the whole problem of Adimantus' method ultimately boils down to a wilful neglect of the context, intended to deceive people.⁹⁰ Sometimes, Augustine made this kind of critical observation especially with regard to a quotation from biblical sources. These remarks of Augustine are worthy of being discussed here in detail.

In *Contra Adimantum* 12, Augustine discusses the putative contradiction between, on the one hand the Old Testament notion that the blood is the soul, and, on the other hand Jesus' incentive not to fear them who can only kill the body and not harm the soul (*Mt.* 10:28), in combination with the saying of the apostle Paul that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God (*1 Cor.* 15:50).⁹¹ After a rather extensive exposition by Augustine in which he says that the texts on the blood merely discuss the soul of animals, and that blood has a symbolic meaning, he explains the text in the Pauline Corpus which Adimantus believed contradicted the opinion which maintains that the blood is the soul (*1 Cor.* 15:50). According to Augustine, the meaning of Paul's text cannot be found in one isolated sentence. He even calls it 'fraudulent' to single out one particular sentence as Adimantus did.⁹² Augustine believes that in *1 Cor.* 15, the apostle Paul intended to describe the radical change of dead bodies at the moment of their resurrection, referring at this point in his argument

⁸⁹ s. 50, 13 (*CCL* 41: 632f., 274–282): 'Credo esse manifestum caritati uestrae, manicheorum sectam non ueritate sed fraude agere cum imperitis, ut scripturas non totas totis, nouas ueteribus praeferant, sed excerpando sententias, quas uelut aduersas sibi esse conantur ostendere, ut decipiant imperitos. Nulla est autem de ipso nouo Testamento uel apostoli epistola uel etiam liber euangelii, de quo non possint ista fieri; ut quibusdam sententiis ipse unus liber sibi uideatur esse contrarius, nisi eius tota contextio diligentissima lectoris intentione tractetur.'

⁹⁰ E.g. *c. Adim.* 13 (*CSEL* 25,1: 146, 28f.): 'quod enim Adimantus elegit de euangelio locum, quem huic legis capitulo tamquam contrarium apud imperitos obiceret ...' Further on Augustine makes the same point the other way around by asking Adimantus what he would say in reply to somebody who collects a few texts in order to demonstrate that the Old Testament is good and the New Testament is evil. Augustine uses words like (*CSEL* 25,1: 147, 18f.): 'fraudulente peruersitate adsidue faceret, ut omnia loca ... colligeret.'

⁹¹ See *Disp.* 12.

⁹² *c. Adim.* 12 (*CSEL* 25,1: 141, 5f.): '... una separate et ad fraudem commemorata sententia ...'; (*CSEL* 25,1: 142, 5f.): 'quid ergo tam turpi fraude non commemorate nis hoc ultimum et tacet illa superiora ...'

to the changed state of the body of the Lord after His resurrection. In the same way, 'flesh and blood' will change into a heavenly body at the coming of the Lord.⁹³ Augustine rightly criticizes Adimantus for neglecting the context of *1 Cor.* 15:50, if one accepts his point of view that the blood only symbolises the soul. Because, this view implies that passages from the Old Testament maintaining that the blood is the soul have nothing to do with *1 Cor.* 15. Further, one may even wonder as to whether the Manichaeans could ever have accepted the context of Paul's saying about flesh and blood. Nevertheless, if one should agree with Adimantus' literal understanding of the Old Testament half of the contradiction, then there still is some room to argue that the single, isolated sentence in the discourse of the apostle Paul indeed expresses a radical difference between the Old Testament notion of the soul and its redemption and what we find in the New Testament. Because, if Hebrew Scripture should be construed thus that the blood is literally identical with the soul, then, in combination with a severe interpretation of Paul's passage on the radical change of the body, it may indeed imply that no one can ever inherit the kingdom of heavens. Therefore, in this case, it is too simplistic to state that the problem can be reduced to the ignoring of the context of the passage, because hermeneutical principles are involved as well.

In *Contra Adimantum* 14, Augustine deals with the question of whether it is lawful to eat meat. According to Adimantus, the Old Testament allows one to eat meat without limit, whereas in the New Testament at least three passages actually prohibit the eating of meat. One of those passages is *Rom.* 14:21: 'It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine.'⁹⁴ Augustine again uses the word 'fraus' (fraud) to describe the way in which Adimantus deals with this passage. According to Augustine, the chapter

⁹³ *c. Adim.* 12 (*CSEL* 25,1: 141, 2–7): '... hanc ergo inmutationem futuram corporum sanctorum uolens insinuare dixit apostolus: dico enim uobis, fratres, quia caro et sanguis regnum dei non possidebunt. quod non una separata et ad fraudem commemorata sententia, sed toto ipso epistolae loco pertractato, uel potius lecto—non enim res obscura est—inuenire potest.' After the quotation (*CSEL* 25,1: 142, 4–11): 'certe iam clarum est, quare hoc apostolus dixerit. quid ergo iste tam turpi fraude non commemorat nisi hoc ultimum et tacet illa superiora, quibus hoc quod male interpretatur, bene possit intelligi? nam quoniam domini nostri corpus post resurrectionem sic leuatum est in caelum, ut pro ipsa caelesti habitatione caelestem acceperit mutationem, et hoc sperare in die ultimo iussi sumus.' And some lines further (*CSEL* 25,1: 143, 10–13): 'hinc ergo adparet, quia caro et sanguis regnum dei non possidebunt, quia induerit incorruptionem et immortalitatem, iam non caro et sanguis erit, sed in corpus caeleste mutabitur.'

⁹⁴ *c. Adim.* 14 (*CSEL* 25,1: 148, 8f.): 'bonum est non manducare carnem, neque bibere uinum.'

as a whole demonstrates that *Rom.* 14:21 does not really mean what Adimantus wants it to say.⁹⁵ In this case, Augustine's negative comment is certainly well justified. The context of *Rom.* 14:21 does not deal with the distinction between various kinds of food but, rather, with tolerance and the need to avoid giving offence to other people.

In *Contra Adimantum* 15, Augustine castigates Adimantus for not taking into account the context.⁹⁶ *Disputatio* 15 has as its subject matter the Old Testament instructions on eating meat: some kinds of animals can be eaten, others cannot. These precepts seem to contradict the saying of Jesus that nothing that enters a man can defile him (*Mk.* 7:14/*Mt.* 15:11). This particular passage is for the Manichaeans somewhat problematic, because they had stringent rules for the *Electi* about eating meat. For that reason, Adimantus insists that Jesus directed those words to the multitude, thereby passing over in silence that Jesus repeated the same words to his disciples in private. Augustine actually devotes a whole excursus to the task of explaining that this was not just said to the multitude, but also to the disciples.⁹⁷ In this case, Augustine rightly excoriates Adimantus for ignoring the context.

In *Disputatio* 19 Adimantus treats as opposites the fact that in the Old Testament it is written about God that He gives richness to his friends, whilst in the New Testament the kingdom of heaven is promised to the poor in spirit (*Mt.* 5:3). Augustine reproaches Adimantus because he did not take into account the following passage. Here, the Lord says that the meek shall inherit the earth (*Mt.* 5:4). This means that the friends

⁹⁵ *c. Adim.* 14 (CSEL 25,1: 149, 6 – 151, 6): 'sufficit enim ipsum de apostoli epistula totum locum huic sermoni contexere, ut et causa manifeste adpareat, cur hoc apostolus dixerit, et istorum fraus, qui particulas quasdam de scripturis eligunt, quibus decipiant inperitos non conectentes, quae supra et infra scripta sunt, ex quibus uoluntas et intentio scriptoris possit intelligi. sic ergo apostolus dicit: "...". numquid opus est cuiusquam interpretatione, ut intellegatur cur hoc apostolus dixerit et quanta isti malitia de scripturis certa quaeque decerpant, quibus circumueniant inperitos?'

⁹⁶ *c. Adim.* 15 (CSEL 25,1: 156, 26 ff.): 'o hominem pessimum, securum de negligentia generia humani ad occultandas deceptiones suas!'

⁹⁷ *c. Adim.* 15 (CSEL 25,1: 156, 15–22): 'sic enim posuit ipsum euangelicum testimonium. in euangelio, inquit, dicit ad turbam dominus: audite et intellegite, nihil est ingrediens in hominem, coinquinans eum, et cetera. quod ergo commemorauit dominum hoc ad turbam dixisse, nihil aliud ostendit, nisi non se ignorantia, sed malitia fecisse quod fecit, ut postea diceret auditoribus suis ad turbam dominum ista locutum esse, non ad paucos sanctos, quales se ipse uideri uolunt ...'. At the end of the section (CSEL 25,1: 158, 4 ff.): '... tamen iste quo timore hoc addiderit uerbis suis, quibus huiusmodi testimonium commemorauit, satis adparet, sicut paulo ante dictum est, ...'. This subject is referred to twice by Augustine in his *Contra Faustum*; see Ch. III, Part E, section 2. *Contra Faustum*.

of God will certainly be made rich, for they shall inherit the earth.⁹⁸ According to Augustine, the meaning of the Old Testament saying about the poor and the rich is intended to be interpreted eschatologically, which agrees with *Mt.* 5:3 as well as with *Mt.* 5:4. If the saying of the Old Testament is interpreted within the framework of Augustine's exegetical rules, he rightly concludes that Adimantus could only have established a contradiction between the Law and the Gospel because he isolated *Mt.* 5:3. Nevertheless, if the Old Testament saying is only relevant in this particular dispensation and only concerns earthly treasures, Adimantus was entitled to quote merely *Mt.* 5:3—and not the passage that follows—without confounding the meaning of the verse. But, here, as well as before, one might wonder whether Adimantus could have accepted *Mt.* 5:4 as a genuine word of Jesus.

From these four examples, we can infer that Augustine regularly rightly castigated Adimantus for not taking into account the complete context of a verse, which especially goes for New Testament passages. The examples even seem to entail the conclusion that Adimantus did not always accept the context of the verse under discussion, which is adjacent to criticism of the New Testament. If Adimantus and Augustine had been debating orally, Augustine's remarks on the ignorance of the context would probably have evoked Adimantus' reaction that the context of the specific quotation had been corrupted by Jewish influences, which criticism of the New Testament he avoids in the *Disputationes*.⁹⁹

Nevertheless, Augustine's claim that the problem of Adimantus' stance on the Old and the New Testament could be reduced to a wilful neglect of the original contexts—as he did in *sermo* 50—is surely far too simplistic. For example, one might point to the fact that in *disputatio* 12, Adimantus cites—apart from the apostolic saying on flesh and blood—from the Gospel as well,¹⁰⁰ which quotation Augustine did not regard as having been singled out from its context. Furthermore, the opinion on what should be regarded as the right interpretation of the Old Testament plays a major role in the discussion as well, as we observed here, and in the previous section.

⁹⁸ *c. Adim.* 19 (CSEL 25,1: 175, 13–16): 'sed cur nolunt et alia in euangelio contueri? ubi enim scriptum est: beati pauperes spiritu, quoniam ipsorum est regnum caelorum, ibi sequitur: beati mites, quoniam ipsi hereditate possidebunt terram.'

⁹⁹ Cf. p. 143 f.

¹⁰⁰ For *Disp.* 12, see as well pp. 163–166.

D. *Contents of the Disputationes*1. *Subjects of the Disputationes*

First, we need an overview of the biblical passages and the subject matter discussed by Adimantus in the 34 *Disputationes* about which we can be reasonably certain:

	Old Testament	New Testament	Subject
<i>Disputatio 1</i>	<i>Gen.</i> 1:1–5	<i>John</i> 1:10 <i>Col.</i> 1:15b–16a	Creation through the Son
<i>Disputatio 2</i>	<i>Gen.</i> 2:1 f.	<i>John</i> 5:17	Is God tired?
<i>Disputatio 3</i>	<i>Gen.</i> 2:18–24	<i>Mt.</i> 19:29	Marriage and the Kingdom of God
<i>Disputatio 4</i>	<i>Gen.</i> 4:10 ff.	<i>Mt.</i> 6:34 and 26	Tilling the earth
<i>Disputatio 5</i>	<i>Gen.</i> 1:26	<i>John</i> 8:44 <i>Mt.</i> 23:33	Origin of man
<i>Disputatio 6</i>	<i>Ex.</i> 20:12 ea.	<i>Lk.</i> 9:59 f.	Parents and the Kingdom of God
<i>Disputatio 7</i>	<i>Ex.</i> 20:5 <i>et al.</i>	Cf. <i>Mt.</i> 5:45 <i>Mt.</i> 18:22	Is God jealous or friendly?
<i>Disputatio 8</i>	<i>Ex.</i> 21:24	<i>Mt.</i> 5:38–40	On retaliation
<i>Disputatio 9</i>	<i>Gen.</i> 2–4 <i>et al.</i>	<i>John</i> 1:18 <i>John</i> 5:37	Can God be seen or heard?
<i>Disputatio 10</i>	<i>Ex.</i> 25:2–8	<i>Mt.</i> 5:34 f. <i>1 Tim.</i> 6:16	Where does God dwell?
<i>Disputatio 11</i>	<i>Ex.</i> 20:5/34:15 <i>et al.</i>	<i>John</i> 17:25	Is God jealous or righteous?
<i>Disputatio 12</i>	<i>Lev.</i> 17:12 ff.	<i>Mt.</i> 10:28 <i>1 Cor.</i> 15:50	On the blood and the soul
<i>Disputatio 13</i>	<i>Dt.</i> 4:23 f.	Cf. <i>Mk.</i> 10:17 f. <i>et al.</i>	Is God jealous or good?
<i>Disputatio 14</i>	<i>Dt.</i> 12:15 f.	<i>Lk.</i> 21:34 <i>Rom.</i> 14:21 <i>1 Cor.</i> 10:21 <i>1 Cor.</i> 10:20	On eating and drinking
<i>Disputatio 15</i>	<i>Lev.</i> 20:25/11:14 f. and <i>Dt.</i> 14:13 f.	<i>Mk.</i> 7:14 and <i>Mt.</i> 15:11	On clean and unclean
<i>Disputatio 16</i>	<i>Dt.</i> 5:12–15 <i>Gen.</i> 17:9–14	<i>Mt.</i> 23:15 <i>1 Cor.</i> 7:18 f. <i>Gal.</i> 4:10 f.	On circumcision and the Sabbath

	Old Testament	New Testament	Subject
<i>Disputatio</i> 17	<i>Ex.</i> 23:22–24	<i>Mt.</i> 5:44	On loving one's enemies
<i>Disputatio</i> 18	<i>Dt.</i> 28:1–6	<i>Mt.</i> 16:24–26 <i>Mk.</i> 8:38	On the reward of obedience
<i>Disputatio</i> 19	Uncertain fragment	<i>Mt.</i> 5:3 <i>Lk.</i> 6:24	On wealth and poverty
<i>Disputatio</i> 20	<i>Lev.</i> 26:3–10	<i>Mt.</i> 10:9f. <i>Lk.</i> 12:20 <i>1 Cor.</i> 14:33	On (the uncertainty of) wealth and on peace
<i>Disputatio</i> 21	<i>Dt.</i> 21:23	<i>Mt.</i> 16:24 / 19:21	Is the cross a curse or reward?
<i>Disputatio</i> 22	<i>Num.</i> 15:32–36	<i>Mt.</i> 12:10–13	On the Sabbath
<i>Disputatio</i> 23	<i>Ps.</i> 127:3f.	<i>Mt.</i> 19:12f.	On sexual reproduction
<i>Disputatio</i> 24	<i>Prov.</i> 6:6–8	<i>Mt.</i> 6:34	On gathering food
<i>Disputatio</i> 25	<i>Hos.</i> 9:14ff.	<i>Mt.</i> 22:30	On sexual reproduction
<i>Disputatio</i> 26	<i>Amos</i> 3:3–6	<i>Mt.</i> 7:17	Does God cause evil?
<i>Disputatio</i> 27	<i>Isa.</i> 45:7	<i>Mt.</i> 5:9	Does God cause evil?
<i>Disputatio</i> 28	<i>Isa.</i> 6:1f.	<i>1 Tim.</i> 1:17	Can God be seen?
<i>Disputatio</i> 29	<i>Job</i> 1:6	<i>Mt.</i> 5:8 <i>John</i> 10:9/14:6 <i>Eph.</i> 3:10	Who can see God?
<i>Disputatio</i> 30	<i>Hag.</i> 2:9	<i>Lk.</i> 16:9 <i>1 Tim.</i> 6:10	On the origin and use of gold
<i>Disputatio</i> 31	<i>Cf. Num.</i> 15 <i>et al.</i>	<i>Mt.</i> 9:13/12:7	On sacrifices
<i>Disputatio</i> 32	<i>Zeph.</i> 1:14f.	<i>Mt.</i> 25:31ff. (?)	On the Day of the Lord
<i>Disputatio</i> 33 (?)	<i>Ps.</i> 35:7	<i>1 Cor.</i> 9:9	Does God take care of cattle?
<i>Disputatio</i> 34 (?)	Uncertain fragment	<i>1 Cor.</i> 7:29	On sexual reproduction

Most of the Old Testament quotations discussed in *Contra Adimantum* have been taken from the Pentateuch: of the 36 Old Testament references by Adimantus, 23 are from the first five books of the Old Testament. Furthermore, Adimantus quoted *Isaiah* and the *Palms* twice and *Hosea*, *Amos*, *Zephaniah*, *Haggai*, *Job* and *Proverbs* have been cited once. Apart from these texts, two cannot be identified with any particular Old Testament verse.¹⁰¹ From these numbers, we may infer that Adimantus'

¹⁰¹ Namely the quotation in *Disp.* 19 (CSEL 25,1: 175, 8f.): 'De eo, quod scriptum est

knowledge of the Old Testament must have been quite extensive, and further, that he found most of the texts he wanted to refute in the five books of Moses.

Adimantus was also well acquainted with the New Testament. He set a quotation from the New Testament over against another from the Old Testament more than fifty times.¹⁰² Most of them come from the Gospels (38 out of 51).¹⁰³ In the Gospels, the Sermon on the Mount is the most frequently cited passage. In ten chapters of the *Disputationes* verses from it have been quoted and discussed. The *First Epistle to the Corinthians* was mentioned six times; the *First Epistle to Timothy* three times; *Romans*, *Galatians*, *Ephesians*, and *Colossians* were cited once. Except for *Disputationes* 28, 33 and 34, at least one passage from the Gospel is treated as the (putative) opposite of a quotation from the Old Testament. This demonstrates that the Gospels are Adimantus' most important source of passages he could use to criticize the Hebrew Scriptures. Although Augustine cited on two occasions one of the so-called 'New Testament apocrypha', and also tells us that the Manichaeans valued them highly,¹⁰⁴ Adimantus did not quote passages from any of these apocryphal books.

In order to come to grips with the subject matter, it is helpful to classify the topics discussed in the *Disputationes*. Decret has classified the putative contradictions between the Old and the New Testament in *Contra Adimantum* into three categories.¹⁰⁵ The first category includes passages on the subject of the wickedness of the God of the Old Testament (11×); the second category includes passages about the anthropology of the flesh in the Old Testament and the curse upon every one who hangs upon a tree (2×); and the third category includes passages about the tough moral

in lege: ego sum, qui diuitias do amicis meis et paupertatem inimicis.' Further, in *Disp.* 34: 'Maledictus qui non suscitauerit semen in Israhel' (F. Dolbeau, *Augustin d'Hippone, Vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique. Retrouvés à Mayence*, Paris 1996, 281). See above, p. 129.

¹⁰² Without counting a possible quotation from *Mt.* in *c. Adim.* 3 (see Ch. III, Part C, section 5. *Adimantus'* *Disputationes in Contra Adimantum*).

¹⁰³ Consequently the word 'euangelium' is used: never the name of any one of the Evangelists. In his survey of *Contra Adimantum*, Decret ('*Adimantum (Contra—)*', 92 f.), has missed the second quotation from the Gospel in *c. Adim.* 19.

¹⁰⁴ *c. Adim.* 17 (CSEL 25,1: 166, 6 ff.): 'ipsi (*Manichaei*) autem legunt scripturas apocryphas, quas etiam incorruptissimas esse dicunt, ubi scriptum est apostolum Thomam maledixisse homini;' idem, (CSEL 25,1: 170, 10): 'cum in apocryphis pro magno opera legant ...'

¹⁰⁵ In *L'Afrique I*, 96–100 and '*Contra Adimantum*', 92 f.

injunctions (16×). Decret based his classification on themes he found in *Contra Faustum*. Unfortunately, Decret's scheme is far too constricted for *Contra Adimantum*.¹⁰⁶ We can distinguish between the following three categories:

- Old Testament descriptions of the nature of God: being in need of rest (*Disp.* 2); living in a tangible house (*Disp.* 10); being jealous (*Disp.* 7, 11 and 13) and visible to human beings and to Satan (*Disp.* 9, 11, 28 and 29); cursing (*Disp.* 4, 21 and 34); causing evil (*Disp.* 17, 20, 26, 27), taking care of cattle (*Disp.* 33) and issuing immoral or improper commandments (cf. OT commandments).
- Old Testament descriptions of the origin, nature, and the end of the world and human beings (*Disp.* 1, 5, 12, 25, 29, 32).
- Old Testament commandments (*Disp.* 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 24, 30, 31).

We may expect that Adimantus not only borrowed the method from Marcion's *Antitheses*, but its subject matter as well. There are indeed many correspondences between Marcion and Adimantus with respect to the subject matter of their works. Both Marcion and Adimantus criticized the God of the Hebrew Bible¹⁰⁷ and, as a consequence, they repudiated the Old Testament laws.¹⁰⁸ To both of them the temporal wealth that was promised in the Old Testament and the eternal wealth in the New Testament were crucially important.¹⁰⁹ Adimantus shared his abhorrence of sexual reproduction with Marcion.¹¹⁰ So, they had in common at least an aversion to the worldly and sometimes rough ethics of the Old Testament, and they also shared a high esteem for the 'spiritual' promises of the New Testament. These similarities between both books indicate that Adimantus did indeed make use of the subject matter of the *Antitheses*.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁶ E.g., Decret classifies *c. Adim.* 1 in the first category. In *c. Adim.* 1, Augustine deals with a difference between *Gen.* 1 and *John* 1. In *John*, it has been said that God created through Christ, whereas in *Gen.* 1, Christ is not mentioned. The problem is not that God acted as a bad God, but, that a factual difference between the Old and New Testament is found. The second category has only two chapters that are certainly rather different from each other.

¹⁰⁷ See for references to Marcion's *Antitheses*, Harnack, *Marcion*, 262*f. and 278*f.

¹⁰⁸ See Harnack, *Marcion*, 276*f.

¹⁰⁹ See Harnack, *Marcion*, 293*.

¹¹⁰ See Harnack, *Marcion*, 277 f.*.

¹¹¹ Another striking similarity is the following: According to Tertullian, reflection on the Lord's saying about the good and the bad tree in *Lk.* 6:43 was the starting point of Marcion's teachings. Marcion combined the saying of the Lord with *Isa.* 45:7: 'It is I who

One of the reasons why Adimantus chose to criticize the Hebrew Bible may well have been missionary strategy, because many of the topics discussed by Adimantus were either offensive or difficult to understand. It is highly probable that Adimantus selected topics which appeared to demonstrate that the tenets of Catholic Christians are inconsistent, or even absurd, namely because they still retained the Old Testament. The example of the conversion of Augustine to Mani's church clearly demonstrates that this is how the missionary strategy of the Manichaeans actually worked.¹¹² Furthermore, even pagans such as Faustus were attracted by the stance of the Manichaeans on Old Testament institutions such as circumcision.¹¹³ It is therefore highly probable that the themes found in the *Disputationes* were selected with a missionary strategy in mind. By demonstrating the putative inconsistency of the tenets of Catholic Christians when they continued to retain the Old Testament, Adimantus attempted to present Mani's religion as a more attractive and more sophisticated religion to Catholic Christians and pagans alike.¹¹⁴ The *Antitheses* probably inspired him and provided him with some good arguments to make his point.

The correspondences between the *Antitheses* and the *Disputationes* give rise to the question to what extent the *Antitheses* influenced the subject

create evil things', in order to demonstrate that Jesus intended to prove that there are ultimately two Gods (*Adversus Marcionem* i, 2; Evans, 7): 'passus infelix huius praesumptionis instinctum de simplici capitulo dominicae pronuntiationis in homines non in deos disponentis exempla illa bonae et malae arboris, quod neque bona malos neque mala bonos proferat fructus, id est neque mens vel fides bona malas edat operas neque mala bonas. Languens enim (quod et nunc multi, et maxime haeretici), circa mali quaestionem, unde malum, et obtensis sensibus ipsa enormitate curiositatis, inveniens creatorem pronuntiantem, Ego sum qui condo mala, quanto ipsum praesumpserat mali auctorem et ex aliis argumentis, quae ita persuadent perverso cuique, tanto in creatorem interpretatus malam arborem malos fructus condentem, scilicet mala, alium deum praesumpsit esse debere in partem bonae arboris bonos fructus.' In *Disp.* 26 Adimantus contrasted *Amos* 3:3–6 with the saying of the Lord on the two trees. As to the interpretation of this saying of Jesus, both of them do agree because they apply it to God and not to human beings, which would have been the most obvious interpretation of the words of Jesus. In *Disp.* 27 Adimantus discussed a putative contradiction between *Isa.* 45:7 and *Mt.* 5:9. In both these chapters of the *Disputationes* we can observe a fargoing agreement with Marcion's *Antitheses*. See further below pp. 156 ff.

¹¹² See Ch. III, Part B, section 2. *The Manichaean years*.

¹¹³ See Ch. V, Part B.

¹¹⁴ Cf. as well Augustine's opinion in *c. Adim.* 13 (CSEL 25,1: 144, 22 ff.): 'uult ergo uideri fauere se simulacris. quod propterea faciunt, ut miserrimae et uesanae suae sectae etiam paganorum concilient beneuolentiam.'

matter of Adimantus' work. If Adimantus merely quoted from Marcion's work without further consideration, we could easily overstate the case of the subject matter of the *Disputationes*. On the other hand, we would even be more entitled to draw conclusions with respect to the subject matter if it could be demonstrated that Adimantus selected the texts from the Old and the New Testament deliberately.

In his analysis of 'The Gnostic-Manichaean Tradition in Roman North Africa', Frend opines that Adimantus 'lifted *en bloc*' passages from Marcion's book. He catalogues a number of similar antitheses to establish his position, which list is worthy of being quoted in full:

It is interesting that both the followers of Marcion in Africa and the Manichees raised precisely the same arguments against the Old Testament. So close are the parallels that it is possible to suggest that the Manichaean apostle to Africa, Adimantus (possibly the Addas of the *Acta Archelai*) lifted extracts *en bloc* from Marcion's *Antitheses* which were circulating in the country. Thus, the old dispensation ordained an 'eye for an eye': Christ commanded the believer to turn the other cheek. (Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem*, ii. 18 and iv. 16; Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, xix. 3 and *Acta Archelai*, 44). In the Old Testament divorce was permitted: in the New Testament it was not (*Adv. Marcionem*, iv. 34; *Contra Faustum*, xix. 3). Moses enforced the Jewish Sabbath and the Law: Christ freed believers from both (*Adv. Marcionem*, iv. 34; *Contra Faustum*, iv. 1). Moses cursed 'everyone that hangeth from a tree': Christ died on the Cross (*Adv. Marcionem*, iii. 18, and v. 3; *Contra Faustum*, xvi. 5 and *Acta Archelai*, 44). One finds, too, the same arguments used in *De Carne Christi*, vii and *Acta Archelai*, 55, against belief in Christ's physical birth, i.e. the revelation of His divine nature to St. Peter as contrasted with the implied rejection of the Virgin related in Mt. xii. 47 and Luke viii. 20. The docetic character of Christ's birth was asserted both by the African Marcionites (*Adv. Marcionem*, iii. 8) and by the Manichaeans (*Contra Faustum*, xxvi. 1; *Acta Archelai*, 50) while both justified the fundamental dualism of their approach to Christianity by reference to the parable of the Two Trees (Mt. vii. 17). It is very difficult to think that these similarities are accidental and do not spring from a common source, which would imply an element of direct continuity between the two heresies.¹¹⁵

Here, Frend mentions four contradictions between the Old and the New Testament which occur both in *Adversus Marcionem* and in two anti-Manichaean writings, namely in the *Acta Archelai* and in *Contra Faustum*. Although Frend ignores *Contra Adimantum*, it is still worth comparing Frend's four examples with our reconstruction of the *Disputationes*.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ Frend, 'The Gnostic-Manichaean Tradition', 20 f.

¹¹⁶ The *Acta Archelai* is a polemical writing which historical worth can only be estimated by means of comparison with authentic Manichaean material. The *Acta Archelai*

The first contradiction mentioned by Frensdal deals with the Old Testament commandment 'an eye for an eye' (*Ex.* 21:24), which is opposed to Christ's command to turn the other cheek. In *Adv. Marc.* iv, 16, Marcion constructed this contradiction between this Old Testament commandment and the Gospel by means of a reference to *Lk.* 6:27–31, where the incentive to love one's enemies is given, as well as the injunction to renounce retaliation. The Old Testament passage under discussion is indeed found in the *Disputationes* as well, namely in *Disputatio* 8. However, the New Testament text cited by Adimantus is much closer to *Mt.* 5:38–40 than to *Lk.* 6:27–31.¹¹⁷

Frensdal's second example is the Old Testament exception to admit divorce under certain circumstances, while in the New Testament divorce is prohibited absolutely.¹¹⁸ Although Adimantus' disciple Faustus did indeed quote the prohibition to divorce one's wife,¹¹⁹ in our reconstruction of the subject matter of the *Disputationes* such an antithesis between the Old and the New Testament did not occur. In the *Disputationes* Adimantus repeatedly quoted passages from the New Testament on marriage, but never on divorce.¹²⁰ Therefore this example is not relevant.

has recently received renewed scholarly attention. In 2001 a new translation in English was edited: Hegemonius, *Acta Archelai (The Acts of Archelaus)*. Translated by Mark Vermes with an introduction and commentary by Samuel N.C. Lieu with the assistance of Kevin Kaatz, Lovanii 2001. See further M. Scopello, 'Hégémonius, les Actes Archelai et l'histoire de la controverse anti-manichéenne', in: R.E. Emmerick *et al.* (eds.), *Studia Manichaica*, Berlin 2000, 528–545 and Jason BeDuhn & Paul Mirecki (eds.), *Frontiers of faith. The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelaus*, Leiden-Boston 2007. Cf. J. van Oort, 'Hegemonius', *RGG* 3 (2000), 1509–1510.

¹¹⁷ *c. Adim.* 8 (CSEL 25,1: 130, 9–20): 'De eo, quod in exodo scriptum est: oculus pro oculo, dentem pro dente et cetera talia. Huic loco manichaei . . . sic calumniantur, quasi et ipse dominus haec duo sibi ueluti aduersantia atque contraria in euangelio demonstrauerit. ipse enim ait: audistis, quia dictum est antiquis oculus pro oculo et dentem pro dente: ego autem dico uobis non resistere malo, sed si quis te percusserit in maxillam, praebe illi et alteram, et quicumque uoluerit tecum iudicio contendere et tunicam tuam auferre, dimitte ille et pallium.' Cf. *Mt.* 5:38–40 (Vulg.): '38 audistis quia dictum est oculus pro oculo et dentem pro dente 39 ego autem dico uobis non resistere malo sed si quis te percusserit in dextera maxilla tua praebe illi et alteram 40 et ei qui uult tecum iudicio contendere et tunicam tuam tollere remitte ei et pallium'; and *Lk.* 6:27–31 (Vulg.): '27 sed uobis dico qui auditis diligite inimicos uestros benefacite his qui uos oderunt 28 benedicite maledicentibus uobis orate pro calumniantibus uos 29 ei qui te percutit in maxillam praebe et alteram et ab eo qui aufert tibi uerimentum etiam tunicam noli prohibere 30 omni autem petenti te tribue et qui aufert quae tua sunt ne repetas 31 et prout uultis ut faciant uobis homines et uos facite illis similiter'.

¹¹⁸ Cf. *Adv. Marc.* vi, 34.

¹¹⁹ See *c. Faust.* 19, 3.

¹²⁰ See *Disp.* 3, 13 and 25.

The third example is on the discordance observed by Marcion regarding the interpretation of the Sabbath. He quoted the Old Testament commandments about the Sabbath and *Lk.* 6:1–11 on picking and eating grains of wheat, as well as the healing of the withered hand on the Sabbath.¹²¹ Adimantus criticized the rules concerning the Sabbath as well, namely in *Disp.* 2, 16 and 22. In *Disp.* 22, he also referred to the healing of the withered hand, as Marcion did. Nevertheless, Adimantus did not quote from *Luke*, but from *Matthew*. Moreover, Adimantus did not take into account the previous story about picking and eating grains of wheat.

The last example mentioned by Frend is the contradiction between the Old Testament saying ‘cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree’¹²² and the fact that Jesus had hung on a tree.¹²³ Adimantus did quote the Old Testament passage, but he did not mention the New Testament saying that Jesus also hung on a tree. He contrasted it with *Mt.* 16:24¹²⁴ where it is said that a disciple of Jesus must take up his cross and follow Jesus.

Our examination of Frend’s four examples does not support his assumption that Adimantus ‘lifted *en bloc* abstracts from the *Antitheses*’, because none of his four examples agrees precisely, and one of them is entirely different. Nevertheless, three of his examples do agree to a considerable extent on the Old Testament subject matter. Furthermore, the New Testament passages, although they do not run exactly parallel, do have much in common as well. These similarities do support the supposition that Adimantus made a deliberate use of the *Antitheses* when he wrote his *Disputationes*. We could treat two of the three corresponding examples from Adimantus’ work, which were catalogued by Frend, as intentional reinterpretations of several chapters of the *Antitheses*. It is quite possible to argue that Adimantus reformulated the third example that dealt with the Sabbath in the light of the Manichaean teachings. The story about Jesus’ disciples picking grains of wheat, which the Gospel suggests that Jesus approved, was not acceptable to Adimantus. He would have regarded it as spurious, for which reason he left it out. The fourth example, on the subject of the cross, could well have been reformulated because of the complications of Manichaean Christology.

¹²¹ Frend mentions *Adv.Marc.* iv, 34 as the source of this contradiction. This chapter does indeed deal with the eternal peace given to believers: but this entails no contradiction. The contradiction on this subject between the Old and the New Testament is found in *Adv.Marc.* iv, 12 (cf. Harnack, *Marcion*, 293*).

¹²² Cf. *Dt.* 21:23 and *Gal.* 3:13.

¹²³ Cf. *Adv.Marc.* iii, 18 and v, 3.

¹²⁴ See *Disp.* 22.

In order to avoid controversial questions about the nature of Christ in the preliminary stages of his mission, Adimantus seems to have adapted this antithesis so that it was about the *imitatio Christi* in opposition to the curse upon every one who hangs upon a tree.

Therefore, it is reasonable to claim that Adimantus was well aware of the implications of the topics that he chose to discuss in the *Disputationes* and that he adapted them to his own missionary intentions. A further indication that Adimantus did more than merely quoting from the *Antitheses*, is the fact that he did not share Marcion's predilection for *Luke*. Both *Matthew* and *John* are used frequently by Adimantus. All this might imply that the subject matter of the *Disputationes* had to tell a message of its own.

This opinion is supported by the fact that several chapters from the *Disputationes* demonstrate that Adimantus constructed contradictions that had not been derived from the *Antitheses* of Marcion. For example, Adimantus began his *Disputationes* with the account of the creation in *Gen.* 1, which he placed over against *John* 1. In *Disp.* 5 he mentioned *Gen.* 1:26, which he put in opposite to *John* 8:44. Adimantus could not have found these two contradictions in Marcion's *Antitheses*, because Marcion did not make a critical comparison between the first chapter of *Genesis* and the Pauline Corpus or Gospel,¹²⁵ neither should he have quoted from *John* to criticize the Hebrew Bible. These two examples give proof of the fact that the *Disputationes* was not merely a slightly reformulated version of the *Antitheses*, but that Adimantus was a creative author himself as well.

Disputatio 1 and 5 give sound reasons to suppose that Adimantus' purpose may well have been more than simply demonstrating the inconsistency of Catholic Christians and the absurdity of their beliefs when they cling to the Old Testament with all its offensive passages. In *Disputatio* 5 when he discussed the origin of man, Adimantus placed *Gen.* 1:26 from the Hebrew Scriptures, and *John* 8:44 as well as *Mt.* 23:33 from the New Testament in opposition to each other. The description of the origin of man, as it stands in *Genesis* (*Gen.* 1:26, RSV: Then God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the

¹²⁵ May, 'Genesisauslegung', 191.

fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.')

is not offensive in itself. It could even be claimed that Jesus' description of the origin of man (*John* 8:44, RSV: You are of your father the devil) was more difficult to accept than *Gen.* 1:26. If Adimantus merely acted strategically with the intention to scoff at the Hebrew Bible, it would have been much better to leave this putative contradiction out of his collection. The reason why Adimantus chose to refute *Gen.* 1:26 could well have much more to do with its subject matter. The problem of the origin of man was crucially important in the Manichaean's belief system.¹²⁶ According to the Manichaean myth, man was created by the demons in order to incarcerate some of the particles of light. The demons created human beings after the likeness of the Third Messenger.¹²⁷ In their account of the origin of man in *Gen.* 1:26, the identity of the creator was hidden, because he called himself God and suggested that man was made after his own image. This entails that the reason why he created man, namely to imprison the particles of light, remained hidden. It is therefore reasonable to assume that in *Disputatio* 5 Adimantus attempted to unmask the one he believed had falsely revealed himself as God.

A similar intention could be suggested when we examine *Disputatio* 1. Here, Adimantus demonstrated that *Gen.* 1 contradicts the Gospels and the Pauline Corpus, because in *Genesis* it is written that God created the earth without saying that He did it through the Son. It is unlikely that this particular example was chosen because of its offensive overtones. It is more likely that Adimantus chose to deal with this subject in the very first part of his book because he believed that this contradiction would expose the deception that was propagated by the Old Testament on the subject of creation. Probably, Adimantus believed that the account of creation in *Genesis*, which does not mention the Son, is ultimately misleading, because it concealed the truth about the reason for creation. In the Manichaean cosmogony, creation is not simply the marvellous design of a creator-God, but an emergency plan drawn up in order to rescue the particles of light. According to the cosmogonic myth of the Manichaeans, Jesus the Splendour emanated from the Father of Greatness and was assigned the task of saving the particles of light from the race of darkness.

¹²⁶ Cf. section 2. *Arguments quoted in full*, apud e. *Disputatio* 12.

¹²⁷ See J. van Oort, 'Manichäismus', *RGG* 5 (2002), 732–741 (738).

In order to do this, the visible creation had to be constructed.¹²⁸ It is quite possible that in *Disputatio* 1, Adimantus was trying to drop a hint at the truth about creation by means of quoting *John* 1:10 and *Col.* 1:15 f.

From our analysis of the subject matter of the *Disputationes* thusfar, we get the impression that Adimantus had a twofold purpose with the *Disputationes*. In exposing the discrepancy between the Hebrew Bible and both the Gospel and the apostle Paul, he demonstrated the inconsistency of the Catholic Christian faith. At this point, he largely cohered with Marcion's *Antitheses*. On the other hand, Adimantus acted as well as a creative author in reformulating the *Antitheses* and in constructing some of his own as well. In this role, he criticized especially those descriptions and commandments from the Hebrew Bible that worked against the release of the particles of the light. All this implies that the subject matter was closely bound up with the Manichaeian teachings. Further, it may be concluded that Adimantus intended to unmask the true nature of the Hebrew Bible, namely as deceptive and therefore dangerous. This temporary conclusion will be tested in the next section when we explore Adimantus' arguments.

2. Arguments quoted in full

Augustine quoted some of Adimantus' lines of reasoning in full. Examining these arguments opens up the possibility of testing our provisional conclusions about the intentions of Adimantus when he wrote the *Disputationes*. Furthermore, Adimantus' words may well give some more precise indications about what kind of writing it really was. In this section we follow the order of the reconstruction.

a. *Disputatio* 1

The first *Disputatio* may well have contained a rather short link in Adimantus' chain of reasoning, albeit one which could still be useful

¹²⁸ The Manichaeian myth is very complicated and not entirely unambiguous. For a fine, well-organized overview, see Van Oort, 'Manichäismus', 736–738. See for the important role of Jesus in Manichaeian beliefs: E. Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie*, Wiesbaden 1979, which study she summarized in her article, 'Die manichäische Christologie', *ZRG* 32 (1980) 219–231; see as well M. Franzmann, *Jesus in the Manichaeian Writings*, London-New York 2003.

for our understanding of Adimantus' precise intentions. Adimantus probably wrote something like this:

*He is the Firstborn of the whole creation; and all things were made through Him in heaven and on earth, both visible and invisible (Col. 1:15 f.), (Aug.: And they say that) this chapter is in opposition to Genesis, where in such a way it is said that God made the earth, that in particular the Son had not been mentioned by name on that occasion.*¹²⁹

Augustine introduces the sentence following the quotation from the apostle Paul with the words 'and they say that' ('dicunt'). First, we need to see whether 'dicunt' only refers to 'in opposition to *Genesis*', or also to the next sentence which expounds this particular passage in *Genesis*. Admittedly, we cannot demonstrate with absolute certainty that Adimantus wrote these words, but it is still highly probable because in *Contra Adimantum* this kind of interpretative summaries of the biblical testimonies is habitually found. These summaries probably originated from the *Disputationes*, because of their peculiar grammatical construction.¹³⁰ Therefore, we may assume that the compact argument just mentioned was almost certainly written by Adimantus. The chain of reasoning is interesting, because it suggests that Adimantus did regard this passage in *Gen. 1* as a piece of deception, and not merely as a symptom of ignorance. The author of *Gen. 1* treated creation in such a way that the Son in particular was not mentioned on that occasion (*ita dicitur . . . ut specialiter filius ibi nos sit nominatus*). In short: *Disputatio 1* confirms the hypothesis advanced above, namely that Adimantus deliberately set about unmasking the deceptive revelation of the Jewish Scriptures.¹³¹

¹²⁹ *c. Adim. 1* (CSEL 25,1: 116, 11–15): 'ipse est primogenitus totius creaturae; et omnia per ipsum facta sunt in caelis et in terris, uisibilia et inuisibilia et hoc capitulum aduersum esse dicunt genesi, ubi deus ita dicitur fecisse mundum, ut specialiter filius ibi non sit nominatus . . .'

¹³⁰ See esp. *c. Adim. 2* (CSEL 25,1: 116, 25 – 117, 2): 'dicunt nouo testamenti aduersari, quod in genesi scriptum est deum septimo die requiesisse ab omnibus operibus suis, quae fecit, quoniam in euangelio dicit: Pater meus usque modo operatur.' The *accusativus-cum-infinitivo* construction connects the summary of the contents with the words 'in genesi' so directly that it must be treated as (part of) a text written by Adimantus himself. The same feature is found in *c. Adim. 3* (CSEL 25,1: 118, 19–22): 'huic rursus loco Manichaei calumniantur dicentes contra nouum testamentum esse istam sententiam, qua deus scribitur et formasse mulierem et uiro coniunxisse, propterea quia in euangelio dicit dominus: . . .'

¹³¹ See p. 160.

b. *Disputatio 2*

In *Disputatio 2*, we find the following argument:

And on the sixth day, God finished all the works that He had made; and on the seventh day, He rested from all these works that He had made (*Gen. 2:2*). What a kind of work was it that made God need to rest? Or was He even exhausted and tired out because of the labours of six days?¹³²

This fragment from the *Disputationes* has several rhetorical questions and the tone of the argument proofs to be rather provocative. These features may indicate that the argument had been originally spoken out loud in the presence of an audience. We might infer from this particular example that the *Disputationes* contains arguments taken from Adimantus' speeches or public discussions.

c. *Disputatio 8*

In *Contra Adimantum 8* Augustine begins his refutation of a *disputatio* with the following words:

Concerning that which is written in Exodus: An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth and suchlike (*Ex. 21:24*). In this way, the Manichaeans falsely accuse this passage that in the old law mutual retaliation is allowed and that it is said that one should be deprived of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, because supposedly even the Lord himself should have demonstrated in the Gospel that both (testaments)¹³³ are like opponents and contrary to each other. For He himself said: Listen, because it was said to them of old: an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say to you not to resist the evil one, but if any man will smite you on your cheek, turn the other one unto him as well, and whoever wants to drag you into the court and take your tunic, let him have the cloak as well (*Mt. 5:38 ff.*).¹³⁴

¹³² *Gn. adu. Man.* I, XXII, 33 (CCL 91: 101, 6f.): 'quid opus erat ut deus requiesceret? An forte operibus sex dierum fatigatus et lassatus erat?'

¹³³ Cf. *c. Adim.* 8 (CSEL 25,1: 130, 20f.): 'in quibus duabus sententiis reuera duorum testamentorum differentia demonstratur, sed amborum tamen ab uno deo constitutorum.'

¹³⁴ *c. Adim.* 8 (CSEL 25,1: 130, 9–14): 'De eo quod in exodo scriptum est: oculus pro oculo, dentem pro dente et cetera talia. huic loco Manichaei, quod in uetere lege par uindicta permittitur et dicitur oculum pro oculo et dentem pro dente esse perdendum, sic calumniantur, quasi et ipse dominus haec duo sibi ueluti aduersantia atque contraria in euangelio demonstrauerit. ipse enim ait: audistis, quia dictum est antiquis: oculus pro oculo et dentem pro dente; ego autem dico uobis non resistere malo, sed si quis te percusserit in maxillam, praebe illi et alteram, et quicumque uoluerit tecum iudicio contendere et tunicam tuam auferre, dimitte illi et pallium.'

In this case it is difficult to reconstruct in entirety what Adimantus originally wrote. Augustine introduces Adimantus' argument with the words 'In this way they falsely accuse, because supposedly ...' (*sic calumniantur, quasi ...*). The following sentence does not really fit in, because it refers to two contradictory items that had not been previously mentioned by Augustine. Probably, Augustine indirectly quotes a line of reasoning from Adimantus. Adimantus may have written something like: 'The two testaments clearly contradict each other and are in contrast with each other. This was demonstrated by the Lord when he said in the Gospel against this passage on retaliation: ...' On the strength of Augustine's argument it is at least possible to claim that Adimantus argued that it was the Lord himself who demonstrated that the Old Testament is contrary to the New, which He himself revealed. This argument indicates that Adimantus regarded himself as a disciple of Jesus when he was criticizing the Hebrew Scriptures.

d. *Disputatio* 10

Disputatio 10 contains another example of the public-oriented character of Adimantus' work. Here Adimantus attempts to demonstrate that the one who reveals himself in the Law must have been another than the God who dwells in the light. Adimantus says:

How could that deity whose throne is the heaven and whose footstool is the earth, live in a tabernacle which is constructed of gold or silver and brass and purple and hairs and skins of small farm animals?¹³⁵

e. *Disputatio* 12

In *Contra Adimantum* 12 we find the most extensive argument of Adimantus that Augustine reproduced. The *Disputatio* is on the contradiction between the Old Testament and the New Testament on the subject of the soul. Adimantus quotes from the Old Testament *Lev.* 17:12 ff., which he places in opposition to *Mt.* 10:28, where the Lord admonished his disciples not to fear human beings because they cannot harm the soul, and to *1 Cor.* 15:50, which states that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God. Adimantus supports his opinion with the following argument:

¹³⁵ c. *Adim.* 10 (CSEL 25,1: 134, 16–19): 'quomodo ille deus, cuius caelum sedes, et terra scabellum pedum eius est, in tabernaculo habitat, quod ex auro uel et argento et aere et purpura et pilis pecorum, pellibusque constructum est?'

If blood is the soul, how may men not have any power over it, for they do many things with blood: they either collect it and give it to dogs and birds as their food, or they pour it out and mix it with mud and sludge. For men can do all these and untold other things with blood without any difficulty. Thus, if blood is the soul, how does it come about that the murderer of a man is unable to damage the soul, since he has such a power over his blood? (...) *And further we* add the saying of the apostle Paul: For flesh and blood cannot possess the Kingdom of God (1 Cor. 15:50). *Therefore:* If the soul consists of blood, as Moses says, it would not be possible to find any soul that obtains the Kingdom of God.¹³⁶ (...) According to the view of the Jewish people, which maintains that blood is the soul, the souls of their parents have been partly devoured by snakes, partly consumed by fire, partly dehydrated in desolate and savage places on the mountains.¹³⁷

As to the form of Adimantus' polemics, we call to mind that Adimantus used the same kind of rhetorical phrases as in *Disputatio* 2 and *Disputatio* 10. The argument seemingly had been crafted in such a way that it has the power to stir up an audience. As we have already said, Augustine reserved the most virulent reply for *Disputatio* 12.¹³⁸ We could even wonder whether Adimantus wrote this *Disputatio* with an anti-Jewish sentiment, because Augustine accuses him of daring to insult (*insultare ausus est*) the people or race (*populus*) of the Israelites or Jews.¹³⁹ Augustine's choice of words seems to imply that he might have discovered racist sentiments in Adimantus' interpretation.

The content of *Disputatio* 12 is also very important for our assessment of the exact purpose of the *Disputationes*, because two other sources tell about Adimantus' interest in this subject. When we compare those

¹³⁶ c. *Adim.* 12 (CSEL 25,1: 138, 8–23): 'si sanguis anima est, quomodo homines potestatem in eam non habent, cum de sanguine multa faciant siue excipientes et canibus uolucris-que in escam proponentes siue effundentes aut caeno lutoque miscentes? haec enim et alia innumerabilia sine difficultate homines de sanguine possunt facere. ideo isti quaerunt insultantes, quomodo, si sanguinis est anima, non possit hominis interfector nocere animae, cum tantam in eius sanguinem habeat potestatem. addunt etiam, quod ait apostolus Paulus: quia caro et sanguis regnum dei non possidebunt: et dicunt: si sanguis est anima, sicut Moyses dicit, nulla inuenietur anima posse regnum dei adipisci.'

¹³⁷ c. *Adim.* 12 (CSEL 25,1: 139, 10–15): 'insultare ergo ausus est populo Iudaeorum, quod secundum eorum intellectum, quo existimant sanguinem esse animam, parentum ipsorum animae, partim a serpentibus deuoratae, partim igne consumptae, partim in desertis atque asperrimis montium locis arefactae sint.'

¹³⁸ See Ch. II, n. 48.

¹³⁹ c. *Adim.* 12 (CSEL 25,1: 139, 8–11): 'quis? quod etiam insultare ausus est populo Israhel Adimantus ... insultare ergo ausus est populo Iudaeorum ...'

sources with *Disputatio* 12, we should be able to define more precisely the relation between the teachings of the Manichaeans and the biblical argument in the *Disputationes*.

In a reconstruction of the chronology of Addas' life we first encounter a Chinese fragment that hands on a conversation between Addas and Mani about the relationship between the soul and the body. A-to, as Addas is called in Chinese, asked Mani whether the fleshly corpse and the spiritual nature formed a unity from the very beginning, or whether each one of them had a different origin. In answer to this question, which was highly appreciated, Mani related the origin of man and his twofold nature. According to Mani's explanation, one of the characteristics of human nature is its double origin, and further, that man should be regarded as a microcosm. Over against the five parts which constitute the good nature, the demons created a malicious nature consisting of five counterparts. Therefore, the fleshly part is a deceptive mirror image, the purpose of which is to prevent human beings from discovering their heavenly origin.¹⁴⁰ According to one of the Sogdian sources from the Silk Road, which relates a missionary journey of Adimantus, the double five-fold nature of human beings was taught by Addas in this way:

The ministers (?) then asked Mâr Addâ: "O Lord, [what] form does the soul take?" Mâr Addâ ans[wered] them thus: "The soul is comparable to the body, which is divided (into five) limbs, (a head), two (arms) and two feet. The soul too [is] just like that: [life] is seen as the [first] limb of the soul, power [is counted] as the second limb, light is counted [as the third] (limb), [beauty] is counted as the (fourth) [limb] and fragrance is counted as the fifth [limb]. And its form and manner are an image [of the body] (?), just as [Jesus (?)] has said: It cannot be seen with a fleshly eye, the fleshly ear does not hear (it), it cannot be held with a fleshly hand nor with a [fleshly] tongue can it be completely explained."¹⁴¹

These accounts of Mani and Addas demonstrate quite clearly that in the Manichaean understanding of man, the body and the soul have much in common. Both consist of five parts. The body, which was created by the demons, is like a mirror image of the real identity of man. Its ultimate purpose is to conceal the origin of the divine part of human nature. When we compare these teachings with *Disputatio* 12, we may

¹⁴⁰ H. Schmidt-Glintzer, *Chinesische Manichaica. Mit textkritischen Anmerkungen und einem Glossar*, Wiesbaden 1987, 77–81.

¹⁴¹ M 18220 = T. M. 389 a. See Ch. II, n. 115.

assume that Adimantus would almost certainly have construed the Old Testament notion that the blood is the soul as a serious attempt on the part of the demons to keep human beings unaware of the real nature of the soul. The teachings of Jesus and the apostle Paul were quoted by Adimantus in order to unmask this understanding of the soul. In this way, the antithetical biblical polemic can be regarded as the harbinger of Mani's teachings about the real identity of the soul.¹⁴²

f. *Disputatio 20*

In *Disputatio 20* we find a rather long quotation from *Lev. 26:3–10*, in which the Lord solemnly promises victories over one's enemies as well as wealth. As to the earthly treasures, Adimantus cites from the Gospel *Mt. 10:9 f.* and the parable of the rich fool (*Lk. 12:20*). Augustine explicitly quotes the argument used by Adimantus to explain why this particular parable should be treated as the opposite of *Lev. 26*. In our reconstruction, it runs as follows:

(...) And we add that one about the rich one, to whom God says: You fool, this night, I shall require your soul; but the things you have prepared, whose shall they be (*Lk. 12:20*)? (...) *This section* is no less in contradiction with that chapter of the Law, since it derides the vanity of empty joy, for he treated those uncertain things as certain; whereas, the omnipotence of the promiser made that promise certain for the people of Israel.¹⁴³

In this passage we can find a rather severe argument which is based exclusively on logic and totally bereft of rhetorical gambits. It is intended to reveal something of the character of the God of the Old Testament. He makes the people of Israel just as great a fool as the rich man by means of His promises, which makes the Jewish people just as unaware of the vanity of wealth as the rich fool.

¹⁴² N.J. Baker-Brian, "..." *quaedam disputationes Adimanti*" (*Retract.* I.xxii,1). Reading the Manichaean Biblical Discordance in Augustine's *Contra Adimantum*, *AS* 34,2 (2003) 175–196, overstretches the argument of Adimantus when he even calls it a kind of catechesis, e.g. pp. 188 and 196.

¹⁴³ *c. Adim.* 18 (*CSEL* 25,1: 178, 3–9): 'addunt etiam de illo diuite, cui deus dixerat: stulte, hac nocte a te animam tuam expetam; quae autem praeparasti, cuius erunt? Et dicunt non minus huic capitulo legis esse contrarium, cum in isto inanitas inrisa sit uanae laetitiae, quia incerta illa pro certis habuit, populo autem Israhel certam faciebat illam pollicitationem omnipotentia pollicentis.'

g. *Disputatio* 29

Disputatio 29, which Augustine quoted in *sermo* 12, deals with the question of how the devil could ever have seen God, as it is written in *Job* 1:6:

If it is indeed the case, that only the pure in heart can see God, how could the devil have seen God with his utterly sordid and unclean heart? Or, how could he have entered the door, that is through Christ (cf. *John*. 10:9)? Again, the Apostel (...) testifies and confirms this, saying that neither principalities, nor authorities, nor yet powers have known God (*Eph.* 3:10).¹⁴⁴

This time, Adimantus poses rhetorical questions in order to demonstrate that the Old Testament is not trustworthy in its description of God and the possibility of seeing Him. It may therefore be treated as yet another indication that at least some parts of the *Disputationes* were originally intended to be used in public.

E. *Evaluation*1. *The form of the Disputationes*

The arguments of Adimantus discussed above seem to confirm that he regularly included material in the *Disputationes* which he had already used in the public arena. Moreover, the form of Adimantus' quotations from the New Testament seems to suggest that they were used in a way that was rather free and associative. This is a possible indication of an oral origin of the *Disputationes*. Both of these features easily lead to the supposition that Adimantus' *Disputationes* were the reports of several debates; all the more so, since the Manichaeans were renowned for their skill in debating. Many reports of debates have already been found, both verbatim and contrived. The very title of the work, i.e. '*Disputationes*', which is explicitly mentioned by Augustine in the *Retractationes*,¹⁴⁵ seems to support this opinion.

¹⁴⁴ s. 12, 1 (CCL 41: 165, 23–28): 'Si igitur hi soli qui sunt puro corde uident deum, quonam modo sordidissimo et immundissimo corde diabolus potuit uidere deum? aut qualiter ianuam, hoc est, per Christum ingreditur? Iterum apostulus, inquit, testatur et confirmat, dicens quod neque potestates neque principes neque virtutes deum cognouerunt.'

¹⁴⁵ *retr.* I, 22, 1 (CCL 57: 63 f., 2 f.): 'Eodem tempore uenerunt in manus meas quaedam disputationes Adimanti ...'

Nevertheless, the specific subject matter of the *Disputationes*, namely the contradictions between the Old Testament and the New Testament, leads us to suspect that those disputations were not originally presented in this particular form. They could well be a collection of (sometimes summarized) debates or selections of those passages that dealt especially with putative contradictions between the Old and the New Testament.

This anthology may well have been originally produced for Manichaean missionaries: namely for use as a manual of instruction during the (first) encounters between Catholic Christians and the exponents of Mani's Christianity. Another possibility is that the work was distributed among potential adherents of Mani's religion.

2. *The target group of the Disputationes*

Both the contents and the method of the *Disputationes* demonstrate that Adimantus had in mind especially the Catholic Christian community, because he focussed his arguments upon the discrepancy between the Old and New Testament. Some features of the *Disputationes* seem to suggest that Adimantus must have been a skilful missionary who was highly sensitive to the feelings of his audience. This can be inferred from the list of subjects that Adimantus blamed. He mainly selected those passages from the Jewish Bible which were either difficult to accept or hard to understand for many Catholic Christians. Moreover, Adimantus only quoted from the New Testament to refute the Law and the Prophets, and never from the so-called 'New Testament apocrypha'. Finally, in the *Disputationes* Adimantus never explicitly criticized any New Testament passages. The case of Faustus of Milevis demonstrates that this missionary strategy was effective among pagans as well.

3. *The relevance of the Old Testament to Adimantus*

One of the most important reasons why Adimantus directed his criticisms against the Hebrew Scriptures was that he intended to demonstrate the sheer inconsistency of Catholic Christians when they insisted on maintaining the Old Testament. The twofold authoritative corpus of holy books of the Catholic Christians provided this Manichaean missionary with a golden opportunity to present his own religion as a much more sophisticated set of beliefs. It turned out that, in this respect, Adimantus heavily drew on Marcion's *Antitheses*, using both its method and contents.

Furthermore, the analysis of both the subject matter and the arguments quoted in full by Augustine supports the conclusion that Adimantus intended to unmask the Old Testament as a deceitful revelation. Adimantus designed his criticisms of the Hebrew Scriptures to be a preparation for the revelation of Mani's truth. If we read the *Disputationes* again with this purpose in mind, we may observe that the core of the Manichaean message is hinted at in the *Disputationes*. The criticisms are all attempts to unmask the God of the Hebrews in order to reveal that he cannot possibly be the good God. Meanwhile, Adimantus also hinted at the nature of the real God, the Father of Light. The good God could never have been jealous;¹⁴⁶ would never have needed a rest;¹⁴⁷ is invisible and lives in the inaccessible light;¹⁴⁸ would never have cursed;¹⁴⁹ would never have caused evil.¹⁵⁰ Faustus' rendering of *Disputatio* 33 states this quite explicitly:

Is it right to satisfy the gluttony of the Jewish demon, for he is not God, with the sacrificing at one time of bulls, another time of rams, or even he-goats, not to mention even humans.¹⁵¹

By representing himself as God, the deity who revealed himself in the Old Testament was trying to keep human beings unaware of the highest God and the sublime origin of the particles of light within them.¹⁵² He dazzled his creatures with earthly treasures.¹⁵³ His commandments in the law, moreover, were intended to prolong the incarceration of the particles of light, because sexual reproduction and eating meat are encouraged.¹⁵⁴ Above all, the ultimate destination of man was concealed by conceiving a radically different kind of eschaton.¹⁵⁵ Adimantus fulminated in the *Disputationes* against this cover up. The reason why the Old Testament was important enough to be discussed is crystal clear. It came from the deceitful demons, which caused it to be written in order to retain the light in the prison of darkness.

¹⁴⁶ See *Disp.* 7, 11 and 13.

¹⁴⁷ See *Disp.* 2.

¹⁴⁸ See *Disp.* 10, 9, 11, 28 and 29.

¹⁴⁹ See *Disp.* 4, 21 and 34.

¹⁵⁰ See *Disp.* 17, 20, 26 and 27.

¹⁵¹ *c. Faust.* 18, 2 (CSEL 25,1: 491, 6–10): 'Placet in ingluuiem iudaeorum daemonis—neque enim dei—nunc tauros, nunc arietes, nunc etiam horcos, ut non et homines dicam, cultris sternere.'

¹⁵² See *Disp.* 1, 5, 12, 25 and 29.

¹⁵³ See *Disp.* 4, 18, 19, 20 and 30.

¹⁵⁴ See *Disp.* 3, 14, 23, 25 and 34.

¹⁵⁵ See *Disp.* 32.

At this point, we may discern an important difference between Marcion and Adimantus as to the reason for rejecting the Old Testament. According to Marcion, the Old Testament does tell the truth about creation and the identity of the creator. The Old Testament should be rejected, however, because of the inferiority of the demiurge when compared with the supreme God of goodness. According to Adimantus, the Old Testament needed to be challenged because it should have given an intentionally distorted account of reality. We need to examine whence this difference originated, because this might be helpful to define more precisely from which sources Adimantus' opinions on the Old Testament originated.

Logically, one could guess that either Mani influenced Adimantus at this point, or that a later development within Marcionitism caused the difference between Adimantus and Marcion. If the last option turns out to be true, then it could be taken for granted that Adimantus' connections with Marcionite ideas were much more comprehensive than merely the lecture of Marcion's *Antitheses*, which should be in support of Lieu's conclusion that Adimantus was a Marcionite prior to his going over to Mani's church.¹⁵⁶

There is sound reason to be sceptical about the idea that Mani influenced Adimantus at this specific point. The sources which are relevant to an examination of the beginnings of Manichaeism (which are especially of importance here, because of Adimantus' early encounter with Mani) justify the conclusion that Mani must have had his roots in a heterodox Jewish Christian context, because these sources testify to the fact that Mani grew up in a community of Baptists who probably adhered to the teachings of Elchasai.¹⁵⁷ Although Mani broke off with this community for rea-

¹⁵⁶ See Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*, 92: 'It is not improbable that Addas was a Marcionite prior to his joining the new sect of Mani.'

¹⁵⁷ Especially the *CMC* demonstrates that Mani must have developed his teachings in a Jewish Christian setting. First edition of the *CMC* with extensive commentary: A. Henrichs & L. Koenen, *ZPE* 5 (1970) 97–216; *ZPE* 19 (1975) 1–85; *ZPE* 32 (1978) 87–199; *ZPE* 44 (1981) 210–318; *ZPE* 48 (1982) 1–59 and C.E. Römer, *Manis frühe Missionsreisen nach der Kölner Manibibliographie. Textkritischer Kommentar und Erläuterungen zu p. 121–p. 192 des Kölner Mani-Kodex*, Opladen 1994. Critical standard edition: L. Koenen and C. Römer, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex. Über das Werden seines Leibes*, Opladen 1988.

From the *CMC* it can be concluded with certainty that Mani grew up in a Jewish Christian Baptising sect whose members were almost certainly adherents of the teachings of Elchasai. Apart from the commentary in the first edition, see *i.a.* A. Henrichs, 'The Cologne Mani Codex Reconsidered', *HSCP* 83 (1979) 339–367; R. Merkelbach, 'Die Täufer, bei denen Mani aufwuchs', in: P. Bryder (ed.), *Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism, August 5–9, 1987 Department of History of Religions Lund University Sweden*, Lund 1988, 106–133; K. Rudolph, 'Die Bedeu-

son that he could no longer accept their teachings and religious practices as a consequence of his own religious experiences, this Jewish Christian background still exerted its influence on Mani and his teachings even after his break with the community. The early traditions on the emergence of Mani's religion give proof of a deliberate incorporation and/or reformulation of traditions from that Jewish Christian milieu, including those with ultimately Old Testament roots. This may be demonstrated by the fact that in the *CMC* a number of apocalypses under the names of five famous Jewish ancestors—Adam, Seth, Enosh, Shem and Enoch—were included in order to give a proof of the identity of Mani's own spiritual experiences.¹⁵⁸ This kind of apocalypses ultimately has its roots in heterodox Jewish biblical exegesis.¹⁵⁹ According to the *CMC*, Mani referred to Elchasai, the Jewish Christian source of inspiration of the sect in which he grew up, as an important authority to justify his own opinions.¹⁶⁰ The Manichaean cosmology and the opinions of the Manichaeans on the creation of the earth were also influenced by Jewish lore.¹⁶¹ Especially

tung des Kölner Mani-Codex für die Manichäismusforschung. Vorläufige Anmerkungen', in: idem, *Gnosis & spätantike Religionsgeschichte. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1996, 667–685; idem, 'Jüdische und Christliche Täufertraditionen im Spiegel des Kölner Mani-Codex', in: idem, 686–697. Cf. also Gerard P. Luttikhuisen who refutes the theory that the Baptist sect in which Mani grew up should be regarded as Elchasaites, most recently in the appendix to his *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*, Leiden-Boston 2006, 170–184.

¹⁵⁸ According to the testimony of Baraies the Teacher in *CMC* 45–60 (ed. Koenen and Römer, 29–41).

¹⁵⁹ John C. Reeves, *Heralds of that good Realm; Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1996, 209. Even Luttikhuisen, although being all too sceptical about the possibility that the sect in which Mani grew up must be treated as Elchasaites, says in his *Gnostic Revisions*, 172: 'I do not doubt that the relevant Manichaean idea developed from a Jewish Christian background.'

¹⁶⁰ See *CMC* 94–99 (ed. Koenen and Römer, 67–71), which passages give testimony of the congruence between Mani's religious attitudes towards baptising and food and those of Elchasai. These passages could even be interpreted in such a way that they might indicate that Mani intended to be a reformer of the Baptists sect, which should emphasize even more the continuity between the Baptists and Mani; see L. Koenen, 'Augustine and Manichaeism in Light of the Köln Mani Codex', *Illinois Classical Studies* 3 (1978) 154–195 (187).

¹⁶¹ See J. van Oort, in: J. van Oort and G. Quispel, *De Keulse Mani-Kodex*, Amsterdam 2005, 54 f. and 66. According to Van Oort, it is quite plausible to conclude that the concept of the column of Glory has much in common with *Dan.* 7:10 and the cloud that guided the Israelites through the wilderness (Van Oort, in: idem, *De Keulse Mani-Kodex*, 66 and esp. 129). The proper name 'Manichaeus' was sometimes explained as: the one who pours out manna. In the *CMC* Mani spoke of himself as the one who pours out (idem 38, 203); for 'Man(n)ichaeus', see further Van Oort, 'Mani and Manichaeism in

Mani's canonical *Book of the Giants* proves this.¹⁶² In addition, it may be mentioned that, recently, F. Stanley Jones has examined the parallels between the contents of the book of Elchasai and Manichaean religious practices,¹⁶³ the similarities of which could well indicate dependence.

Mani's incorporation of these traditions, including those with Old Testament roots, certainly involved a kind of corrective exegesis. But he did not discuss them radically antithetically like Marcion, nor did he reject them in entirety as intentionally misleading. Some of the Old Testament motives could even be applied in a direct and positive way, such as the pouring out of manna.¹⁶⁴ Probably, the traditions stemming from the Old Testament had already been reinterpreted in the Jewish Christian heterodox context from which Mani emerged; or they could be reinterpreted thus by Mani himself, so that they were not an urgent matter to be discussed, leave alone to be refuted because of its dangerous character. This state of affairs makes it quite unlikely that Mani should have given the impetus to a supposed development in Adimantus' opinions on the Old Testament from Marcion's view on it, to the assessment of its nature in the *Disputationes*.

It is far more likely to suppose that Adimantus learned to view upon the Hebrew Bible as a deceiving revelation from a later development within Marcionitism. Adimantus' assessment of the Old Testament and his way of criticizing its subject matter has several features in common with the tenets of Apelles, who was one of Marcion's most important followers. On several points, Apelles' opinions differed radically from Marcion's ideas. Apelles believed that creation was caused by an angel who attempted to create a material mirror image of the spiritual domain of the supreme God. The creator angel did not succeed in his attempts, which made him feel ashamed. Apelles ascribed the creation of humans to the act of another angel, who was thoroughly malicious. Apelles called him the fire angel. The fire angel enticed the souls of men to come down from heaven to earth and enfolded them in material bodies. This fire angel was

Augustine's *De Haeresibus*. An analysis of *haer.* 46,1; in: R.E. Emmerick *et al.* (eds.), *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin 14.-18. Juli 1997*, Berlin 2000, 451–463 (455 ff.).

¹⁶² See John C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony. Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions*, Cincinnati 1992.

¹⁶³ F.S. Jones, 'The *Book of Elchasai* in its Relevance for Manichaean Institutions; with a Supplement: The *Book of Elchasai* Reconstructed and Translated', *ARAM* 16 (2004) 179–215.

¹⁶⁴ See n. 161.

also responsible for the law of the Jews. Apelles derived the name of this creator of the human race from the revelation of God to Moses in the burning bush (*Ex.* 3:2). The fire angel attempted to keep human beings unaware of their heavenly origin. Apelles was highly interested in the Old Testament and attacked it vigorously in his *Syllogismoi*.¹⁶⁵ The similarity between Apelles and Adimantus when we examine what they have to say about the misleading intentions underlying the Old Testament seems to support the claim that Adimantus must have been influenced by Apelles.

After all, it is most logical to suppose that Adimantus was a Marcionite prior to his going over to the church of Mani. We may add that Adimantus probably adhered to the school of Apelles and that he creatively combined these Marcionite beliefs about the Hebrew Bible with the teachings of Mani.

Adimantus' aversion to the Hebrew part of the Catholic Canon can be explained with a reference to his convictions, but we can still wonder whether a biographical factor could be implicated as well. In chapter II, we concluded that Adimantus might have had a Jewish (or Jewish Christian) background, because of the possible origin of his name,¹⁶⁶ and in *Disputatio* 12 we detected some rather hostile overtones, which might suggest a personal—not to say emotional—involvement with this subject matter. The radical rejection of Jewish beliefs and practices could well have been provoked by a certain disappointment in the tenets of a Jewish (Christian) group to which Addas once might have belonged, before his Marcionite and Manichaean period. Nevertheless, we have already noted that Adimantus habitually quoted Old Testament passages in accordance with their New Testament formulations, and—in contrast to the quotations from the Gospel and the apostle Paul—those renderings betray no signs of knowledge by heart, which we might have expected when Adimantus should have grown up in Jewish (Christian) circles. This means that it is more reasonable to assume that the hostility of his language is little more than rhetoric. There is not enough evidence to suppose that Adimantus came to reject the Old Testament because of a disappointment in the tenets that he might have learned in his youth.

¹⁶⁵ See especially Katharina Greschat, *Apelles und Hermogenes. Zwei theologische Lehrer des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2000. Cf. Harnack, *Marcion*, 177–195 and Meike Willing, 'Die neue Frage des Marcionschülers Apelles—zur Rezeption marcionistischen Gedankenguts', in: May *et al.* (eds.), *Marcion*, 221–231.

¹⁶⁶ See p. 23 ff.

4. *The importance attached to the New Testament*

In the *Disputationes*, the New Testament plays a major role. In it, passages from both the Pauline Corpus and the Gospels are cited to demonstrate the real nature of the Old Testament. Furthermore, the text of the New Testament receives not any criticisms in this work of Adimantus. Some might argue that the importance attributed to these texts was little more than a propaganda strategy and that Adimantus' appreciation of them should be regarded as rather superficial. Admittedly, this may well apply to the absence of any critical remarks on the contents of the Pauline Corpus and the Gospels. In the next chapter, it is one of our purposes to examine as to whether the absence of any criticisms of the New Testament should indeed be ascribed to Adimantus' missionary strategy. In the present section, we have to see what can be concluded from the *Disputationes* regarding Adimantus' esteem of the New Testament texts. His antithetical work provides us with sound reasons to suppose that Adimantus highly appreciated (parts of) the New Testament.

The method that Adimantus adopted in the *Disputationes* points to the fact that he had a great appreciation of (parts of) the New Testament. Because, one could easily envisage Adimantus criticizing the Hebrew Scriptures, without thereby invoking passages from the Gospel and the Pauline Corpus. The antithetical method entails that Adimantus not only believed that the Old Testament originated from evil, but as well that (parts of) the New Testament came from God. This claim is supported by our analysis of the arguments quoted in full by Augustine, from which we learned that Adimantus opined that Jesus strove to unmask the Hebrew Scriptures as the work of the god of deceit. This implies as well that Adimantus would have regarded himself as a disciple of Jesus when he criticized the Hebrew Scriptures. Therefore, we may safely assume that the New Testament passages chosen by Adimantus to criticize the Old Testament were considered by him as a revelation from the good God and intended to rescue human beings from their ignorance.

Further, we can refer to Adimantus' familiarity with the Gospel and the Pauline Corpus, because Adimantus was quite capable of citing *ad lib.* from the Gospel and the apostle Paul in an associative way. Adimantus' positive use of and his familiarity with the Gospel as well as the apostle Paul is in support of the claim that Adimantus had a genuine appreciation of (parts of) the New Testament.

Adimantus' preference for the sayings of Jesus, especially the ones in the Sermon on the Mount, is also of importance. It is probable that

the sayings of Jesus were powerful stimuli to the religious sentiments of Adimantus. The importance of such genuinely evangelical principles as poverty and total devotion to God, in the *Disputationes* as well as in Adimantus' missionary life, is in support of this claim.¹⁶⁷ Therefore, we may assume that obedience to Jesus lay right at the heart of the spirituality of Adimantus.¹⁶⁸ The emphasis Adimantus placed upon the contrast between the injunctions in the Hebrew Scriptures and the demands of the Gospel can only be explained satisfactorily if and when we also take into consideration his spiritual commitment to the teachings of Jesus.

All this implies that we really ought to treat Adimantus' esteem for (parts of) the New Testament not as mere propaganda strategy. In fact, it ultimately was one of the constitutive elements of his spirituality.

¹⁶⁷ See Ch. II, Part B, section 4. *Mani's missionary precepts and Adimantus*.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. my, 'Wie kan God zien?—Augustinus' *sermo* 12', in: J. van Oort and P. van Geest (eds.), *Augustiniana Neerlandica. Aspecten van Augustinus' spiritualiteit en haar doorwerking*, Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA 2005, 73–85.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE LITERARY CONTEXT OF THE *DISPUTATIONES*

A. Introduction

1. *Relevance*

Adimantus had the reputation of being a prolific writer. Both the adherents and the opponents of Mani's Church referred to his considerable literary output. As to the Manichaean sources, the ones discovered in Iran (which we discussed in chapter II) mention the writings that Adimantus produced in order to attack the tenets of other religions.¹ Moreover, Faustus, who during Augustine's lifetime seems to have been the most important Manichaean bishop in the West, treated Adimantus as the most important author to be studied apart from Mani himself.² Adimantus' writings regularly provoked a negative reaction from Catholic Christian authors, which can be deduced from some references we find in Photius of Constantinople's *Bibliotheca*. In this work, Photius († 895 CE) quoted *i.a.* from an anti-Manichaean work of a certain Heraclianus of Chalcedon (supposedly 5th century CE),³ which references demonstrate that Addas' writings were attacked by Christian authors:

... and Titus, who thought to write against the works of Manichaeans, actually wrote against the treatises of Addas ...⁴

¹ E.g. M2: '... Addâ laboured very hard in these areas, founded many monasteries, chose many Elect and Hearers, composed writings and made wisdom his weapon. He opposed the "dogmas" with these (writings), (and) in everything he acquitted himself well. He subdued and enchained the "dogmas" ...'; M216: '... [And he composed ...] and the writings of Light. [And] (he grasped) (?) [wisdom for] the refutation of the dogmas. In many [ways] he made and fashioned them [as weapon] against all the dogmas. And he defeated the teachings and put them all to shame like somebody who [wielded] a powerful weapon ...'.

² *c. Faust.* 1, 2.

³ Cf. N.A. Pedersen, *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-Boston 2004, 138.

⁴ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 85, 6ff.: καὶ Τίτον ὃς ἔδοξε μὲν κατὰ Μανιχαίων γράψαι

According to Heraclianus, Addas' writings were, on occasions, also confused with the works of Mani. This can be inferred from a following line in the *Bibliotheca*: Diodore of Tarsus († 390 CE) supposed that he was refuting the *Living Gospel* of Mani. Actually, however, he was fulminating against a writing of Addas, called *Modion*:

... and Diodoros, disputing Manichaeans in a collection of twenty-five books, thought to reject the Living Gospel of Manichaeus in the first seven books, but he actually dealt with the writing of Adda, which is called Modion.⁵

In addition to such historical traces of Adimantus' literary activity, it may be mentioned that students of Manichaeism seriously allow for the possibility that Adimantus could well have been the editor of the *Kephalaia*.⁶

All this evidence clearly suggests that the *Disputationes* was not the only one of Adimantus' literary products. In order to avoid premature conclusions about the precise aim of Adimantus when he wrote the *Disputationes* and vented his opinions about the Holy Scriptures, it is important to produce an overall picture of Adimantus' literary output.

So, the purpose of this particular chapter is to examine the direct literary context of the *Disputationes*. A preliminary examination of the other writings of Adimantus will make it possible to evaluate the significance of the discussion about Scripture for Adimantus' ideas and works, and, more specifically, to ascertain whether (and how) the views that can be inferred from his *Disputationes* are related to what can be deduced from his other works. Furthermore, a comparison of the *Disputationes* with

ἔγραψε δὲ μᾶλλον κατὰ Ἄδδου συγγραμμάτων. Text R. Henry, *Photius' Bibliothèque*, Tome II, Paris 1960, 9. This sentence should probably be construed thus, that Titus believed that he was writing against many Manichaeans (among whom Mani himself), but actually wrote against only one, namely Adimantus. See Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 179.

⁵ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, 85, 11–16: καὶ τὸν Διόδωρον, ἐν κ' καὶ ε' βιβλίοις τὸν κατὰ Μανιχαίων ἀγῶνα ἀγωνισάμενον, ὃς διὰ μὲν τῶν πρώτων βιβλίων ἑπτὰ οἶεται μὲν τὸ τοῦ Μανιχαίου ζῶν εὐαγγέλιον ἀνατρέπειν, οὐ τυγχάνει δὲ ἐκείνου, ἀλλὰ ἀνατρέπει τὸ ὑπὸ Ἄδδα γεγραμμένον, ὃ καλεῖται Μόδιον. Text *idem*, 9 f.

⁶ M. Tardieu, 'Principes de l'exégèse Manichéenne du Nouveau Testament', in: *idem*, *Les règles de l'interprétation*, Paris 1987, 123–146 (134) and, cautiously, W.-P. Funk, 'The reconstruction of the Manichaean *Kephalaia*', in: P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn (eds.), *Emerging from Darkness. Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997, 143–159 (154). Cf. as well T. Pettipiece, *Pentadic Redaction in the Manichaean Kephalaia*, Leiden-Boston (2009).

other works of Adimantus will make it possible to test the conclusions from the previous chapter regarding the precise role and the purposes of the *Disputationes* in the missionary practice of the Manichaeans, and possibly to define them more precisely.

2. Method

Direct indications to the manifold works of Adimantus are very rare and often short, such as the mere mention of a title,⁷ which makes it difficult to generate an overview of his literary output. As to the subject matter of Adimantus' literary output, we depend for the most part on two important sources. The first is Faustus' *Capitula*. The *Capitula* is important in this context, because, in his introduction to the *Capitula*, Faustus clearly testifies to the importance of Adimantus as a Manichaean author. The opening sentences of the *Capitula* could even be interpreted in such a way, that the work should be taken as a kind of supplement to Adimantus' writings for the use of Manichaean missionaries working in Roman Africa towards the end of the fourth century CE:

Although sufficiently and even more than that, the errors of the Jewish superstition have been brought to light, and likewise the deception of the semi-Christians has abundantly been detected by the most learned Adimantus—the only person whom we have to study after our blissful father Manichaeus—it seems not unhelpful, dear brethren, to write for you these short and polished answers on account of the crafty and cunning statements from the conferences with us; by these, you yourselves should be equipped to answer them vigilantly, when they should want to surround you as well with deception by means of trifling questions, in accordance with the habit of their forefather, the serpent.⁸

Apart from this statement in the introduction, some other traces of literary dependence on Adimantus can be found in Faustus' *Capitula*.⁹ Therefore, the *Capitula* should be treated as an important source of knowledge about the other writings of Adimantus.

⁷ See n. 5.

⁸ c. *Faust.* 1, 2 (CSEL 25,1: 251, 22 – 252, 7): 'Satis superque in lucem iam traductis erroribus ac Iudaicae superstitionis simul et semichristianorum abunde detecta fallacia a doctissimo scilicet et solo nobis post beatum patrem nostrum Manichaeum studendo Adimanto non ab re uisum est, fratres carissimi, haec quoque breuia uobis et concinna responsa propter callidas et astutas conferentium nobiscum propositiones scribere, quo cum idem uos ex more parentis sui serpentis captiosis circumuenerit questiunculis uoluerint, et ipsi ad respondendum uigilanter eis sitis instructi.'

⁹ See below, pp. 184f., 197, and 208.

Hence, it is reasonable to begin with an examination of Faustus' work. His *Capitula* certainly demonstrates the existence of another critical writing of Adimantus on the subject of the Old Testament in addition to the *Disputationes*, as well as another work on the New Testament. Furthermore, Faustus' *Capitula* could well shed light on the subject matter of the book of Adimantus which is called *Modion*. Moreover, the subject matter of Faustus' *Capitula* seems to indicate that Adimantus must have written about the Manichaeian myth as well.

In addition to the Manichaeian *Capitula* of Faustus, Titus of Bostra's (4th century CE) *Contra Manichaeos* is also important for the reconstruction of an overview of Adimantus' works. In his *Contra Manichaeos*, Titus seems to have quoted from a number of Manichaeian works, especially from the writings of Adimantus. This can be concluded on the basis of Heraclianus' words which are transmitted by Photius.¹⁰

However, the *Contra Manichaeos* is certainly not an easily accessible source. Titus' writing was transmitted partly in Greek and *in extenso* in Syriac. A complete and easily accessible translation in one of the modern languages is still lacking. Furthermore, the technical problems entailed by the sources of Titus are as complex as they are manifold. Although Titus did indeed quote from Manichaeian sources, he did not indicate precisely when he was quoting a Manichaeian text, nor did he specify which sources he was using. It would take far too long to discuss all these problems and their possible solutions in this study. In order to generate a global overview of the other writings of Adimantus, it is sufficient (at least for the moment) to mention the excellent study of Nils Arne Pedersen on Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos*.¹¹ In his examination of the material Pedersen also attempted to identify those Manichaeian texts which could have been used by Titus of Bostra. Pedersen's analysis of the sources of *Contra Manichaeos* corroborates the conclusions which may be drawn from Faustus' *Capitula*. Giulia Sfameni Gasparro has also examined the *Contra Manichaeos*¹² and her conclusions apply equally to the works of Adimantus.

¹⁰ See above, n. 4.

¹¹ N.A. Pedersen, *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-Boston 2004.

¹² G. Sfameni Gasparro, 'Addas-Adimantus unus ex discipulis Manichaei: for the History of Manichaeism in the West', in: Ronald E. Emmerick *et al.* (eds.), *Studia Manichaica IV*, Berlin 2000, 546–599.

3. *The Contra Faustum and the Capitula*

Before examining Adimantus' writings, however, it is necessary to make some preliminary remarks about Faustus and his *Capitula*, because this particular source is of vital importance to our purpose.

Faustus originally came from Milevis in Numidia in Roman Africa.¹³ In the *Capitula* he tells that he was a pagan before he became an adherent of Mani's church.¹⁴ Faustus ranked highly in Mani's Church, because he became one of its seventy-two bishops.¹⁵ From Augustine's *Confessiones* we may conclude that Faustus had a considerable reputation among the Manichaeans: he was considered to be the most important authority in questions about the teachings of the Manichaeans.¹⁶

Faustus, the leader of the Manichaeans in Roman Africa in Augustine's days, was the author of the *Capitula*. Because the *Capitula* is a primary Manichaean source, it deserves much more attention in Manichaean studies than it has hitherto received. It is the most extensive Manichaean work originally written in Latin that is still available.¹⁷ Thanks to Augustine, this work was preserved for posterity, because in his *Contra Faustum* Augustine first quoted Faustus' words *in extenso*, after which he commented on them.¹⁸ In this way, Augustine discussed every chapter of the *Capitula*, dealing with one separate *capitulum* in each of the books of his *Contra Faustum*.¹⁹ Only one exception to this procedure may be

¹³ See Augustine, *c. Faust.* 1, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 251, 4): 'Faustus quidam gente Afer, ciuitate Mileuitanus'; cf. also E. Decret, *Aspects du Manichéisme dans l'Afrique Romaine. Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Felix avec saint Augustin*, Paris 1970, 51–61.

¹⁴ See e.g., *c. Faust.* 13, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 378, 1–5): 'unde si mihi adhuc in paterna religione moranti praedicator adueniens, Christum uellet ex prophetis insinuare, hunc ego protinus dementem putarem, qui gentili mihi, et longe alterius religionis homini de magis dubiis dubia conaretur astruere'; 15, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 417, 24 ff.): 'nobis uero in hoc quid opus est uel praecepto, quibus ex gentilitate conuersis ad Christum Hebraeorum deus non mortuus debet uideri, sed nec natus?'

¹⁵ See *conf.* 5, 7, 3 (CCL 27: 58, 3, l. 2 ff.): 'Iam uenerat Carthaginem quidam manichaeorum episcopus, Faustus nomine, magnus laqueus diaboli, et multi implicabantur in eo per inlecebram suauiloquentia.'

¹⁶ See Ch. III, n. 34.

¹⁷ Cf. G. Wurst, 'Bemerkungen zu Struktur und *genus litterarium* der *Capitula* des Faustus von Mileve', in: J. van Oort et al. (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaean Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001, 307–324 (307).

¹⁸ See *c. Faust.* 1, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 251, 19 ff.): 'commodum autem arbitror sub eius nomine uerba eius ponere et sub meo respersionem meam.'

¹⁹ See Augustine's conclusion in *c. Faust.* 33, 9 (CSEL 25,1: 796, 14 f.): 'quapropter post omnes Fausti calumnies refutatas horum eius capitulorum ...'

found, because in *Contra Faustum* 16 Augustine seems to suggest that he refuted two chapters of the *Capitula* in a single book of his *Contra Faustum*.²⁰

The most important subjects in the *Capitula* are: the incarnation of the Son of God and other Christological items;²¹ the question of whether or not the Old Testament should be accepted;²² and the possibility that the New Testament could have been corrupted by manipulators of Scripture.²³ Only a few of the chapters are about Manichaean teachings that are not directly connected with Catholic Christian teachings.²⁴ Sometimes, the capita are interrelated, as is the case in those *Capitula* that Augustine quoted in *Contra Faustum* 17, 18 and 19. These three chapters deal with the question of whether *Mt.* 5:17 was added by a forger, and the relation between the Old Testament and Christ.

In the introduction, Faustus insists that the *Capitula* should be construed as if they were stylized reports of discussions with Catholic Christians.²⁵ The text of the *Capitula* does indeed have some features that suggest a debate, such as posing questions²⁶ and an uncomplicated style, which is in contrast with the highly complex sentences of the introduction. Moreover, in one case Faustus identifies a question from his audience as the *Sitz-im-Leben* of the *capitulum*.²⁷ Thus, the *Capitula* reveals several features which could be interpreted as a confirmation of Faustus' remarks about its origin. In the *Capitula* Faustus frequently discussed a matter more than once. Sometimes he continues the argument of his previous *capitulum*;²⁸ in other passages he gives an almost identical (and

²⁰ Augustine subsequently introduces Faustus' *Capitula* with the words: 'Faustus dixit'. In 16, 8 (*CSEL* 25,1: 446, 15), we find as an introduction to that paragraph: 'Alias inquit: si christianus . . .'. *Alias* can be translated with 'at another time' or 'in sequel'.

²¹ See *c. Faust.* 2, 1; 3, 1; 5, 1-3; 7, 1; 11, 1; 23, 1-4; and 28, 1.

²² See *c. Faust.* 4, 1; 6, 1; 8, 1; 9, 1; 10, 1; 12, 1; 13, 1; 14, 1; 15, 1; 16, 1; 17, 1-3; 18, 1-3; 19, 1-3; 22, 1-5; 31, 1-3; 32, 1-7; and 33, 2.

²³ See e.g. *c. Faust.* 3, 1; 17, 1-3; 31, 1-3; and 32, 7.

²⁴ See e.g. *c. Faust.* 20, 1-4; and 21, 1.

²⁵ *c. Faust.* 1, 2 (*CSEL* 25,1: 252, 2-5): 'non ab re uisum est, fratres carissimi, haec quoque breuia uobis et concinna responsa propter callidas et astutas conferentium nobiscum propositiones scribere.'

²⁶ E.g. *c. Faust.* 2, 1 (*CSEL* 25,1: 253, 18-21): 'Faustus dixit: Accipis euangelium? et maxime. proinde ergo et natum accipis Christum? non ita est. neque enim sequitur ut si euangelium accipio, idcirco et natum accipiam Christum.'

²⁷ *c. Faust.* 23, 1 (*CSEL* 25,1: 707, 6 f.): 'Faustus dixit: disputanti mihi aliquando quidam ex numerosa plebe respondens ait: accipis Iesum de Maria natum?'

²⁸ See e.g. the *Capitula* quoted in *c. Faust.* 2, 1 and 3, 1. In 3, 1 (*CSEL* 25,1: 261, 20), Faustus renders the question of his opponent with the words: 'Accipis ergo generationem'. The word 'ergo' presupposes a previous discussion on the 'generatio'. In 2, 1 (*CSEL* 25,1:

sometimes shortened) reply to a critical question as he has already given elsewhere.²⁹ The length of a single *capitulum* ranges from one, rather short paragraph,³⁰ to seven very long ones.³¹ All of those features could be treated as clues which ultimately suggest that the *Capitula* originated in debates between Faustus and (probably especially) Catholic Christians.³² Those debates could have been either brief or long, and in all likelihood some subjects would have been discussed more than once. Even the apparently arbitrary sequence of the individual *capitula* could be explained in this way. This lack of logic has challenged students of Manichaeism to reconstruct the 'original' order of the chapters in the *Capitula*.³³ These attempts to restore the original sequence in Faustus' work are not convincing and entail new, equally difficult problems.³⁴ The hypothesis that the *Capitula* originated in debates involves, however, a rather plain and natural solution to this problem: the sequence of the individual *Capitula* may well have been chronological, depending largely on the precise moment at which a certain subject had been discussed.

Faustus also tells that he polished his answers,³⁵ which entails that the accounts in the *Capitula* should not be construed as verbatim reports. Probably, he adapted what he remembered, or what was recorded in the minutes of the debates, to make the *Capitula* an effective instruction about debating with (Catholic) Christians for his own pupils. Elaborating

254, 19f.) Faustus concludes his answer with the words: 'uideris enim mihi nunc scire uelle, non utrum euangelium accipiam, sed utrum generationes.' The question in 3, 1 naturally follows after this remark. Cf. as well the discussion on *Mt. 5:17* in *c. Faust.* 17, 1–3; 18, 1–3 and 19, 1–6.

²⁹ E.g. Faustus' criticism of the behaviour of the Jewish ancestors in *c. Faust.* 22, 5 and 32, 4 (see nn. 46f.).

³⁰ See *c. Faust.* 8, 1; 9,1; 27, 1 and 28, 1.

³¹ See *c. Faust.* 16, 1–7 (or 8, cf. above n. 20) and 32, 1–7.

³² Both Faustus' introduction to his *Capitula* as well as the contents of the discussion do indicate that these discussions originated from controversies between Manichaeans and Catholic Christians (which may be taken as: not Gnostic Christians). Of course, the debates will have had influence on others as well.

³³ See especially P. Monceaux, *Le manichéen Faustus de Milev. Restitution de ses Capitula*, Paris 1924.

³⁴ To assume that Augustine disturbed the initial order is transposing the problem from Faustus to Augustine. Another possibility, namely that the *Capitula* originally consisted of single leaves, founders on the fact that Faustus wrote an introduction to the *Capitula* which would have been completely unnecessary in the case of single sheets. See further: G. Wurst, 'Bemerkungen', 312–318.

³⁵ *c. Faust.* 1, 2 (CSEL 25,1: 252, 3f.): 'haec quoque breuia uobis et concinna response ...'

on the assumption that Faustus used his earlier discussions when he was writing the *Capitula*, it could be argued that Faustus must have intended to use the same style and method as already applied in the *Kephalaia*. This Manichaean writing looks as if it was originally composed on the basis of reports of discussions between Mani and his disciples. There are several striking similarities between these two works: they are presented as dialogues, their (illogical) ordering, etc.³⁶ Gregor Wurst argued that the title ‘*Capitula*’ could be a translation of the Greek *Kephalaia*.³⁷ This is a very interesting hypothesis. It needs, however, to be adapted somewhat, because the word *Kephalaia* should be translated with *Capita*. Nevertheless, the diminutive *Capitula* could well have been chosen deliberately³⁸ in order to refer to the method and style of the *Kephalaia*, but without claiming that it should be treated as a work of the same standard.³⁹

B. *Writings against the superstitio of the Jews*

In the introduction to his *Capitula*, Faustus mentions Adimantus’ exco-riation of the failures of the Jewish superstition.⁴⁰ As a matter of fact, in his *Disputationes* Adimantus tried to refute many Jewish beliefs. However, Faustus’ *Capitula* suggests a number of reasons why Adimantus must have deployed even more of his literary productions in the struggle against the Old Testament than just the *Disputationes*.

Faustus’ observation that Augustine quoted in *Contra Faustum* 12,1 is of particular importance. In the concerning passage Faustus discusses the question as to whether the Jewish prophets had predicted Christ, or not.

³⁶ See Wurst, ‘Bemerkungen’, 308–313.

³⁷ Wurst, ‘Bemerkungen’, 312 f.

³⁸ In fact, it is not certain that the word ‘*Capitula*’ belonged to the original copy of the work of Faustus. It is found in Augustine’s words, *c. Faust.* 33, 9 (CSEL 25,1: 796, 14f.): ‘Quapropter post omnes Fausti calumnias refutatas horum eius capitulorum ...’ Consequently, Faustus as well as Augustine could have named Faustus’ work in this way.

³⁹ Cf. below p. 211 and n. 146. The discussion on the subject of the structure of the *Capitula* has much in common with the discussion about the *Disputationes* (see pp. 53 f. and 66 f.). That is to say: the *Kephalaia*, the *Disputationes* and the *Capitula* all share the lack of an ordering principle for the sequence of the chapters.

⁴⁰ *c. Faust.* 1, 2 (CSEL 25,1: 251, 22 – 252, 2): ‘Satis superque in lucem iam traductis erroribus, ac Iudaicae superstitionis simul et semichristianorum abunde detecta fallacia a doctissimo scilicet et solo nobis post beatum patrem Manichaeum studendo Adimanto ...’

Faustus rejects this possibility by quoting *John* 8:13–18 and some other texts.⁴¹ At the end of this passage he says:

Therefore, it is this which I reply concisely, provisionally and briefly to the question you ask: Why do you not accept the prophets? In any event, the books of our fathers have demonstrated sufficiently that they (*i.e.* the prophets of the Old Testament) have predicted nothing concerning Christ. I actually aim at this, how could the Hebrew forefathers, if they had known and predicted Christ, have lived so offensively?⁴²

Here the identity of the ‘fathers’ remains hidden, but it is obvious that Faustus will have had Adimantus in mind as one of the fathers. In the debate with Catholic Christians, Faustus employed the rhetorical phrase ‘our fathers’, whereas in the introduction to the *Capitula*, when he was directly addressing his own pupils, he says explicitly that especially Adimantus is worthy of further study.⁴³ This means that we may assume that Adimantus was at least one, if not the only one, of these ‘fathers’. Because Adimantus’ *Disputationes* were not especially concerned with questions about prophecy regarding Christ, it is conceivable that Adimantus must have written elsewhere on this subject. As to the subject matter of this writing (or: writings), we may conclude that the life of the Old Testament prophets will have been one of the important topics, because Faustus explicitly mentions the offensive way of life which was lived by the ancestors of the Jews as the reason why they could not have predicted Christ.

Faustus’ *capitulum* that Augustine quoted in *Contra Faustum* 22,1–5 may well provide us with some information regarding the arguments applied by Adimantus to defend his claim that the prophets had lived shockingly. This *capitulum* discusses the question: ‘Why do you blame

⁴¹ *c. Faust.* 12, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 329, 15–24): ‘ad quae ringentes Iudaei: “tu de te testificaris”, dicebant, “testimonium tuum non est verum”. quibus ipse: etsi ego testifcor de me, testimonium meum uerum est, quia non sum solus. nam et in lege uestra scriptum est: duorum hominum testimonium uerum est. ego sum qui testifcor de me, et testifcatur de me, qui me misit pater, non dixit: prophetae. ad haec et opera ipsa sua sibi in testimonium uocat: si mihi non creditis, dicens, operibus credite. non dixit: si mihi non creditis, prophetis credite.’

⁴² *c. Faust.* 12, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 330, 7–12): ‘quapropter haec strictim interim et castigate ad interrogationem tuam responderim, quia quaeris, cur non accipiamus prophetas; alioquin nihil eos de christo prophetasse abunde iam parentum nostrorum libris ostensum est. ego uero illud addicam, quia si Hebraici uates Christum scientes et praedicantes tam flagitiose uixerunt.’

⁴³ See n. 8.

the law and the prophets?⁴⁴ In *Contra Faustum* 22,2, Faustus makes clear his position with regard to the law. In the following sections, he takes up the theme of the slandering of the prophets, *i.e.* the same topic as is discussed in *Contra Faustum* 12,1. In section 3, Faustus claims that it is not he who blames the prophets, but it is the prophets themselves, or their companions, who did so, in writing their evil deeds.⁴⁵ In *Contra Faustum* 22,5, Faustus lists the examples of atrocities committed by renowned Jewish forefathers. Faustus recalls the history of Abraham and Hagar; Abraham who sold his wife both to the Pharaoh and Abimelech; Lot who committed incest with his daughters; Isaac who, like his father, sold his wife to Abimelech; Jacob who had four wives; Judah and his daughter-in-law Tamar; David who, despite already having many wives, took Bathsheba as well and went on to procure the death of her husband Uriah; Solomon who had 300 wives and 700 concubines as well as many princesses; Hosea, the first prophet, who had a number of children by a prostitute with the approval of God; and, last but not least, Moses, who not only committed murder, but also perpetrated a number of other cruelties.⁴⁶ Faustus also provides us with an abbreviated list in

⁴⁴ *c. Faust.* 22, 1 (*CSEL* 25,1: 591, 2–13): ‘Faustus dixit: Cur legem blasphematis et prophetas? minime quidem nos hostes sumus aut inimici legis ac prophetarum, sed nec ullius omnino: adeo ut si modo per ipsos uos liceat, simus parati fateri falsa illa omnia esse, quae de eis scripta sunt et quorum causa videntur nobis exosi. sed enim uos repugnatis et scriptoribus assentiendo uestris in crimen forsitan prophetas innocentes adducitis, infamatis patriarchas, dedecoratis et legem atque, quod sit stultius, uultis et scriptores uestros non esse mendaces et eos tamen religiosos ac sanctos, quorum hi flagitia et turpes conscripserint uitas. quod quia utrumque pariter constare non potest, oportet enim aut hos fuisse malos, aut illos mendaces et falsos.’

⁴⁵ *c. Faust.* 22, 3 (*CSEL* 25,1: 593, 6–12): ‘Ad haec et prophetas ac patriarchas uestros cur nos blasphemare existimetis, ego non uideo. nam si a nobis scripta haec dictatae fuissent, quae idem commisisse leguntur, esset uestra haec in nos non inrationabilis accusatio; ubi uero aut ab ipsis eadem scripta sunt contra honestatis morem de uitiis captantibus gloriam aut ab eorum sociis ac paribus, nostra quae istic culpa est?’

⁴⁶ *c. Faust.* 22, 5 (*CSEL* 25,1: 594, 8 – 595, 21): ‘Alioquin neque illa nos de Abraham scripsimus, quod habendae prolis insana flagrans cupidine, et deo, qui id iam sibi de Sara coniuge promiserat, minime credens, cum pellice uolutatus sit sub conscientia—quo sit inhonestius—uxoris: nec quod matrimonii sui infamissimus nundinator idem auaritia ac uentris causa duobus regibus, Abimelech et Pharaoni, diuersis temporibus, memoratam Saram coniugem suam sororem mentitus, quia erat pulcherrima, in concubitum uenditauit; nec quod Loth ipsius frater de Sodoma liberatus cum duobus filiabus suis in monte concubuit—qui honestius arsisset in Sodoma ictu fulminis quam in monte flagrauit inconcessae libidinis flamma—sed nec quod Isaac eadem patri suo gessit ac paria erga Rebeccam coniugem suam fingens et ipse eam sororem, quo per ipsam uiueret turpiter; nec quod Iacob filius eius inter Rachel et Liam duas germanas sorores earumque singulas famulas quatuor uxororum maritus tamquam hircus errauerit, ut esset quotidie

Contra Faustum 32,4. There he mentions Judah and Tamar; Lot and his daughters; Abraham, Jacob, David and Solomon.⁴⁷ It is highly probable that Faustus borrowed these examples from the work of Adimantus to which he refers in *Contra Faustum* 12,1.⁴⁸

It is worth to examine whether this might apply to *Contra Faustum* 22,4 as well. Here, Faustus says that the authors of the Old Testament even dared to publish calumnies against God: God dwelled in darkness and admired the light; He was ignorant about the future and issued commandments to Adam that he would eventually break; furthermore, He was not able to see Adam and was also envious of everlasting life.⁴⁹

inter quattuor scorta certamen, quanam eum uenientem de agro prior ad concubitum raperet, interdumque etiam mercedibus in noctem ab inuicem conducerent eum; item quod Iudas filius eius cum Thamar nuru sua dormierit post unius et alterius nuptias filii deceptus, ut aiunt, prostitutionis habitu, in quem se transformauerat eadem, quae socerum suum bene nosset cum hoc genere feminarum semper habuisse commercium; nec quod David post tot numero uxores, mulierculam quoque Uriae militis sui moechatus sit, ipsumque perdidit in bello; nec quod Salomon filius eius trecentas uxores et septingentas concubinas habuerit, et regum filias sine numero; nec quod Osee prophetarum primus de fornicaria muliere filios fecerit—cui turpitudini, quo sit deterius, ascribitur et consilium Dei—sed nec illud, quod Moyses homicidium fecerit, quod spoliauerit Aegyptum, quod bella gesserit, quod crudelia multa et mandarit et fecerit, quod ne ipse quidem uno contentus matrimonio fuerit; haec, inquam, et horum similia, quae in diuersis eorum habentur libris, nihil a nobis scriptum, nihil dictatum est; sed aut scriptorum uestrorum ista commenta sunt falsa, aut patrum crimina uera. uos utrum uultis eligite: nam nos, aut hos, aut illos pariter detestari necesse est, quia tam malos et turpes odimus, quam mendaces.’

⁴⁷ *c. Faust.* 32, 4 (CSEL 25,1: 763, 7–14): ‘illa uero iam ne audire quidem uos uelle credo ex testamento uetere, nedum admittere, id est soceros dormire cum nuribus, tamquam Iudas; patres cum filiabus, tamquam Loth; prophetas cum fornicatricibus tamquam Osee; maritos uxoribus noctes amatoribus uendere tamquam Abraham; duabus germanis sororibus unum misceri maritum tamquam Iacob; rectores populi et quos maxime entheos credas, millenis et centenis uolutari cum scortis, tamquam David et Salomon.’

⁴⁸ See n. 42.

⁴⁹ *c. Faust.* 22, 4 (CSEL 25,1: 593, 18 – 594, 7): ‘Et sane fieri potuit, ut quemadmodum de deo inpudenter idem tanta finxerunt, nunc eum in tenebris ex aeterno uersatum dicentes et postea miratum cum uidisset lucem, nunc ignarum futuri, ut praeceptum illud, quod non esset seruaturus Adam, ei mandaret, nunc et improuidum, ut eum latentem in angulo paradisi post nuditatem cognitam uidere non posset, nunc et inuidum ac timentem, ne, si gustaret homo suus de ligno uitae, in aeternum uiueret, nunc alias et adpetentem sanguinis atque adipis ex omni genere sacrificiorum zelantemque, si et aliis eadem offerrentur ut sibi, et nunc irascentem in alienos, nunc et in suos, nunc perimentem milia hominum ob leuia quidem aut nulla commissa, nunc etiam comminantem uenturum se fore cum gladio et parcuturum nemini, non iusto, non peccatori: fieri, inquam, potuit, ut et de dei hominibus mentirentur, qui de deo ipso tanta proteruitate mentiti sunt. sed uos consentite nobiscum, ut portent scriptores crimen, si uultis eodem liberari prophetas.’

The fact that Faustus presents these objections to the Paradise episode from *Genesis* in reaction to the accusation that he, Faustus, blamed the prophets, could well indicate that Faustus read these arguments in Adimantus' work, like it seems to be the case with the list of atrocities committed by the Jewish ancestors.

Two of the objections to *Genesis* 2 and 3 which Faustus puts forward in *Contra Faustum* 22,4, namely the ignorance and the envy of God, are found in Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos* III.7 as well, which is to say in the work that Heraclianus believed to have been directed against the works of Addas.⁵⁰ It is furthermore striking, as Pedersen observed, that in *Contra Manichaeos* III.7 just after the criticisms of *Genesis* 2 and 3, the same kind of disapproval of the behaviour of the Old Testament forefathers can be found as Faustus brings up in *Contra Faustum* 22,5.⁵¹ In other words, we can find the same sequence of arguments in the *Capitula* and in the source that Titus quoted. The fact that two sources from different areas, both of which were probably connected with Addas, tell independently about the same objections to the Old Testament, strongly supports the claim that Addas must have been responsible for a book in which such criticisms had been articulated.⁵²

In order to secure this point, and to bring possibly to the fore some more details of the writings of Adimantus, *Contra Manichaeos* III.7 needs to be quoted in full:

(1) He [i.e. Mani] thus also doubts why the world came into being, but as for man he strives to demonstrate that he is not God's creature. (2) He [i.e. Mani] examines also other things foolishly: 'In what way', he says, 'has God given Adam a commandment?' (3) For one of two reasons: Either He knew that he would transgress, (and in that case) He not only gave the commandment in vain but was also responsible for it [i.e. the transgression], (4) or one must say that God was ignorant and was endowed with ignorance, so that the commandment was indeed given, but by (the principle of) evil as a plot against man, as he [i.e. Mani] believes, and by none other. (5) But it has been of the greatest benefit and has set man free when he followed the serpent's advice, which he [i.e. Mani] claims was the angel of the good. (6) 'For man was blind', he says, 'but when he had tasted the forbidden, he saw that he was naked, and he made use of the clothing that he found, and he learned to know good and evil.' (7) Thus he (i.e. man) has above all benefit from transgressing the order from the one who created him with guile. (8) 'But how', he says, 'can it be fitting for God to say, See,

⁵⁰ See n. 4.

⁵¹ Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 244.

⁵² Cf. also Sfameni Gasparo, 'Addas-Adimantus', 555.

Adam has become like one of us, knowing good and evil, and now, lest he ever stretch out his hand to take from the Tree of Life and eat and live forever!?' (9) 'For', he says, if it is possible to take away immortality, then He is jealous who expels the man from paradise and excludes him from sharing the Tree of Life, from which the participant could forever possess immortality.⁵³

The primary question to be dealt with is whether this text should be ascribed to Mani, like Titus of Bostra opines, or that it had been written by Adimantus, as Heraclianus claimed. The contents of the text raise serious doubts about the possibility that Mani could have been its author. First, the fact is to be noted that in the text, Titus presents Mani as one who doubts, which Pedersen rightly regards as an uncommon feature.⁵⁴ But the subject matter itself is even more telling. The question this text sets out to deal with, *i.e.* did God give a command in vain, or was God ignorant when He forbade Adam from eating from the tree of knowledge (2–5 in the text above), is highly interesting. Pedersen cautiously claims that the idea that the creator-God lacked foreknowledge, the option on which the writer of the text above elaborates, ultimately came from the Marcionites, especially from Apelles.⁵⁵ If Pedersen's conclusion is right, we have a firm basis to argue that Adimantus was the author of the text that Titus refuted, because in the previous chapter we concluded that, in all likelihood, Apelles influenced Adimantus.

⁵³ *Contra Manichaeos* III.7 (ed. P. de Lagarde, *Titus Bostrenus. Syriace et graece*, 69, 5–25): ἐπαπορῶν μὲν δὴ καὶ περὶ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου, τοῦ χάριν ἐγένετό, περὶ δὲ ἀνθρώπου δεικνύει ἐπιχειρῶν ὡς οὐκ ἔστι πλάσμα θεοῦ, κινεῖ μὲν ἀνοήτου καὶ ἔτερπᾶ, πῶς δὲ καὶ ἐντολὴν ἐδίδου (φησὶν) ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἀδάμ; δυοῖν γὰρ θάτερον ἢ ἐγίνωσκεν ὡς παραβήσεται καὶ οὐ μᾶτην μόνον ἐδίδου ἀλλὰ καὶ αἴτιος αὐτοῦ, ἢ ἀγνοοῦντα λέγειν ἀνάγκη τὸν θεὸν ἀγνοία περιβεβλησθαι, ὡς τὴν ἐντολὴν δεδόσθαι μὲν, εἰς ἐπιβουλήν δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τῆς κακίας (ὡς οἶεται) καὶ οὐδενὸς ἑτέρου, ὠφελῆσθαι δὲ τὰ μέγιστα καὶ ἡλευθερωσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, πεισθέντα συμβουλῇ τοῦ ὄφρα, ὃν ἄγγελον εἶναι τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ διορίζεται. τυφλὸς μὲν γὰρ ἦν, φησί, γευσάμενος δὲ τοῦ ἀπιγγορευμένου εἶδεν ἑαυτὸν ὅτι γυμνὸς ἦν καὶ σκέπη τῇ εὐρεθείσῃ κατεχρήσατο καὶ ἔγνω τὰγαθὸν τε καὶ τὸ κακόν. οὕτως μάλιστα ὠφέληται, παραβητικῶς τὸ πρόσταγμα τοῦ ἐπιβούλως πλάσαντος. πῶς δὲ (φησὶ) πρῆποι θεῷ λέγειν “ἰδοὺ Ἀδάμ γέγονεν ὡς εἴ ἔξ ἡμῶν τοῦ γινώσκεν καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν· καὶ νῦν, μήποτε ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα λάβῃ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς καὶ φάγη καὶ ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα”; εἰ γὰρ ἐνὶν ἀθανασίαν ἀπολαβεῖν, φθονερός δὴ ὁ ἐξελαύνων τοῦ παραδείσου τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ ἀποκλείων αὐτῷ τὴν μετουσίαν τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, οὗ μετέχων εἰς αἰεὶ ἀθανασίαν ἔχειν οἷός τε ἦν. Translation: Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 206.

⁵⁴ Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 207: ‘Titus thus presents Mani as one who doubts or questions. Such a “sceptical Mani” is not a common understanding of him, as we know from the fragments of Mani’s own writings or from the other Manichaean literature, in which Mani is rather the omniscient revealer.’

⁵⁵ Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 224.

There is sound reason to suppose that the criticism of the demiurge, as it is rendered in *Contra Manichaeos* III.7, had its origin in Apelles' *Syllogismoï*. The text quoted by Titus of Bostra demonstrates a radical polemical reversal of the original intention of the author of *Genesis*. In the extant Gnostic texts commenting on the story of the Garden of Eden in a similar way,⁵⁶ we also see that God is accused of ignorance. In some of these texts, He is blamed for being unaware of the existence of the highest God,⁵⁷ whilst his putative ignorance is mentioned together with his desire to raise up seed from Eve.⁵⁸ In some other texts God's ignorance is linked to Adam's transgression, because they criticize that God is unaware of Adam's hiding place after the sinful act related in *Gen.* 3:9. This implies that the demiurge must have been previously quite unaware of this transgression. For example, the *Testimony of Truth* (46,20–47,1) reads as follows:

And he said, "Adam, where are you?" He answered (and) said, "I have come under the fig tree." And at that very moment God knew that he had eaten from the tree of which he had commanded him, "Do not eat of it." And he said to him: "Who is it who had instructed you?"⁵⁹

We may observe two important differences between the Nag Hammadi texts that relate God's ignorance with regard to Adam's disobedience and the text quoted by Titus of Bostra. The first divergence is that the text quoted by Titus discusses the problem of the lack of prescience remote from God looking for Adam; the second is that it mentions the possibility that God knew that Adam would transgress, which is absent in the Nag

⁵⁶ See P. Nagel, 'Die Auslegung der Paradieserzählung in der Gnosis', in: K.-W. Tröger (ed.), *Altes Testament—Frühjudentum—Gnosis*, Berlin 1980, 49–70 (esp. 52–57) and N.A. Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 215. Important in this context are: *Testimonium veritatis* (NHC IX, 3; B.A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, Leiden 1981); *Hypostasis Archontion* (NHC II,4; B. Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2–7; together with XIII,2**, *Brit. Lib. Or.4926(1)*, and *P.Oxy 1*, 654, 655, vol. I, Leiden-New York-København-Köln 1989); *De origine mundi* (NHC II,5; idem, vol. II, 1989) and *Apocryphon Johannis* (Codex Papyrus Berolinensis 8502/NHC III,1 and NHC II,1/IV,1; synoptical edition and translation M. Waldstein and F. Wisse (eds.), *The Apocryphon of John; Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,1; and IV, with BG 8502,2*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1995). As is the case with the text refuted by Titus of Bostra in *Contra Manichaeos* III.7, these four Nag Hammadi texts demonstrate a polemical rejection, reversal, or correction of the text of *Genesis*.

⁵⁷ *Hypostasis Archontion* 86, 29–31 (Layton I, 235).

⁵⁸ *Apocryphon Johannis* (Waldstein and Wisse, Synopsis 63).

⁵⁹ Translation Pearson, *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, Leiden 1981, 161 f. See further, *Hypostasis Archontion* 90, 20f. (Layton I, 243); *De Origine Mundi* 119, 20–29 (Layton II, 75) and also *Apocryphon Johannis* (Waldstein and Wisse, Synopsis 63).

Hammadi texts under discussion. These two aspects are found exactly in one of the fragments from Apelles' *Syllogismoi*. It concerns a fragment found in Ambrose of Milan's *De Paradiso* 8,38 that runs:

A question once more: Did God know that Adam would neglect his commands, or was He unaware of it? If He did not know, the declaration is not of a divine sovereignty; but if He knew, He indeed knowingly prescribed what should be brushed aside. It is not Godlike to prescribe anything superfluous. Nevertheless, it is superfluous that He ordered the first created Adam, while knowing that he should not at all obey. God does nothing superfluous. Thus, this is not Scripture from God.⁶⁰

In this fragment from Apelles' *Syllogismoi* we can find a discussion of Adam's transgression, without mentioning God's unawareness of Adam's precise location after the first sin. But it does mention two of the options regarding the role of God in this story: He was either ignorant, or His command was superfluous. This is, in reverse order, exactly what we find in Addas' text, because the Greek *μάτην* (construed in the aforementioned translation as: *in vain*) is almost synonymous with the Latin 'superfluo' (superfluous).

At face value, it could be concluded that Apelles must have believed that the latter of those two options was much more reasonable than the former, in contrast to Addas, who elaborated on the first option of Apelles. Pedersen, although he is inclined to accept the hypothesis that Apelles must have influenced Addas at this particular juncture, does have some hesitations because of this particular feature.⁶¹ However, we must take into account the fact that the *Syllogismoi* originally consisted of, at the very least, thirty-eight books, all of them on the Pentateuch.⁶² In those books Apelles repeatedly discusses the same problems from a different point of view, demonstrating by means of syllogisms with

⁶⁰ Ambrose, *De Paradiso* 8, 38 (CSEL 32,1; 294, 9–15): 'Iterum quaestio: sciebat preuicaturum deus Adam mandata sua an nesciebat? si sciebat, non est ista diuinae potestatis adsertio, si autem sciebat et nihilominus sciens neglegenda mandauit, non est dei aliquid superfluum praecipere. superfluo autem praecepit primoplasto illi Adae quod eum nouerat minime seruaturum. nihil autem dues superfluo facit; ergo non est scriptura ex deo.'

⁶¹ Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 222 f.

⁶² See K. Greschat, *Apelles und Hermogenes. Zwei theologische Lehrer des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2000, 52, who, discussing Ambrose's words in *De Paradiso* 5,38 which he quoted from Apelles' 38th book, remarked: 'Dieses Werk hatte demnach einen ganz beträchtlichen Umfang und wird aus wenigstens achtundreiig Bände bestanden haben. Doch selbst wenn Ambrosius hier aus dem letzten Band der Syllogismen zitierte, so deutete auch das noch auf ein recht imposantes Werk hin.' Cf. Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 221 n. 92.

different presuppositions that those Scriptures are ultimately quite untenable.⁶³ Therefore, a single syllogism discusses a given passage from only one theoretical point of view that needs not necessarily reflect the final opinion of the author. In the context of Apelles' opinions, it is probable that Apelles' own point of view was almost completely in agreement with Addas' polemical reversal of the story of the Garden of Eden which is found in Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos* III.7, 5–9.⁶⁴ Because, Apelles assumed, as did Addas, that the fire-angel must have given the commands in the Old Testament in order to tie the souls to their bodies, and to divert the attention of human beings from the highest God to himself.⁶⁵ Furthermore, in the thirteen rather small fragments from the *Syllogismoi* scattered among the anti-heretical writings of the Catholic Christian writers,⁶⁶ we also find several other indications that Apelles did indeed believe that it was good to transgress.⁶⁷ All this seems to justify the conclusion that Apelles really did believe that the transgression of the commands given in the Garden of Eden should ultimately be regarded as a benefit for Adam and as a consequence that the demiurge was unaware of the fact that Adam would transgress.

The supposed influence of Apelles' *Syllogismoi* on the text quoted in *Contra Manichaeos* III.7 is also a good explanation for the fact that Titus says that 'Mani doubted why the world came into being', because this attitude agrees with the character of the *Syllogismoi*.

Furthermore, the objections to the Old Testament which can be found in *Contra Manichaeos* III.7 correspond with what we already know as the result of our study of the *Disputationes*. The criticism of creation agrees with what is said in *Disputatio* 1 about this subject. Furthermore, in his *Disputationes*, Adimantus blamed the God of the Jews for being envious,⁶⁸ whilst the claim that the God of the Jewish Scriptures must have blinded his human creatures by means of divine commandments is

⁶³ The problem of Adam's transgression is also discussed in another fragment. See Greschat, *Apelles und Hermogenes*, 66.

⁶⁴ See n. 53.

⁶⁵ See esp. Greschat, *Apelles und Hermogenes*, 91.

⁶⁶ According to Greschat, who collected and discussed them (*Apelles und Hermogenes*, 45–72).

⁶⁷ *Apud* Ambrose, *De Paradiso* 6,30 (CSEL 32; 286,23–287,2): 'Rursus faciunt alias quaestiones hoc modo: non semper malum est non oboedire praecepto. Si enim bonum est praeceptum, honesta est oboeditio; quodsi inprobum praeceptum, non oboedire utile ...' See also Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 223.

⁶⁸ Namely, in *Disp.* 7, 11 and 13.

also found in this writing.⁶⁹ Only the positive identification of the serpent as an angel of the good could entail some doubts about that particular conclusion, because in the introduction to the *Capitula* Faustus applies the metaphor of the serpent negatively, namely by insisting that Catholic Christians use to encircle the Manichaeans with trifling questions in accordance with the habit of their forefather the serpent.⁷⁰ However, in *Contra Faustum* 1 Augustine seems to have been well aware of the Manichaeans' teaching about the serpent in the Garden of Eden, when he says:

Why did you say that the serpent is our father? Has it slipped of your mind how you used to disapprove of God, who gave to man the injunction in paradise, and to praise the serpent, that he had opened man's eyes by his advice?⁷¹

Moreover, in *De Genesi aduersus Manichaeos* a positive interpretation of the serpent can be found in a discussion of the serpent's advice to eat from the tree.⁷² Obviously, Augustine learned this doctrine during his years as a Manichaean. It is furthermore probable that it stemmed from Adimantus' work, as was also the case with the antithesis that he remembered in *De Genesi aduersus Manichaeos* I, xxii (33).⁷³ Besides, it is virtually unavoidable to hold the serpent in the Garden of Eden in high esteem if the commandment of God is interpreted a plot against human beings.

Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the objections refuted in Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos* III.7 originally stemmed from a work of Adimantus in which he excoriated the first chapters of *Genesis*.

In short: we can be quite confident that Adimantus wrote, apart from the *Disputationes*, other works in which he refuted the Old Testament. The possibility that the Old Testament prophets could ever have prophesied about Christ was one of the themes he discussed. An important argument

⁶⁹ See pp. 168 f.

⁷⁰ See n. 8.

⁷¹ *c. Faust.* 1, 3 (CSEL 25,1: 253, 10–13): 'cur autem serpentem patrem nostrum dixisti? an excidit tibi, quemadmodum soleatis uituperare deum, qui homini praeceptum in paradise dedit, et laudare serpentem, quod ei per suum consilium oculis aperuit?'

⁷² *Gn. adu. Man.* 2, xxvi, 39 (CSEL 91; 164, 1–7): 'Sed nihil vehementius istos designat et notat quam quod dicit serpens: non morte moriemini; sciebat enim deus quoniam quo die ederetis, aperientur oculi vestri. Sic enim isti credunt, quod serpens ille Christus fuerit, et deum nescio quem gentis tenebrarum, sicuti affirmant, illud praeceptum dedisse confingunt, tamquam inuideret hominibus scientiam boni et mali.'

⁷³ Cf. pp. 54 f.

would have been the offensive lifestyle of the ancestors of the Jews. Furthermore, we can be rather sure that Adimantus criticized the contents of the first chapters of *Genesis* in one of his writings. It is likely, especially with respect to the discussion of the Paradise episode, that Adimantus had been influenced by Apelles' *Syllogismoi*, both with respect to the issue at hand and to the way in which he presented his criticisms.

C. Writings against the deceit of the 'semi-christiani'

1. Faustus' introduction to his *Capitula*

One of the results of our analysis of the *Disputationes* was that, in it, Adimantus did not raise any objections against the New Testament.⁷⁴ However, the *Capitula* of Faustus provide us with some convincing arguments that Adimantus believed that the New Testament was not handed on without deliberate textual manipulation and errors and, furthermore, that Adimantus did write about those developments.

Faustus' already frequently quoted introduction to the *Capitula* gives reason to suppose thus. He says in *Contra Faustum* 1,2 that Adimantus had already revealed the errors of Jewish unbelief (*superstitio*) and had also unmasked the deceptions (*fallacia*) of the *semi-christiani*.⁷⁵ Apparently, Faustus was acquainted with one or more of the writings of Adimantus that were deliberately intended to expose the deceptions of Catholic Christians. It is conceivable that Faustus was not referring to the *Disputationes* on this occasion, for the simple reason that this particular document objected mainly to the Jews and the Old Testament. So he may have been referring to one or more of the hitherto unknown works of Adimantus in which he explicitly discussed whether Catholic Christians had manipulated the texts of the New Testament.

Several clues from the subject matter of the *Capitula* seem to support this assumption, and they could well provide us with more information about the contents of the writing(s) that Adimantus will have produced on the New Testament.

⁷⁴ See pp. 143 f.

⁷⁵ *c. Faust.* 1, 2 (CSEL 25,1: 251, 22 – 252, 2): 'Satis superque in lucem iam traductis erroribus, ac Iudaicae superstitionis simul et semichristianorum abunde detecta fallacia a doctissimo scilicet et solo nobis post beatum patrem Manichaeum studendo Adimanto ...'

2. *Adimantus' fame as 'Paraclete'*

A general indication supporting the claim that Adimantus wrote about the true and false passages in the New Testament—which, when considered in isolation, does not seem to have sufficient conclusive power, but in the context of several other indications discussed in these sections does carry considerable weight—can be adduced from *Contra Faustum* 32, in which Augustine cited one of Faustus' longest *capitula*. In this *capitulum* Faustus declared that he did not accept the whole of the New Testament, because he believed that those writings had been corrupted by manipulators of the Scriptures.⁷⁶ According to Faustus, Manichaeans have the ability to distinguish between true and false passages because they are guided by the Paraclete who was promised by Jesus. It was the Paraclete who taught the believers which passages to accept and which to reject.⁷⁷ The involvement of the Paraclete within the process of distinguishing between the true and false segments of Scripture is important for this analysis,⁷⁸ because in later years Adimantus himself was identified as Paraclete, as is demonstrated by the abjuration of that belief in the *Latin Formula of Renunciation*:

'Everyone who, in regard to the coming of the Spirit, the Paraclete, about whom the Lord promised in his Gospel that He should come to the apostles, does not believe that, after the Lord's Ascension, on the day of Pentecost, it was fulfilled immediately, but believes that, after many years, He has come in Mani or in Adimantus, his disciple, [let him] be anathematized.'⁷⁹

⁷⁶ *c. Faust.* 32, 1–7.

⁷⁷ *c. Faust.* 32, 6 (CSEL 25,1: 765, 18–23): '... et nobis paracletus ex nouo testamento promissus perinde docet, quid accipere ex eodem debeamus et quid repudiare. de quo ultro Iesus cum eum promitteret, dicit in euangelio: ipse uos inducet in omnem ueritatem, et ipse uobis adnuntiabit omnia et commemorabit uos.'

⁷⁸ The reference to the Paraclete whom Jesus promised in *i.a. John* 16:7 is not an invention of Faustus, because it also appears in other (eastern) Manichaean sources. See W. Sundermann, 'Der Paraklet in ostmanichäischen Überlieferung', in: P. Bryder (ed.), *Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism*, Lund 1988, 201–212. Concerning the question of the Paraclete in Manichaeism, see also J. van Oort, 'The Paraclete Mani as the Apostle of Jesus Christ and the Origins of a new Church', in: A. Hilhorst (ed.), *The Apostolic Age in Patristic Thought*, Leiden-Boston 2004, 139–157 (esp. 153–157).

⁷⁹ Adam, *Texte*, 92 f., 10: 'Quicumque adventum spiritus paraleti, quem dominus in euangelio promittit esse venturum in apostolos, post ascensionem domini in die Pentecostes non statim credit impletum, sed post multos annos in Mane vel in Adimanto discipulo eius uenisse credit, anathema sit.' Cf. Ch. II, nn. 156 f.

It is possible that Adimantus was considered so skilful when he distinguished between false and true passages in the New Testament in his writings that, in later centuries, he, like Mani, was regarded as Paraclete as well. Faustus' esteem for Adimantus could well have been a stimulus for this particular development.

3. *Adimantus' criticism of Christ's genealogies*

One of the most important subjects in Faustus' *Capitula* is the incarnation of Christ and the genealogies in *Mt.* 1:1–17 and *Lk.* 3:23–38. It is the first subject discussed in the *Capitula*,⁸⁰ and it is also found in *Contra Faustum* 3, 5, 23, 26, 27, 28. From the *Seven Chapters*⁸¹ we know that Addas strongly objected to the incarnation of Christ. In the fourth chapter of the *Seven Chapters*, Addas (Adeimantos), together with Manichaeus, is anathematized because he denied the incarnation:

οὐκ ἐπαισχυνθέντα ἐνναμηνιαῖον χρόνον οἰκῆσαι μόρια ἅπερ αὐτὸς ἀνυβρίστως ἐδημιούργησεν κἂν διαρρήγνυνται ὁ Μανιχαῖος καὶ οἱ τοῦτου μαθηταὶ Ἀδδᾶς καὶ Ἀδεΐμαντος σὺν Ἑλλήσι καὶ Ἰουδαίοις ἀπιστοῦντες τῷ μυστηρίῳ τῆς θείας ἕναν θρωπήσεως

He was not ashamed to dwell for nine months in her womb which he fashioned (in a manner which was) undefiled,—even if Manichaeus and his disciples Addas and Adeimantos, who along with the Pagans and the Jews do not believe in the mystery of the holy incarnation, explode with fury!—...⁸²

From this anathema we may conclude that Adimantus did believe that the genealogies in the Gospels must be spurious. Furthermore, when we take into consideration that the subject has such a prominent place in the *Capitula* and that in its introduction, Faustus hinted at Adimantus' exposure of the Catholic Christian deceptions, it is reasonable to suppose that Adimantus stated his opinions on those passages of the Gospel in some of his writings, and that Faustus used them in the *Capitula*.

⁸⁰ *c. Faust.* 2, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 253, 18–23): 'Faustus dixit: Accipis euangelium? et maxime. proinde ergo et natum accipis Christum? non ita est. neque enim sequitur, ut, si euangelium accipio, idcirco et natum accipiam Christum. cur? quia euangelium quidem a praedicatione Christi et esse coepit et nominari; in quo tamen ipse nusquam se natum ex hominibus dicit.'

⁸¹ Cf. pp. 13 f.

⁸² Text and translation: S.C.N. Lieu, 'An Early Byzantine Formula for the Renunciation of Manichaeism—The "Capita VII contra Manichaeos" of (Zacharias of Mitylene). Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary', in: idem, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1999², 242.

4. *Adimantus'* criticism of positive references to the Hebrew Bible

Faustus' treatment of *Mt.* 5:17 in the *Capitula*, which Augustine quoted in *Contra Faustum* 18 and 19, is worth to be mentioned here. In these passages Faustus discusses at great length the question of whether *Mt.* 5:17 (RSV: 'Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfil them.')

should be accepted as a genuine saying of Jesus, or whether it should be regarded as spurious. This discussion provided an opportunity for Faustus to relate a personal experience. He says in *Contra Faustum* 19, 5:

For this reason I do not stop giving thanks to my teacher who prevented me from falling in the same way, so that I am now a Christian. Because, also I, when I read this chapter without consideration, like you did, almost decided to become a Jew.⁸³

On the basis of this passage, it seems to be likely to conclude that Faustus—he was originally a pagan⁸⁴ who might have been interested in the Christian faith—began at a certain point in his life to read the New Testament. When he came across *Mt.* 5:17, he concluded that he should first become a Jew before he could properly be called a Christian.⁸⁵ However, his teacher prevented him from reading this text 'without consideration.' In the previous chapter, which Augustine quoted in *Contra Faustum* 18,3, Faustus already related what he meant by these words, when he said that the Manichaean faith taught him to distinguish between true and false passages in the New Testament.⁸⁶ This saved him, he says in the final lines of *Contra Faustum* 19,5, from the danger of becoming a Jew.⁸⁷ If these words are read in the light of Faustus' introduction to the

⁸³ *c. Faust.* 19, 5 (CSEL 25,1: 501, 1–4): 'Quare indeficientes ego praeceptorum meo refero gratias, qui me similiter labentem retinuit, ut essem hodie christianus. Nam ego quoque, cum capitulum hoc imprudens legerem, quemadmodum tu paene ieram in consilium Iudaeus fieri.'

⁸⁴ Cf. Part A, section 3. *The Contra Faustum and the Capitula.*

⁸⁵ Cf. *c. Faust.* 18, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 490, 16–23): 'quae cum ita sint, quomodo Christum illud dixisse credemus, nisi ante nosmetipsos damnemus stultae in praeteritum opinionis et ad paenitentiam recurramus obsequamurque legi de integro ac prophetis atque eorum curemus. qualiacumque sunt, observare mandata? quod cum fecerimus, tunc denique uere crediderimus dixisse Iesum, quia non uenerit Legem soluere, sed adimplere.'

⁸⁶ *c. Faust.* 18, 3 (CSEL 25,1: 491, 27 – 492, 4): 'Et tamen me quidem iam aduersus capituli huius necessitudinem Manichaea fides reddidit tutum, quae principio mihi non cunctis, quae ex saluatoris nomine scripta leguntur, passim credere persuasit, sed probare, si sint eadem uera, si sana, si incorrupta.'

⁸⁷ *c. Faust.* 19, 5 (CSEL 25,1: 502, 2): 'sed huic periculo me Manichaei ueneranda fides eripuit.'

Capitula, it is not impossible to suggest that Adimantus could be identified as the teacher who taught Faustus—through his writings—not to accept every single saying in the Gospel as a saying of Jesus, because the thankfulness and the relief⁸⁸ resonating in Faustus' words are substantially in agreement with his high esteem for Adimantus. This implies that it might be assumed that another important subject for Adimantus may have been the positive attitude to the Old Testament which can be found in references to it in the Gospels and the Pauline Corpus.

5. Concluding remarks

It is reasonable to conclude that Adimantus devoted one or more of his writings to demonstrating the manipulation of the text of the New Testament.⁸⁹ Adimantus could have discussed the criticisms of the Gospel and the apostle-texts in several ways. It is conceivable that Adimantus published a commentary of sorts on those passages of the New Testament in which he refuted those parts that were objectionable. Another possibility, which does not exclude the previous one, is that Adimantus had written a work similar to the *Kephalaia* in which he recapitulated his discussions with Catholic Christians on the New Testament.

As regards to the argumentations that Adimantus could have advanced, we might cautiously suppose that he delivered much of the material of the argument that Faustus used in *Contra Faustum* 5,1:

'Do you accept the Gospel?' You inquire after me whether I accept that, from which it is clear that I accept it, because I observe the things it prescribes. Or should I ask you whether you accept it, because no signs of accepting the Gospel are found. I have abandoned my father and mother, wife, children, et cetera, which the Gospel demands (cf. *Mt.* 19:29), and you ask me, whether I accept the Gospel? Up to now, you do not know what it is, that the Gospel declares. Because it is nothing other than the declaration and assignment of Christ. I have rejected silver and gold and I have despised to have them in my belt, being content with daily bread, and not being worried about tomorrow. My stomach is not filled, nor my body covered by means of bearing sorrows (cf. *Mt.* 6:25 and *Lk.* 21:34). And you inquire after me whether I accept the Gospel? You see in me Christ's blessings for those who do the Gospel; and you ask if I accept the Gospel?

⁸⁸ Faustus seemed to have had a strong aversion to the Old Testament rules, especially its injunctions on circumcision; see Ch. III, n. 201, and e.g. *c. Faust.* 4, 1; 6, 1 and 19, 6.

⁸⁹ This conclusion is supported by Pedersen's claim that Titus of Bostra almost certainly knew of a Manichaean tract, most probably written by Addas, which was intended to purge the New Testament (*Demonstrative Proof*, 205).

You see me poor, meek, a peacemaker, with a pure heart, sad, hungry, thirsty, persecuted, enduring hate because of justice (cf. *Mt.* 5:3–10); and you doubt whether I accept the Gospel?⁹⁰

Faustus used similar arguments in *Contra Faustum* 5, 3 to defend his opinions about the birth of Christ:

Let us then ask Christ himself, and learn from his mouth, which cause principally makes possible our salvation. ‘Who of the humans shall enter into your Kingdom, o Christ?’ ‘Who has done’, He says, ‘the will of my Father who is in heaven (cf. *Mt.* 7:21).’ He did not say: ‘Who will have professed that I was born.’ And at another place to his disciples: ‘Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to keep all that I have commanded you (*Mt.* 28:19).’ He did not say: ‘Teaching them that I was born’, but that they should keep the commandments. Again at another place: ‘You will be my friends, if you shall do what I ordered you (*John* 15:14).’ He did not say: ‘If you have believed that I was born.’ Again: ‘If you shall do my commandments, you will stay in my love (*John* 15:10),’ and much more. And did he not teach as well in the Sermon on the mount, saying: ‘Blessed are the poor, blessed are the meek, blessed are the peacemakers, blessed are the pure of heart, blessed are they who mourn, blessed are they who are hungry, blessed are they who suffer persecution for the sake of righteousness (cf. *Mt.* 5:3–10)?’ He never said: ‘Blessed are they who have confessed that I was born.’ And in the separation of the sheep from the goats in the Judgement, He says that He will say to them at his right hand: ‘I was hungry, and you fed me; I was thirsty and you gave me to drink, et cetera; therefore, take possession of the Kingdom (*Mt.* 25:34–36).’ He did not say: ‘Because you have believed that I was born, take possession of the Kingdom.’ And did He not say to the rich man who searched for eternal life: ‘Go, sell all you have, and follow me (cf. *i.a. Mt.* 19:21)?’ He did not say: ‘Believe that I was born so that you may live in eternity.’⁹¹

⁹⁰ *c. Faust.* 5, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 271, 8–19): ‘Faustus dixit: Accipis euangelium? tu me interrogas, utrum accipiam, in quo id ipsum accipere adparet, quia quae iubet obseruo. An ego de te quaerere debeo, utrum accipias, in quo nulla accipientis euangelium uidentur indicia? ego patrem dimisi et matrem, uxorem, filios et cetera, quae euangelium iubet, et interrogas, utrum accipiam euangelium? nisi adhuc nescis, quid sit quod euangelium nuncupatur. est enim nihil aliud quam praedicatio et mandatum Christi. ego aurum arenisque reieci et aes in zonis habere destiti cotidiano contentus cibo nec de crastino curans nec unde uenter impleatur, aut corpus operiatur sollicitudinem gerens, et quaeris a me utrum accipiam euangelium? uides in me Christi beatitudines illas, quae euangelium faciunt; et interrogas utrum illud accipiam? uides pauperem, uides mitem, uides pacificum, puro corde, lugentem, esurientem, sitientem, persecutiones et odia sustinentem propter iustitiam, et dubitas utrum accipiam euangelium?’

⁹¹ *c. Faust.* 5, 3 (CSEL 25,1: 273, 8 – 274, 3): ‘Age ergo, ipsum eumdem interrogemus Christum, et unde potissimum nobis salutis oriatur occasio, ex eius ore discamus. quis

This kind of argument is in agreement with the lifestyle of Adimantus and his other opinions. Furthermore, many of Jesus' sayings quoted by Faustus to underline his argument come from the Sermon on the Mount, which played a major part in the *Disputationes*.⁹² Probably, Faustus learned these arguments from one of Addas' works, in which Addas stated that he certainly obeyed the words of Jesus, even though he did not believe that everything in the transmitted Gospel texts is ultimately true.

D. Other works

1. *The Modion*

According to Heraclianus, whom Photius quoted in the *Bibliotheca*, Diodore of Tarsus claimed that he had refuted the *Living Gospel* of Mani in seven books, although he actually excoriated Addas' *Modion*.⁹³ This small piece of information about Addas Adimantus' literary activities is interesting, but it leaves many questions unanswered. The title of the work ascribed to Addas, namely '*Modion*', is rather odd, meaning 'a (corn) measure', or 'vessel'.⁹⁴

hominum intrabit in regnum tuum, Christe? qui fecerit, inquit, uoluntatem patris mei qui in caelis est. non dixit: qui me professus fuerit natum. et alibi ad discipulos: ite, docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti et docentes eos seruare omnia quae mandau i uobis, non dixit: docentes eos quia sim natus, sed ut mandata conseruent. item alibi: amici mei eritis, si feceritis, quae praecipio uobis, non dixit: si natum me credideritis. rursum: si feceritis mandata mea, manebitis in mea caritate et alia multa. necnon et in monte cum doceret: beati pauperes, dicens, beati mites, beati pacifici, beati puro corde, beati qui lugent, beati qui esuriunt, beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter iustitiam, nusquam dixit: beati qui me confessi fuerint natum. et in discretionem agnorum ab haedis in iudicio dicturum se dicit iis, qui ad dextram sunt: esuriui, et cibastis me; sitiui, et potastis me, et cetera; propterea recipite regnum. non dixit: quia natum me credidistis, regnum percipite. necnon et diuini quaerenti uitam aeternam: uade, inquit, uende omnia, quae habes, et sequere me; non dixit: crede me natum, ut in aeternum uiuas.'

⁹² See p. 152.

⁹³ Cf. n. 5.

⁹⁴ Cf. S.C.N. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the later Roman Empire and Medieval China*, Tübingen 1992, 91. Its form is intriguing as well, because we would have expected Περὶ τοῦ μόδιου, or eventually Μόδιος. So, if 'Modion' is to be regarded as a male noun—which is its common gender (in H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon. With a revised supplement*, Oxford 1996, p. 1140, only Μόδιος is found)—, the title is in an accusative case, which is at least unusual. However, G.W.H. Lampe (ed.), *A Patristic Greek*

Students of Manichaeism advocated a number of solutions to the problem of the book's subject. For example, Lim jumps far too quickly to conclusions on the subject of the content of this book when he identifies it as the work of Adimantus against which Augustine fulminated in *Contra Adimantum*.⁹⁵ In our reconstruction of the *Disputationes* we did not find any indication to support the hypothesis that the title of the *Disputationes* could have been *Modion*. Alfaric claims that there is a connection with *Mt.* 5:15,⁹⁶ where Jesus says that a candle should not be put under a bushel (μόδιος).⁹⁷ Elaborating on this hypothesis, Lieu has suggested that the subject of the *Modion* could have been the struggle between light and darkness. Furthermore, Lieu tentatively proposes a second hypothesis, namely that the title *Modios* might have some connections with the proper name 'Mani'. Lieu uses a synoptic comparison between *Mt.* 5:15 and *Lk.* 8:16 to establish this position. In *Lk.* 8:16 a metaphor can be found which is similar to the one in *Mt.* 5:15. There, instead of μόδιος, the word σκεῦος (vase) is used. The Syriac equivalent of σκεῦος is *m'n'*, which is almost a homophone of 'Mani'. Mani, moreover, was often called the 'Vase of Perdition' by his Syriac speaking enemies, while 'Manichaios' could well have been a transliteration of the Syriac *mny hy'* (the living Mani), which sounds like *m'n' hy'* (vessel of Life). Therefore Lieu proposes that the subject of Addas' book could well have been 'Mani' or the 'Vessel (of Life)'. He deems it possible that σκεῦος, which is an elegant vessel, had been (intentionally) corrupted into μόδιος, which is merely a common utensil.⁹⁸

The hypothesis of Alfaric is more convincing than Lieu's second rather conjectural construction. It is well imaginable that Adimantus should have written a work in which *Mt.* 5:15 had an important role, because the Sermon on the Mount plays a major part in the *Disputationes*. Nevertheless, although Alfaric's solution is reasonable, Faustus' *Capitula* gives some indications in favour of another theory regarding the contents of the *Modion*.

Lexicon, Oxford 1961, part II, p. 875, mentions two places where a neuter form is found. Therefore, it seems to be the most probable explanation to regard 'Modion' as a neuter noun in the nominative case.

⁹⁵ R. Lim, 'Manichaeans and Public Disputation in Late Antiquity', *RA* 25 (1993) 238 f.

⁹⁶ P. Alfaric, *Les écritures manichéennes*, Paris 1918/9, tome II, 98.

⁹⁷ *Mt.* 5:15: οὐδὲ κείουσιν λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

⁹⁸ Lieu, *Manichaeism in the later Roman Empire and Medieval China*, 92.

It is probable that Faustus knew the *Modion* and developed some of its ideas in the *Capitula*, just as he did with other works of Adimantus. This means that in the *Capitula* we might be able to find some indications of the subject matter of the *Modion*. In *Contra Faustum* 15 such an indication may be found. Here, Faustus uses the metaphor of a vase (*vas*) to explain why he did not accept the Old Testament. Faustus' argument is of interest, because the Latin *vas*, which can be translated as 'vessel' or 'utensil',⁹⁹ has almost the same meaning as the Greek *μόδιος*. Faustus argues that a vessel that has already been completely filled cannot possibly hold any more. In other words: if somebody accepts the Old Testament, his vessel is already full. This means that there is no place for the treasures of Christ.¹⁰⁰ In the same passage, Faustus also applies the New Testament metaphor of the bride when he is referring to the church of Christ. This particular bride should not be interested in the treasures of the Old Testament, because she ought to be content with the riches of her bridegroom.¹⁰¹ Several lines further on, Faustus insists that he wants to be an imitator of Paul, who said (*2 Cor.* 3:5 f.) that his sufficiency is in God who made him an able minister of the New Testament.¹⁰² This passage

⁹⁹ See P.W.G. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 2006 (reprint), 2014.

¹⁰⁰ *c. Faust.* 15, 1 (*CSEL* 25,1: 415, 21 – 416, 7): 'Faustus dixit: Quare non accipitis testamentum uetus? quia et omne uas plenum superfusa non recipit, sed effundit et stomachus saturus reicit ingesta. proinde et Iudaei ex praeoccupatione Moyses testamento uetere satiati respuerunt nouum, et nos ex Christi praeuentione nouo referti respuimus uetus. uos ideo utrumque accipitis, quia in neutro estis pleni, sed semi alterumque ex altero in uobis non tam repletur quam corrumpitur, quia et sema uasa numquam de dissimili implentur materia, sed de eadem ac sibi simili, ut uini uino et mellis melle et aceti aceto: quibus dissimilia et non sui generis superfundas, ut melli fel et aquam uino et aceto garos, non repletio uocabitur haec, sed adulterium. hoc ergo causa est, unde nos parum accipimus testamentum uetus.'

¹⁰¹ *c. Faust.* 15, 1 (*CSEL* 25,1: 416, 7–14): 'et quia ecclesia nostra, sponsa Christi, pauperior quidem ei nupta, sed diuiti, contenta sit bonis mariti sui, humilium amatorum dedignatur opes, sordent ei testamenti ueteris et eius auctoris munera famaeque suae custos diligentissima nisi sponsi sui non accipit litteras. uestra sane ecclesia usurpet testamentum uetus, quae ut lasciua uirgo inmemor pudoris alieni uiri et muneribus gaudet et litteris'; *idem* (*CSEL* 25,1: 417, 12–22) 'ac ne incongrue me haec comparasse existimes, Paulus in nos hanc coniugalis disciplinae similitudinem prior contulit dicens: quae sub uiro est mulier uiuente, uiro alligata est lege uiri; si autem mortuus fuerit uir eius, soluta est a lege uiri. ergo uiuente uiro uocabitur, inquit, adultera, si iuncta fuerit alteri uiro; quodsi mortuus fuerit uir eius, non erit adultera alii coniuncta, per haec ostendens spiritu moechari eos, qui non ante repudiantes et in mortuis quodam modo ponentes legis auctorem tum demum se copulauerint Christo.'

¹⁰² *c. Faust.* 15, 1 (*CSEL* 25,1: 417, 5–9): 'nobis soli Christo seruire permittite, eius tantum immortalis dote contentis et imitantibus apostolum, qui dicit: sufficientia nostra ex deo est, qui nos idoneos probauit ministros noui testamenti'.

from *2 Corinthians* on the ministers of the New Testament includes the saying that we have the treasure of this ministry in earthen vessels.¹⁰³ It could be suggested that the subject matter of the *Modion* was the relationship between Jesus the Bridegroom and the church, his bride. The bride is filled like a vessel with the treasures of Christ. This implies that clinging on to the Old Testament must be tantamount to adultery.

It is conceivable that this writing could have been confused with Mani's *Living Gospel*. Furthermore, it could ultimately explain the rather associative argument that Faustus used when he was dealing with *Mt. 5:17*. Augustine quotes it in *Contra Faustum* 19,5. Here Faustus says:

Because, if Christ did not come to abolish the Law, but to fulfil it—and we never say that empty vessels are fulfilled but half-full—it seemed to me that I only as an Israelite could become a Christian, that I should come to Christ in order to be fulfilled by Him being nearly full with a bit of the Law and a bit of the Prophets.¹⁰⁴

Faustus' 'exegesis' of *Mt. 5:17* can only be explained satisfactorily if we assume that the metaphor of the vessel was already familiar to him. In *Mt. 5:17* 'fulfilment' did not denote 'making anything full' at all, although Faustus seems to interpret those words thus. Furthermore, the real subject of the text is not a Christian who must be fulfilled but, rather, the Law and the Prophets. Therefore, it might be assumed that Faustus applied some ideas stemming from Adimantus' *Modion*.

2. *Adimantus on the Manichaeon myth*

Giulia Sfameni Gasparro has recently discussed an important difference between the Manichaeon myth of the creation of man such as it can be found in the rendering of the *Epistula Fundamenti* and the version in the Manichaeon document which Titus of Bostra refuted in his *Contra Manichaeos*. The passage from Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos* under discussion here, *i.e.* III. 4–5, needs to be quoted in full. In Sfameni Gasparro's translation, it runs as follows:

¹⁰³ *2 Cor.* 4:7: Ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὄστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν, ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν.

¹⁰⁴ *c. Faust.* 19, 5 (CSEL 25,1: 501, 5–9): 'etenim si Christus legem non uenit soluere, sed adimplere, adimpletio autem numquam in uase inani dicitur, sed in semo, solus mihi uidebatur Israelita posse christianus fieri, qui refertus maxima ex parte lege ac prophetis, ad Christum ueniret replendus eo ...'

He says literally, either he himself (i.e. Mani) or one of his disciples who wrote the chapter on man's first formation: 'Since the Archons understood that if the part of the light which fell to them were rescued, death would immediately fall upon them, they planned the descent of the soul to the body. They wanted to prevent the return of the soul to the world from whence it came, or, if it should return, they would prevent it being reputed worthy of the higher dwelling, since it had been polluted by the flesh. (. . .) Their first moulding was Adam, the medium of desire and a bait for the soul from above and a trap for attracting the souls to the bodies.'¹⁰⁵

According to Sfameni Gasparro, the text discussed by Titus must have given an adaptation of the Manichaean myth, to make it more in agreement with the account we find in *Genesis*. Because, the text describes Adam's generation as a process of moulding (πλάσμα), whereas the *Epistula Fundamenti* and the *Šābuhragān* both speak of the procreation of archons and the eating of abortions. Sfameni Gasparro goes on to claim that this particular adaptation was done for missionary reasons.¹⁰⁶ According to Sfameni Gasparro, the text that Titus was refuting here continued to discuss this anthropological theme within the framework of a critical exegesis of *Genesis*, referring to the discussion in *Contra Manichaeos* III.7. Thus, she claims that Titus of Bostra quoted from one Manichaean tractate in III.4–5 and III.7 and she finally advances the hypothesis that it was Adimantus who must have been responsible for this 'adaptation of Manichaean anthropogony to the biblical pattern.'¹⁰⁷ Sfameni Gasparro bases her opinion on the agreements between the Manichaean criticisms of the first chapters of *Genesis* discussed by Titus of Bostra in *Contra Manichaeos* III.7 and those met by Augustine in espe-

¹⁰⁵ *Contra Manichaeos* III.4–5 (ed. P. de Lagarde, *Titus Bostrenus. Syriace et graece*, 68, 10–18 and 25–27): φησὶ δὲ πρὸς λέξιν αὐτὴν ἐκεῖνος ἢ ἕτερός τις τῶν ἀπ' ἐκείνου, ἐπιγράψας τὸ κεφάλαιον περὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης πρωτοπλαστίσας· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν οἱ ἄρχοντες ὡς ἐκ τοῦ παραιρεῖσθαι τὸ ἅπαξ ἀπλῶς ἐμπίπτων εἰς αὐτοὺς μέρος τοῦ φωτός ταχὺς ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὁ θάνατος ἦξει, τὴν εἰς τὰ σώματα τῆς ψυχῆς κάθοδον ἐμηχανήσα[ν]το, ἀναδοραμεῖν μὲν αὐτὴν μηδ' ὅλως ζητοῦντες, ἀνελθοῦσαν δὲ μηδὲ τῆς ἄνωθεν ληξεως ἀξίαν εὐρίσκεισθαι μιάσματα τῆς σαρκὸς ἀνεχομένην. (. . .) καὶ πλάσμα αὐτῶν ἐστὶ πρῶτον ὁ Ἀδάμ, ὄργανον ἐπιθυμίας καὶ δέλεαρ τῶν ἄνωθεν ψυχῶν καὶ μηχανήμα τοῦ αὐτὰς εἰς σώματα ἐμπίπτειν. Translation: Sfameni Gasparro, 'Addas-Adimantus', 552 f.

¹⁰⁶ Sfameni Gasparro, 'Addas-Adimantus', 552 and 556. This adaptation of the myth on the origin of the human race does not mean that Addas reconceptualised the myth completely. Both versions of the myth of the origin of the human race have been developed along the same line. The difference between the version of Mani and the version of Addas merely reflects the toning down of some of the possibly offensive parts of the myth by Addas.

¹⁰⁷ Sfameni Gasparro, 'Addas-Adimantus', 556.

cially *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos*, which writing appears to have been directed against arguments originating from Adimantus.¹⁰⁸ Sfameni Gasparro's reasoning that Adimantus' text that we discussed above¹⁰⁹ not merely criticized the first chapters of *Genesis*, but related the moulding of man as well, should indicate that Adimantus rewrote with missionary sensitivity the Manichaean myth on the creation of humans.

When Pedersen discusses the same problem, he rejects (for good reasons) the claim that the Manichaean text that was refuted by Titus in *Contra Manichaeos* III must have contained both the rendering of the myth and criticisms of the first chapters of *Genesis*, because the texts which Titus was refuting in III.4–5 differed at crucial points from what was given in III.7. Thus, Pedersen comes to the conclusion that in *Contra Manichaeos* III Titus must have been quoting from at least two sources: one on the anthropogony (III.4–5) and another including objections to *Genesis* (III.7).¹¹⁰ Pedersen's conclusion removes the foundations of Sfameni Gasparro's claim that Adimantus must have been responsible for the adaptation of the myth of the origin of man to the traditional Old Testament pattern, because her argument about the agreement on questions of exegesis has been dismissed.¹¹¹ Another observation of Pedersen even further diminishes, at least at first sight, the likelihood that Adimantus wrote the text refuted in *Contra Manichaeos* III.4–5, since this Manichaean text consistently replaces the mythological names with (Hellenistic) philosophical notions, quite possibly for missionary reasons. Pedersen, however, doubts that Adimantus was sufficiently well-versed in Hellenistic culture to do this,¹¹² and he finally concludes that 'by virtue of the text's link to the Manichaean mission, Addas would be a natural candidate for its authorship, but' that 'this is far too insecure a basis on which to claim anything about the author of the text.'¹¹³

Nevertheless, we may add a number of observations that could ultimately provide a more solid basis for the claim that the teachings in this particular text originated from Adimantus. The remark of Heraclianus, namely that Titus actually wrote against Addas,¹¹⁴ is confirmed when we

¹⁰⁸ Sfameni Gasparro, 'Addas-Adimantus', 553–336. See above, p. 193.

¹⁰⁹ See n. 53.

¹¹⁰ Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 190.

¹¹¹ See as well Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 247 ff., for similar exegetical problems discussed both by Titus of Bostra and Augustine in an anti-Manichaean discourse.

¹¹² Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 193.

¹¹³ Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 198 f.

¹¹⁴ See n. 4.

look at the text which was discussed in *Contra Manichaeos* III.7. The same could well apply to the text quoted in *Contra Manichaeos* III.4–5. Another important clue is the fact that the subject itself was highly important for Adimantus,¹¹⁵ which makes it all the more probable that he was trying to propagate his opinion about it in his writings. Furthermore, in a *capitulum* on the question of whether Manichaeism should be regarded as a species of paganism, Faustus relates that Adimantus taught him to call evil matter ‘hyle’.¹¹⁶ This is one aspect of the process of toning down the mythical framework of the Manichaean teachings on creation that Pedersen found in the text refuted by Titus in *Contra Manichaeos* III.4–5,¹¹⁷ which moreover removes Pedersen’s doubts as to whether Adimantus could have been able to adapt the Manichaean myth to Greek culture. Therefore, it is plausible to assume that the doctrines found in this text were indeed derived from Adimantus.¹¹⁸

As regards to the form of the text that Titus of Bostra refutes in *Contra Manichaeos* III.4–5, it is of importance to observe that the text is actually called *kephalaion*:

He says literally, or another from those of him, when he wrote the *kephalaion*: ‘On the first moulding of humankind.’¹¹⁹

Both the qualification of the text as *Kephalaion* and its title ‘on the first moulding of humankind’ seem to indicate a relationship between the text quoted by Titus of Bostra and the *Kephalaia*-documents from Medinet Madi. All this could imply that Adimantus copied the form and method

¹¹⁵ See pp. 163–166.

¹¹⁶ *c. Faust.* 20, 3 (CSEL 25,1: 537, 12 ff.): ‘his ego ualde contraria sentio, qui bonis omnibus principium fateor deum, contrariis uero hylen; sic enim mali principium ac naturam theologus noster appellat.’ A. Hoffmann, ‘Verfälschung der Jesus-Tradition. Neutestamentliche Texte in der manichäisch-augustinischen Kontroverse’, in: L. Cirillo and A. Van Tongerloo (eds.), *Manichaeismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico*, Lovanii-Neapoli 1997, 149–182 (165, n. 65) claimed that the ‘theologus’ must have been Mani and not Adimantus. In the light of Sfameni Gasparro’s observation that Mani made use of mythological rather than philosophical idiom to render his teachings, this opinion seems rather unlikely. Furthermore, Mani is always regarded as a *revelator* whereas the designation ‘theologus’ indicates a person who only studies and interprets revelation. Therefore, it is more justifiable to maintain that the ‘theologus’ under discussion is the ‘doctissimus Adimantus’ (see *c. Faust.* 1, 2 [CSEL 25,1: 252, 1 f.]); so, too, M. Tardieu, ‘Principes de l’exégèse’, 134. Cf. above, n. 54.

¹¹⁷ See n. 105.

¹¹⁸ Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof*, 187.

¹¹⁹ *Contra Manichaeos* III.4–5 (ed. P. de Lagarde, *Titus Bostrenus. Syriace et graece*, 68, 10–12): φησὶ δὲ πρὸς λέξιν αὐτὴν ἐκεῖνος ἢ ἕτερός τις τῶν ἀπ’ ἐκεῖνου, ἐπιγράψας τὸ κεφάλαιον περὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης πρωτοπλαστίσας.

of the *Kephalaia*, or even that he was responsible for the edition of the *Kephalaia*-documents (which possibility we will examine below). There are, however, some differences between the text that Titus of Bostra came across and the *Kephalaia*-documents from Medinet Madi. Titus was confused about the authors of the text: could it be Mani or was it one of his disciples? In the *Kephalaia*-documents from Medinet Madi this is not a problem, because Mani is always introduced as the one who answers. A glimpse into the tradition history of Manichaean texts may provide us with some helpful insights about the possible feature and purpose of the text refuted in *Contra Manichaeos* III.4–5. For this reason, it is necessary to look at the literary texts found in Kellis.¹²⁰ There, a didactic text has been found, the subject matter of which closely resembles *Kephalaia* 20,¹²¹ namely *T.Kell. Copt. 1*. It deals with the question ‘who is the father?’¹²² One of the remarkable features of this text from Kellis is that it mentions neither Mani nor any of his disciples. It starts simply with the question: ‘Who is the father?’ to which a fivefold answer is given. This particular feature made Gardner to suggest that *T.Kell. Copt. 1* should be regarded as ‘a local production, developed for the purpose of evangelism, which uses material abstracted from a canonical or semi-canonical work.’¹²³ In the same way, it is quite possible that the text refuted in *Contra Manichaeos* III.4–5 should be regarded as an abstraction from a *kephalaion* of the Medinet Madi texts, with a missionary intention.

Apart from a text on the creation of humans, it can be tentatively proposed that Adimantus also wrote a document about the revelation of the truth to human beings, which we might infer from the *Capitula* that Augustine quoted in *Contra Faustum* 26–29. The discussion of these four *Capitula* focuses upon the question of whether it was necessary that Jesus must be born in order to suffer and to die. In *Contra Faustum* 29 Faustus says:

Because that is ridiculous, which you are used to affirm often, that it is necessary that He was born, because otherwise it would have been

¹²⁰ Edited by I. Gardner *et al.*, *KLT* I, Oxford 1996.

¹²¹ See for the Coptic text and a German translation, C. Schmidt and H.J. Polotsky (eds.), *Kephalaia* I, Stuttgart 1940, 63.20–64.12; see for the most recent English translation: I. Gardner, *The Kephalaia of the Teacher. The edited Coptic Manichaean texts in translation with commentary*, Leiden-NewYork-Köln 1994.

¹²² Gardner, *KLT* I, 1.

¹²³ Gardner, *KLT* I, 3.

impossible that he could have been seen by humans or spoken to them; because often angels turn out to have appeared and to have spoken to humans, as has already been expounded *by those of us*.¹²⁴

Like we did in the case of the *capitulum* quoted in *Contra Faustum* 12,¹²⁵ we may assume that Faustus has been referring to a writing of Adimantus in which he wrote about the appearance of angels. Because of the context of this remark—*i.e.* a discussion of the Christology—, it is probable to suppose that the purpose of such appearances may well have been the communication of insight to human beings, as was also the case in the Garden of Eden.¹²⁶

3. *The Kephalaia*

In the analysis of the works of Adimantus and Faustus we occasionally referred to the *Kephalaia*, especially with regard to the form of this vitally important Manichaean source.¹²⁷ Furthermore, in chapter IV we discussed a Chinese tractate with a *Kephalaia*-like form, in which Adimantus played the role of the interlocutor.¹²⁸ Such similarities could well suggest some kind of relation between the *Kephalaia* tradition and Adimantus. In this section we examine whether this relation can rightly be specified thus, that Adimantus should be treated as its compiler. Michel Tardieu was the first to defend the position that Adimantus will have been responsible for the compilation of the *Kephalaia*. The most important argument adduced by Tardieu in support of his claim is that in

¹²⁴ *c. Faust.* 29, 1 (CSEL 25,1: 744, 5–9): ‘nam illud quidem, quod saepe adfirmare soletis necessario eum esse natum, quia alias hominibus uideri aut loqui non posset, ridiculum est, cum multotiens, ut iam probatum a nostris est, angeli et uisi hominibus et locuti esse monstrentur.’

¹²⁵ See pp. 184 f.

¹²⁶ See p. 193.

¹²⁷ See pp. 184 (esp. n. 39), 198 and 207. The *Kephalaia* consist of two codices, one entitled *The Kephalaia of the Teacher* (= the Berlin *Kephalaia* codex) and the other *The Kephalaia of the Wisdom of My Lord Mani* (Dublin *Kephalaia* codex). The first one, which consists of two parts, has been partly published and translated. The second is still to be edited. See for a rather recent account of the state of affairs, W.-P. Funk, ‘The Reconstruction of the Manichaean *Kephalaia*’, in: P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn (eds.), *Emerging from Darkness. Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997, 143–159 (143) and, more recently, T. Pettipiece, ‘The Faces of the Father: “Pentadization” in the Manichaean *Kephalaia* (Chapter 21)’, *VC* 61 (2007) 407–477 (esp. 470, n. 1).

¹²⁸ See p. 165 (esp. n. 140).

the *Kephalaia* the principle of evil is called ‘hyle’,¹²⁹ which philosophically coloured phrasing he (rightly) ascribes to Adimantus.¹³⁰ In addition, Tardieu stresses the influence of Adimantus as the Teacher of the Manichaeans in the West, as an important argument to support his claim.¹³¹ More recently, Wolf-Peter Funk has published some of the results of his examination of the *Kephalaia*. He concludes *i.a.* that the *Kephalaia* had not been edited anonymously. On the contrary, a hitherto unpublished part of the final page of the second volume of the *Kephalaia* confirms that the compiler of the book was well known to the Manichaeans, and, furthermore, these words also demonstrate that the author emphasized the value of the records with his personal authority.¹³² Funk concludes that the author must have been one of Mani’s disciples. He even suggests that the redactor is ‘The Teacher’ who is mentioned in the title *Kephalaia of the Teacher*, and therefore not Mani himself (who never was called the Teacher). As to the identity of this Teacher, Funk has no definite conclusions, although he is inclined to accept Tardieu’s solution.¹³³

Admittedly, a number of other candidates could be mentioned instead of Adimantus,¹³⁴ but Tardieu’s opinions could well be correct. Apart from Tardieu’s and Funk’s arguments on the authority of Adimantus, we may point to several striking similarities between the subject matter of the *Kephalaia* and what we know about the teachings of Adimantus. It is highly probable that the redactor left his mark, both on the selection of the subject matter and on the final wording. This entails that similarities between the themes could well be used as arguments in the discussion about the identity of the redactor of the *Kephalaia*.

A preliminary reading of the *Kephalaia* yields a list of remarkable similarities between the subject matter of the *Kephalaia* and the teachings of Adimantus. In *Kephalaion* 2 we find a discussion about the good tree and the bad tree about which Jesus spoke in *Mt.* 7:17–20. Mani explained this parable by insisting that the good tree is the good religion, and the

¹²⁹ Tardieu is certainly right in this case, see the many references to matter (hyle) in the index of I. Gardner, *The Kephalaia of the Teacher. The edited Coptic Manichaean texts in translation with commentary*, Leiden-NewYork-Köln 1995, 301 *apud* ‘matter’.

¹³⁰ Cf. n. 116.

¹³¹ Tardieu, ‘Principes de l’exégèse’, 134 (n. 73).

¹³² Funk, ‘Reconstruction’, 151 f.

¹³³ Funk, ‘Reconstruction’, 152 (see esp. n. 17).

¹³⁴ For example, Sisinnios, who turned out to be a conscious defender of the purity of Mani’s teachings; see p. 23.

bad tree the misleading sects of evil.¹³⁵ Adimantus applied *Mt.* 7:17 in a similar way when he criticized *Amos* 3:3–6, which stated that God caused both good and evil. Adimantus placed this passage from the prophet in opposition to *Mt.* 7:17.¹³⁶ *Kephalaion* 65 renders a discussion about the sun with an explicit reference to *Dt.* 17:3 ff. In Gardner’s translation it runs as follows:

However, since Satan knows that it is the gate of the soul’s departure, he places an exclusionary judgement in his law that no one worships it, saying: Whoever will worship it can die.¹³⁷

Criticism of the Old Testament belonged to the core of Adimantus’ thinking and this piece of criticism could well have come from his pen, because it falls in line with our analysis of the contents of the *Disputationes*.¹³⁸

Funk has also published a synopsis of the headings of the hitherto untranslated parts of the *Kephalaia* from both of the *Kephalaia* codices. Some of those titles from the *Kephalaia of the Teacher* are reminiscent of Adimantus’ work. This certainly applies to *Kephalaion* 161: ‘What this word means that the Saviour spoke: I am working till now (*John* 5:17)’.¹³⁹ In *Disputatio* 2 Adimantus quotes this text placing it in opposition to *Gen.* 2:1 f.¹⁴⁰

In the previous section we discovered that it is probable that Adimantus adapted the Manichaean myth of the creation of humankind, toning down its original mythological framework.¹⁴¹ In the *Kephalaia of the Teacher* we can find an almost identical assimilation of the Manichaean myth. Because,—as Pedersen rightly observed—it cannot be concluded on the basis of the *Kephalaia*-texts that Adam and Eve were created by means of procreation and cannibalism, as is the case in the *Epistula Fundamenti* and the *Šābuhragān*.¹⁴²

¹³⁵ Schmidt *et al.*, *Kephalaia* I, 16–23; Gardner, *The Kephalaia of the Teacher*, 22–26.

¹³⁶ See *Disp.* 26.

¹³⁷ Gardner, *Kephalaia*, 168; cf. Schmidt *et al.*, *Kephalaia* I, 159.1–4.

¹³⁸ See pp. 168–173.

¹³⁹ Funk, ‘Reconstruction’, 157.

¹⁴⁰ See *Disp.* 2.

¹⁴¹ See p. 204 (esp. n. 106).

¹⁴² Pedersen, *Demonstrative proof*, 192 (n. 39): ‘In *Kephalaia* Ch. 55 (Schmidt, Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 133.4–137.11) and Ch. 56 (Schmidt, Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 137.12–144.12) it is also merely a question of Adam and Eve being “formed” (πλάσσειν) (for example, Schmidt, Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 133.19, 137.16–17, 138.11.17), and of being “what was formed” (πλάσμα) (for example, Schmidt, Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 134.10, 137.18.22, 138.21); here, neither cannibalism nor sexual intercourse are mentioned. In

When we look at the similarities between the teachings of Adimantus and the *Kephalaia*¹⁴³ it is reasonable to conclude that Adimantus left his mark on the contents of the *Kephalaia*. Since the text itself claims to have been edited by an important Manichaean,¹⁴⁴ the most obvious step would be to accept Tardieu's hypothesis that Adimantus must have been the editor of the *Kephalaia*.¹⁴⁵ Besides, the claim that Adimantus must have been the editor of the *Kephalaia* is a credible explanation for the fact that both in the *Capitula* and in the *Kephalaia* precisely the same procedure is used: Faustus the student not only applied the ideas of his master, but also his methods.¹⁴⁶

E. Evaluation

In this reconstruction of the literary output of Adimantus, we have uncovered sound reasons to conclude that Adimantus wrote at least one book (in addition to the *Disputationes*) which included objections to the Old Testament. Furthermore, we concluded that Adimantus also criticized the text of the New Testament, especially those texts in the

Kephalaia Ch. 57 (Schmidt, Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 144.13–20) Adam is both “formed” (πλάσσειν) (for example, Schmidt, Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 144.18) and “begotten” (for example, Schmidt, Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 144.19), but the latter is not really explained. Nor are cannibalism or intercourse mentioned in *Kephalaia* Ch. 64 (Schmidt, Polotsky and Böhlig 1940, 157.1–158.23).’

¹⁴³ Cf. as well below, n. 146, about some striking similarities between the *Kephalaia* and the *Capitula*, which can be regarded as indirect evidence of certain congruence between the teachings of Adimantus and the *Kephalaia*.

¹⁴⁴ See Funk, ‘Reconstruction’, 151 f.

¹⁴⁵ See Tardieu, ‘Principes de l'exégèse’, 134.

¹⁴⁶ As to the influence of the *Kephalaia* on the subject matter of the *Capitula*, we may especially point to the only three chapters that are not directly connected with a discussion on the beliefs of Catholic Christian, namely those quoted by Augustine in *c. Faust.* 20 (on the question of whether Manichaeans must be regarded as pagans), *c. Faust.* 21 (on believing in one God and two principles) and *c. Faust.* 24 (on the two kinds of the creation of the human race), because they would not have been influenced by the exegetical work of Adimantus. These three *capitula* all have much in common with the *Kephalaia*. The *capitula* cited in *c. Faust.* 20 and 21, both include a discussion about God and ‘hyle’, for which concept see n. 116. The *capitulum* in *c. Faust.* 20 starts with a question about worshipping the sun (CSEL 25,1; 535, 25 f.): ‘Cur solem colitis, nisi quia estis pagani et gentium schisma, non secta?’. The sun is discussed in *Kephalaia* 65; see n. 137. The *capitulum* quoted in *c. Faust.* 24,1 on the two origins of mankind (CSEL 25,1; 717,9–721,6), might have been a revision of the (hitherto unedited) *Kephalaion* 136, which has as its title: ‘On the begetting of two men: “Oldman” and “Newman”, the way they are begotten’; see, Funk, ‘Reconstruction’, 157.

Gospels and the Pauline Corpus which deal with the incarnation of Jesus and possibly with the positive references to the Old Testament. In addition to the writings against the beliefs of Catholic Christians—which books seem to have had a preparatory function for, and only holding largely indirect references to the Manichaeian teachings—the analysis of the sources provided us with conclusive evidence that Adimantus wrote as well about the Manichaeian teachings themselves. This probably goes for the *Modion*, because the work was confused with Mani's *Living Gospel*. In the *Modion*, Adimantus quoted New Testament texts to describe the abundant spiritual gifts which Christ bestows upon believers (accepting the truth of Mani), and in due course it also ensured that the Old Testament could not ultimately be maintained. Furthermore, Adimantus produced at least one document about the Manichaeian interpretation of the creation of humans, and possibly he wrote on other aspects of the myth as well. Besides, it appeared to be highly likely that Adimantus, as the compiler of the *Kephalaia*, influenced significantly its contents, which work contains many discussions on the subject of the Manichaeian teachings.

Our overview of Adimantus' works supports the conclusion of chapter IV that the *Disputationes* should be treated as a kind of preliminary work.¹⁴⁷ It could well have been one of the manuals to be used in an early phase in missionary work amongst Catholic Christians. Its intention was to evoke doubts in Catholic Christian circles about the validity of their Canon. Furthermore, it was meant to demonstrate the misleading nature of the Hebrew Scriptures and, in the meantime, it introduced indirectly essentials of the Manichaeian myth, such as the identity of the true God, the nature of mankind, and also important ethical questions.¹⁴⁸ Other works of Adimantus on the Catholic Christian Holy Scriptures, which were possibly intended to be used in a following phase, elaborated on this theme, which also entailed discussions on a number of possibly spurious passages in the Gospels and the Pauline Corpus. Furthermore, those writings included even more explicit discussions of Manichaeian teachings. The writings on the Manichaeian teachings were almost certainly intended to initiate the hearers more deeply into the mysteries of Mani's revelation.

¹⁴⁷ See above, Ch. IV, Part E, section 1. *The form of the Disputationes*.

¹⁴⁸ See e.g. pp. 168 f.

The findings of this chapter confirm our assessment of the stance adopted by Adimantus' on the Old Testament, which we derived from the *Disputationes*. As was the case with the *Disputationes*, some of Adimantus' other writings also claim that the Old Testament must have originated from the devil. For that reason, it was regarded as a very dangerous book that should be rejected because of all its misleading tenets.¹⁴⁹ Apart from placing the subject matter of the Old Testament over against the subject matter of the New Testament, we also found evidence that Adimantus used to practice a highly polemical method of expounding the first chapters of *Genesis*, intended to subvert the original meaning of the *Genesis* account.¹⁵⁰ This kind of aggressive 'exegesis' is well suited to a vision that includes the idea that the Jewish Scriptures should be treated as an intentionally misleading distortion of reality.

As to Adimantus' use and appreciation of the New Testament, we should look in particular at two aspects. On the one hand, our analysis of Adimantus' work has demonstrated convincingly that the absence of criticisms of the New Testament in the *Disputationes* must be regarded as propaganda ploy, because Adimantus surely did not take the view that the whole of the New Testament must be regarded as the revelation of the truth. On the other hand, the importance attached to New Testament passages is a feature that is not restricted to the *Disputationes*, because it also occurs in other writings of Adimantus. Especially our analysis of Adimantus' *Modion* demonstrate that, even during the propagation of explicitly Manichaean teachings, New Testament passages still played a major part. This observation supports the conclusion in chapter IV that Adimantus did indeed treat certain parts of the New Testament as a revelation of the truth.

As to the place and contents of the *Disputationes* in the context of the other writings of Adimantus, we may claim that the *Disputationes* should not be treated as a 'Fremdkörper' in his oeuvre. Discussions about the Catholic Christian Canon, both on the Jewish Scriptures and on the New Testament writings, are found at the very core of Adimantus' literary output.

¹⁴⁹ See Ch. IV, Part E, section 3. *The relevance of the Old Testament for Adimantus*.

¹⁵⁰ See for this qualification P. Nagel, 'Die Auslegung der Paradieserzählung in der Gnosis', in: K.-W. Tröger (ed.), *Altes Testament—Frühjudentum—Gnosis*, Berlin 1980, 49–70 (esp. 52–57).

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In conclusion the results of this study into the use of the biblical argument in Manichaean missionary practice will be summarized. Besides, we will make some suggestions for further research.

The most important aim of this study was to reconstruct Adimantus' *Disputationes*, namely the work Augustine refuted when he was a priest in the parish of Hippo Regius. We succeeded to reconstruct a substantial part of its subject matter, especially thanks to the procedure that Augustine followed when he refuted Adimantus' book. Augustine quoted what Adimantus had written when he presented his own reflections on the arguments of Adimantus. Because he consistently followed this procedure, we were able to recover much of the material in Augustine's rebuttal of the *Disputationes*, especially in his *Contra Adimantum* and in his sermons. Apart from the material which can be recovered from those two polemical sources, we found as well evidence about the subject matter of the *Disputationes* in a writing of the Manichaean Bishop Faustus, a highly appreciated contemporary of Augustine in Manichaean circles. Faustus used the *Disputationes* in his *Capitula*, a writing which Augustine quoted in full in *Contra Faustum*. The results of the analysis of the *Capitula* corroborated what was found among Augustine's refutations and, furthermore, it expanded our knowledge of the contents of the *Disputationes*.

This reconstruction of the *Disputationes* demonstrates that Adimantus had an extensive knowledge of the Bible, because he quoted on considerable scale from both the Old and New Testament. As to the Old Testament, most of the quotations came from the Pentateuch, but Adimantus' knowledge was not restricted to the five books of Moses. He also criticized texts and subjects from the Prophets and the Writings. Over against those passages from the Jewish Scriptures, Adimantus placed a selection of quotations from the Gospel traditions and the Pauline Corpus. Most of those citations are taken from the Gospel, with its focal point in the Sermon on the Mount. The procedure that Adimantus regularly followed involved the construction of contradictions between one or more

passages from the Hebrew Scriptures and at least one passage from the New Testament. Adimantus habitually clarified his opinions about the Old Testament by means of logical and rhetorical arguments.

The *Disputationes* are probably an anthology consisting of the written records of Adimantus' discussions with other Christians. Furthermore, this anthology could well have been compiled for the use of Manichaean missionaries as a kind of preparatory handbook for their own disputes with other Christian movements, and/or as a pamphlet which could be distributed among potential members. So it could be treated as a missionary writing to be used in the first contacts of Manichaeans and Catholic Christians. The claim that there must have been a missionary motive can be supported by several arguments. First, we may mention a piece of circumstantial evidence that points in this particular direction: the book was circulating among the members of Augustine's parish, in all likelihood to pave the way for further instruction on the subject of Mani's teachings. Furthermore, the contents of the *Disputationes* seem to have been well suited to play a part in debates with Catholic Christians. A number of difficult subjects from the Hebrew Bible were criticized by bringing up authoritative passages from the New Testament. Furthermore, Adimantus refrained from specifically criticizing the Gospel and the Pauline Corpus. In addition, one should also mention that the subject matter of the *Disputationes* seems to have played an important role in Augustine's conversion to the Church of Mani, which further underlines its missionary motive.

The contents of the *Disputationes* demonstrate that Adimantus had a double intention with his book. On the one hand, he intended to demonstrate the sheer inferiority of the Catholic Christian teachings by revealing the fundamental incoherence of their bipartite canon. On the other hand, Addas excoriated the Old Testament because he believed that those writings were highly dangerous, because they not only stemmed from the Kingdom of Darkness, but were also inspired by the intention to retain the particles of light in the prison of the dark matter. The second of these intentions in particular tells us a great deal about the opinions of Adimantus on the Holy Scriptures. On the sole authority of passages from the Gospel and the Pauline Corpus, Adimantus actually succeeded in depicting the Old Testament as a hostile revelation over against the true teachings of the Paraclete Mani. This leads to the conclusion with respect to the New Testament, that it had a revelatory character and with respect to the Old Testament that it was highly relevant, because of its dangerous, misleading intentions.

Although it is obvious to conclude that the *Disputationes* should be treated as an introduction to a more comprehensive explanation of the teachings of Mani, and that it must have been written with a clear missionary motive which also influenced its subject matter, it would be quite misleading to underestimate those conclusions on the Old Testament and New Testament, on the argument that the criticisms of the Jewish Scriptures by means of passages from Gospel traditions and the Pauline Corpus were nothing but a tactical gambit on the part of Adimantus. Actually, a close reading of the New Testament citations justifies the conclusion that Adimantus quoted from the Gospel traditions and the Pauline Corpus by heart. His associative and interpretative use of passages from those traditions demonstrates that he must surely have had a thorough knowledge of the texts. This is not what we would have expected if Adimantus' use of those texts was a strange element in his teachings. Furthermore, the course of Adimantus' life demonstrates that he practised what he preached from the Sermon on the Mount and other Christian traditions. Moreover, in other works of Adimantus such as the *Modion*, the New Testament played a major part as well. So it is quite reasonable to assume that the New Testament must have been highly appreciated by Adimantus. On this point Adimantus agreed with Mani, who also quoted regularly from the New Testament and used several Pauline formulae in his epistles. At only one point the missionary intentions of Adimantus could conceivably lead to misleading conclusions on the subject of the New Testament. On the basis of the *Disputationes*, it might be possible to conclude that Adimantus must have accepted all of it, because in this work, he never criticized its subject matter. In other writings, however, Adimantus certainly did criticize at least parts of the New Testament.

The conclusion on Adimantus' assessment of the essence of the Jewish Scriptures, namely that he regarded the Jewish Bible as a dangerous and misleading revelation, cannot simply be written off as an exaggeration for missionary motives. It is certainly supported by what we know about the other writings of Adimantus. Because, what we can derive from Faustus' appreciative use of Adimantus' books in his *Capitula*—which is corroborated by what we can glean from Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos*—clearly demonstrates that this particular opinion was one of Adimantus' basic assumptions. The problem plays a very important part in Adimantus' thinking. As far as we can see, his criticisms of the Jewish Scriptures and their influence on the New Testament belonged to the very heart of Adimantus' teaching.

Adimantus' verdict on the Jewish Scriptures as a misleading revelation may well have been provoked by his background. The procedure that Adimantus followed in the *Disputationes*, as well as the contents of his book, has much in common with Marcion's *Antitheses*. Furthermore, Adimantus' view that the Old Testament is dangerous due to its deceptive nature agrees precisely with what Marcion's pupil Apelles opined regarding the Hebrew Scriptures. It is quite reasonable therefore to assume that Adimantus must have been a Marcionite from the school of Apelles before he became an adherent of Mani's church. Marcionite influence upon Adimantus did not simply disappear after his conversion to 'the religion of Light'.

The scholarly esteem of the results of our reconstruction and analysis of the *Disputationes* for the opinions of the Manichaeans on the Bible should not be diminished for this reason. Although Marcionite influence on Adimantus is crystal clear, this does not imply that the prominence given to the discussion on Catholic Christian Scripture should be regarded as a later development of the original teachings of Mani himself. Historically, this is rather implausible, because, as Augustine rightly guessed, Adimantus is the same person as Addas, and Addas was one of Mani's first disciples. Addas not only ranked high in the Manichaean hierarchy, but was also charged with the responsibility of organizing the Manichaean mission in the West. It is quite inconceivable that Mani would have put so much trust in a man with whom he did not agree. On the contrary, it is probable that Mani would have regarded the influence of Apelles on Addas as a plus point in his missionary debates with Christians who appreciated the Jewish Scriptures. Furthermore, we also need to take into account that Adimantus' approval of the New Testament did not differ fundamentally from that of Mani. This means that we may assume that the biblical argument, which closely resembles extant Marcionite teachings, must have been incorporated into Manichaean missionary practice right from the beginning.

This reconstruction and analysis of Adimantus' teachings also sheds some new light upon Augustine's Manichaean years. Post mortally, Adimantus exerted a powerful influence on Augustine. Augustine's life history still demonstrates the convincing power of Adimantus' stance on the subject of the Hebrew Scriptures (and consequentially the influence of both Marcion and Apelles). Of course, there may have been reasons other than merely this particular biblical stance which can ultimately explain Augustine's decision to become a member of Mani's Church. Nevertheless, the arguments of Adimantus on the Bible, which were propagated by

Manichaean missionaries, were one of the crucial factors that paved the way for Mani's teachings to enter into Augustine's heart. In all likelihood, Adimantus' hermeneutical approach to the Bible was the first method that Augustine seriously applied and tested when he strove to understand the words of the Old and the New Testament. For many years, Adimantus' approach worked satisfactorily to Augustine. It provided the young Augustine with many arguments when he was debating with his friends. Furthermore, Augustine's disappointment with the teachings of the Manichaeans was not ultimately brought about because Adimantus' arguments no longer had the power to convince him. On the contrary, it took many years before Augustine developed a new hermeneutic method. In particular, his many attempts to explain the first chapters of *Genesis* prove this point.

The reconstruction of the *Disputationes* in this study may provide scholars with a secure foundation for further examinations of the Manichaean's use and explanation of the Holy Scriptures. Its results may be used as well to assess the historical value of the *Acta Archelai*. Furthermore, they may be of importance to evaluate the many biblical arguments in later Manichaean sources such as the *Epistula Secundini*,¹ and the Tebessa Codex.² In our reconstruction of Adimantus' works, we also noticed that Faustus' *Capitula* included many allusions to the writings of Adimantus, as well as quotations and interpretations. To arrive at a better understanding of Faustus and the *Capitula*, further scholarly research needs to pay considerable attention to Faustus' sources and the way he used them. In chapter V we examined the literary context of the *Disputationes*, which ultimately generated a preliminary outline of the corpus of Adimantus. The most important sources turned out to be Faustus'

¹ See for a study on the biblical argument in this Manichaean epistle, J. van Oort, 'Secundini Manichaei Epistula: Roman Manichaean 'Biblical' Argument in the Age of Augustine', in: J. van Oort et al. (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht International Symposium of the IAMS*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001, 161-173.

² See for this Latin Manichaean codex from probably the 5th or 6th century: R. Merkelbach, 'Der manichäische Codex von Tebessa', in: P. Bryder (ed.), *Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism*, Lund 1988, 229-264; J.D. BeDuhn and G. Harrison, 'The Tebessa Codex: A Manichaean Treatise on Biblical Exegesis and Church Order', in: P. Mirecki et al. (eds.), *Emerging from Darkness. Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997, 33-87; and M. Stein, 'Bemerkungen zum Kodex von Tebessa', in: J. van Oort et al. (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001, 250-271.

Capitula and Titus of Bostra's *Contra Manichaeos*, and to a lesser extent Augustine's *De Genesi adversus Manichaeos*. Furthermore, the *Kephalaia* also needs to be mentioned in this connexion. A more thorough analysis of those sources will probably lead to a more profound and extensive knowledge of Adimantus' opinions on the Holy Scriptures, and also of his other teachings. In this process Apelles' *Syllogismoi*, which appeared to have influenced Adimantus, could eventually help us to determine whether a saying or opinion in any of the sources stemmed from Adimantus.³

To conclude, the fact that Addas was a Marcionite before he went over to the Church of Mani could be helpful to further explain the relation between Marcionitism and Manichaeism. The abiding influence of Marcion's school on at least one of Mani's disciples may well have been one of the crucial factors behind the connections between both of those two currents in Antique Religion.⁴

³ For example, *Gn. adu. Man.* II, 28, 42 (CSEL 91; 168,1–5): 'Quid habent ergo isti, quod in his litteris veteris testamenti reprehendant? Interrogent secundum morem suum, et respondeamus sicut dominus donare dignatur: Quare fecit deus hominem quem peccatum sciebat?' The question 'Why did God make a man whom He knew would sin', closely resembles the fragment of Apelles' *Syllogismoi* discussed in Ch. V, which makes it probable that it was found in one of Adimantus' works. Furthermore, Augustine's remark that the Manichaeans were accustomed to ask critical questions about the Jewish Scriptures might need to be construed literally, because it is precisely the essence of the *Syllogismoi* that probably influenced Adimantus' work, and subsequently the Manichaean missionary praxis in the time of Augustine.

⁴ There are many of these connections to be found in the West, most of which we discussed in this study and ascribed to Adimantus' influence. We can find only few passages with relationship to Marcion and his school in sources from the East. I only know of two. A fragmentary text from Turfan relates the story of the conversion of a Catholic Christian to Mani's religion and in it the Law is described as lies and deceit, which is exactly what Apelles (and of course Adimantus) opined on it; it concerns SO 14196/r/128–31/ (text and translation: C. Reck, 'Die Bekehrung einer Christin zum manichäischen Glauben? Probleme bei der Interpretation eines fragmentarischen Textes', in: A. Mustafa *et al.* (eds.), *Inkulturation des Christentums im Sasanidenreich*, Wiesbaden 2007, 55–70 [59]). Furthermore, in a polemical Parthian hymn one can find one rather obscure line with an explicit reference to the God of Marcion; M28 I: 'That which they (the Jews) did is like (the deed) of the God of Marcion, Who led him who was not his own; and they seized him and killed him.' (Translation: H.-J. Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic Texts from Central Asia*, San Francisco 1993, 127). If we combine this remarkable geographical difference with the fact that the sources on the beginnings of Manichaeism do not betray much influence of Marcion (as we observed in Ch. IV), then it is tempting to conclude that the Marcionite influence on Manichaeism is to be ascribed—at least partly—to Adimantus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Sources: Editions and translations

1. Biblical sources

- BHS K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Stuttgart 1977
- LXX A. Rahlfs (ed.), *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta lxx interpretes*, Stuttgart 1979
- NT E. Nestle and K. Aland (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*, Stuttgart 1990⁴
- Vulg. R. Weber *et al.* (eds.), *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, Stuttgart 1994⁴

2. Manichaeen sources

- Chinese sources* E. Chavannes & P. Pelliot, 'Un traité manichéen retrouvé en Chine', *JA* 10 XVIII (1911), 499–617 (509)
H. Schmidt-Glitzner, *Chinesische Manichaica. Mit textkritischen Anmerkungen und einem Glossar*, Wiesbaden 1987
- CMC *Cologne Mani Codex*
A. Henrichs & L. Koenen, *ZPE* 5 (1970) 97–216; *ZPE* 19 (1975) 1–85; *ZPE* 32 (1978) 87–199; *ZPE* 44 (1981) 210–318; *ZPE* 48 (1982) 1–59
L. Koenen and C. Römer (eds.), *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex. Über das Werden seines Leibes. Kritische Edition aufgrund der von A. Henrichs und L. Koenen besorgten Erstedition*, Opladen 1988
J. van Oort and G. Quispel, *De Keulse Mani-Codex*, Amsterdam 2005
- Kellis texts R.S. Bagnall (ed.), *The Kellis Agricultural Accountbook*, Oxford 1997
I. Gardner (ed.), *Kellis Literary Texts*, I, Oxford 1996
I. Gardner *et al.* (eds.), *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis I*, Oxford 1999
- Kephalaia* C. Schmidt, and H.J. Polotsky (eds.), *Kephalaia I*, Stuttgart 1940
I. Gardner, *The Kephalaia of the Teacher. The edited Coptic*

- Manichaeen texts in translation with commentary*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1995
- Psalm-Book* C.R.C. Alberry (ed.), *A Manichaeen Psalm-Book, Part II*, Stuttgart 1938
G. Wurst (ed.), *The Manichaeen Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library; Psalm Book, Part II, Fasc. 1: Die Bema Psalmen* (CFM, Series Coptica I), Turnhout 1996
A. Villey, *Psaumes des errants. Écrits manichéens du Fayyûm*, Paris 1994
- Silk Road texts* F.C. Andreas & W. Henning, 'Mitteliranische Manichaica' II, SPAW (Ph-Hist.Kl.), Berlin 1933, 249–363
M. Boyce, *A Reader in Manichaeen Middle Persian and Parthian. Texts with Notes*, Leiden 1975
H.-J. Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic Parables, Hymns & Prayers from Central Asia*, New York 1993
W. Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*, Berlin 1981
- A. Adam *Texte zum Manichäismus*, Berlin 1969² (1954¹)
J. Asmussen *Manichaeen Literature*, New York 1975

3. Sources from Nag Hammadi

- Testimonium veritatis* NHC IX, 3; B.A. Pearson (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*, Leiden 1981
- Hypostasis Archonton* NHC II,4; B. Layton (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2–7; together with XIII, 2**, *Brit. Lib. Or.4926(1)*, and *P.Oxy 1, 654, 655*, vol. I, Leiden-New York-København-Köln 1989
- De origine mundi* NHC II,5; idem, vol. II, 1989
- Apocryphon Johannis* Codex Papyrus Berolinensis 8502/NHC III,1 and NHC II,1/IV,1; synoptical edition and translation M. Waldstein and F. Wisse (eds.), *The Apocryphon of John; Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,1; and IV, with BG 8502,2*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1995

4. Augustine

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| Confessiones | CCL 27 |
| Contra Adimantum, Manichaei discipulum | CSEL 25,1; BA 17 |
| Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum | CCL 49 |
| Contra Faustum | CSEL 25,1 |
| De duabus animabus | CSEL 25,1 |
| De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim | CSEL 28,1 |
| De Genesi adversus Manichaeos | CCL 91 |

De moribus Manichaeorum	CSEL 90
Enarrationes in Psalmos	CCL 38–40
Retractationes	CCL 57; BA12
Sermones	CCL 41; PL 38–39; RB 75 (1965)

<i>Cetedoc</i>	<i>Library of Christian Latin Texts, CLCLT-2, Lovanii 1994</i>
F. Dolbeau	<i>Augustin d'Hippone, Vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique. Retrouvés à Mayence, édités et commentés par F. Dolbeau, Paris 1996</i>

5. Other Sources

Alexander of Lycopolis	A. Villey, <i>Alexandre de Lycopolis, 'Contre la doctrine de Mani'</i> , Paris 1985
Ambrose	<i>De Paradiso</i> CSEL 32,1
<i>Didache</i>	K. Wengst, <i>Schriften des Urchristentums</i> , München 1984
(Ps.-) Hegemonius of Chalcedon	<i>Acta Archelai</i> Mark Vermes (transl.), <i>Hegemonius Acta Archelai (The Acts of Archelaus). With introduction and commentary by Samuel N.C. Lieu, with the assistance of Kevin Kaatz</i> , Lovanii 2001
<i>Historia Karka de Beth Selok</i>	AMS, II, 512, 11–14 G. Hoffmann, 'Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer übersetzt und durch Untersuchungen zur historischen Topographie erläutert', in: <i>Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes</i> 7 (1881) no. 3, 46 S.N.C. Lieu & D.A.S. Montserrat, 'From Mesopotamia to the Roman East—The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Eastern Roman Empire', in: S.N.C. Lieu, <i>Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East</i> , Leiden-New York-Köln 1999 ² , 22–131
Papyrus Rylands 496	C.H. Roberts, <i>Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library</i> , Manchester 1938, vol. 3, 38–46 (no. 469)
Photius, <i>Bibliotheca</i>	R. Henry, <i>Photius Bibliothèque</i> , Tome II, Paris 1960
Possidius, <i>Elenchus</i>	A. Wilmart, in: <i>MA</i> , vol. 2, Roma 1931, 149–233
Ptolemaeus, <i>Letter to Flora</i>	G. Quispel, <i>Ptolémée, 'Lettre a Flora'. Texte, traduction et introduction</i> , (Sources Chrétiennes; Série annexe de textes non chrétiens), Paris 1966 ²
Tertullianus, <i>Adversus Marcionem</i> I–V,	E. Evans, <i>Tertullian, 'Adversus Marcionem'. Books I–III/Books IV–V</i> Oxford 1972
Titus of Bostra, <i>Contra Manichaeos</i>	ed. P. de Lagarde, <i>Titus Bostrenus. Syriace et graece</i> , Wiesbaden 1967 ³

2. Secondary Literature

- B. Aland, 'Marcion/Marcioniten', *TRE* 22, 89–101
 ———, 'Sünde und Erlösung bei Marcion', in: G. May *et al.* (eds.) (eds.), *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung*, Berlin-New York 2002, 147–157
- P. Alfarcic, *L'Évolution intellectuelle the Saint Augustin*, I, *Du Manichéisme au Néoplatonisme*, Paris 1918
 ———, *Les écritures manichéennes*, I, *Vue générale*, Paris 1918; II, *Étude analytique*, Paris 1919
- B. Altaner & A. Stuiber, *Patrologie. Leben, Lehre und Schriften der Kirchenväter*, Freiburg-Basel—Wien 1978⁸
- J.P. Asmussen, *X^uâstvânîft. Studies in Manichaeism*, Copenhagen 1965
- N.J. Baker-Brian, "'... quaedaem disputationes Adimanti'" (*Retract.* I.xxii,1). Reading the Manichaean Biblical Discordance in Augustine's *Contra Adimantum*, *AS* 34,2 (2003) 175–196
- I. de Beausobre, *Histoire critique de Maniché et du Manichéisme*, I, Amsterdam 1734 (reprint New York & London 1984)
- J.D. BeDuhn *et al.* (eds.), *Frontiers of faith. The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelaus*, Leiden-Boston 2007
- J.D. BeDuhn & G. Harrison, 'The Tebessa Codex: A Manichaean Treatise on Biblical Exegesis and Church Order', in: P. Mirecki *et al.* (eds.), *Emerging from Darkness. Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997, 33–87
- J.A. van den Berg, 'Wie kan God zien'—Augustinus' *sermo* 12, in: P. van Geest & J. van Oort (eds.), *Augustiniana Neerlandica. Aspecten van Augustinus' spiritualiteit en haar doorwerking*, Leuven 2005, 73–85
- A. Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*, Turnhout s.a
- A. Böhlig, 'Die Bibel bei den Manichäern', (unpublished dissertation) Münster 1947
 ———, 'Christliche Wurzeln im Manichäismus', in: idem, *Mysterion und Wahrheit. Gesammelte Beiträge zur spätantiken Religionsgeschichte*, Leiden 1968, 202–221
- M. Boyce, *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, Leiden 1977
- P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo*, Londen 1990⁶ (pb 1969¹)
 ———, 'The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire', in: idem, *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine*, London 1972, 94–118. First published in *JRS* 59 (1969) 92–103
- H. von Campenhausen, 'Das Alte Testament als Bibel der Kirche', in: idem, *Aus der Frühzeit des Christentums*, Tübingen 1963, 152–196
 ———, *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*, Tübingen 1968
- F. Chatillon, 'Adimantus Manichaei discipulus', *RMAL* 10 (1954) 191–201
- F.F. Church *et al.*, 'Mani's Disciple Thomas and the Psalms of Thomas', *VC* 34 (1980) 47–55
- J.K. Coyle, 'What did Augustine know about Manichaeism when he wrote his two Treatises *De Moribus*?', in: J. van Oort *et al.* (eds.), *Augustine and Mani-*

- chaeism in the Latin West; Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaean Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001, 41–56
- , ‘Saint Augustine’s Manichaean Legacy’, *AS* 34,1 (2003) 1–22
- F. Decret, *Aspects du Manichéisme dans l’Afrique Romaine. Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Felix avec saint Augustin*, Paris 1970
- , *L’Afrique manichéenne (IVe–Ve siècles). Étude historique et doctrinale*, I–II, Paris 1987
- , ‘Adimantum Manichei discipulum (Contra—)’, *AL*, vol. I, 91–93
- , ‘Adimantus’, *AL*, vol. I, 94 f.
- H.J.W. Drijvers, ‘Addai und Mani; Christentum und Manichäismus im dritten Jahrhundert in Syrien’, *OrChrAn* 221 (1983) 171–185
- E. Feldmann, ‘Der junge Augustinus und Paulus. Ein Beitrag zur (manichäischen) Paulus-Rezeption’, in: L. Cirillo & A. Van Tongerloo (eds.), *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi ‘Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico’*, Lovanii-Neapoli 1997, 41–76
- , ‘Der Übertritt Augustins zu den Manichäern’, in: A. Van Tongerloo & J. van Oort (eds.), *The Manichaean NOYΣ*, Leuven 1995, 103–128
- G. Ficker, ‘Eine Sammlung von Abschwörungsformeln’, *ZKG* 27 (1906) 443–464
- M. Franzmann, *Jesus in the Manichaean Writings*, London-New York 2003
- P. Fredriksen, ‘Beyond the body/soul dichotomy: Augustine on Paul against the Manichees and the Pelagians’, *RA* 23 (1988) 87–114
- W.H.C. Frend, ‘The Gnostic-Manichaean Tradition in Roman North Africa’, *JEH* 4 (1953), 13–26
- , *The Rise of Christianity*, Philadelphia 1985
- K. Froehlich, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*, Philadelphia 1984
- W.-F. Funk, ‘The Reconstruction of the Manichaean *Kephalaia*’, in: P. Mirecki et al. (eds.), *Emerging from Darkness. Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997, 143–155
- I. Gardner, ‘Personal Letters from the Manichaean Community at Kellis’, in: L. Cirillo & A. Van Tongerloo, *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi ‘Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico’*, Lovanii-Neapoli 1997, 77–94
- , ‘The Manichaean Community at Kellis: a Progress Report’, in: P. Mirecki & J. BeDuhn (eds.), *Emerging from Darkness; Studies in the Rediscovery of Manichaean Sources*, Leiden-Boston-Köln, 1997
- , ‘He has gone to the monastery’, in: R.E. Emmerick et al. (eds.), *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin 14.–18. Juli 1997*, Berlin 2000, 247–257
- , ‘The Reconstruction of Mani’s *Epistles* from Three Coptic Codices (Ismant el-Kharab and Medinet Madi)’, in: P. Mirecki & J. BeDuhn (eds.), *The Light and the Darkness. Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001, 93–104
- I. Gardner et al., ‘From Narmouthis (Medinet Madi) to Kellis (Ismant El-Kharab): Manichaean Documents from Roman Egypt’, *JRS* 86 (1996) 146–169
- P.W.G. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 2006 (reprint)

- K. Greschat, *Apelles und Hermogenes. Zwei theologische Lehrer des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2000
- A. von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche*, Leipzig 1924² (repr. Darmstadt 1996)
- A. Henrichs, 'The Cologne Mani Codex Reconsidered', *HSCP* 83 (1979) 339–367
- A. Hoffmann, *Augustins Schrift "De utilitate credendi". Eine Analyse*, Münster 1997
- , 'Verfälschung der Jesus-Tradition. Neutestamentliche Texte in der Manichäisch-augustinischen Kontroverse', in: L. Cirillo & A. Van Tongerloo, *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi "Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico"*, Lovanii-Neapoli 1997, 149–182
- G. Hoffmann, 'Auszüge aus syrischen Akten persischer Märtyrer übersetzt und durch Untersuchungen zur historischen Topographie erläutert', *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 7 (1881) no. 3
- R.J. Hoffmann, 'How Then Know This Troublous Teacher? Further Reflections on Marcion and his Church', *SecCent* 6,3 (1987/88) 173–191
- C.A. Hope *et al.*, 'Three Seasons of Excavation at Ismant el-Gharab in the Dakleh Oasis, Egypt', *Mediterranean Archaeology* 1 (1988) 160–177
- , 'The Archaeological Context of the Discovery of Leaves from a Manichaean Codex', *ZPE* 117 (1997) 156–169
- M. Hutter, 'Genesis-"Exegese" in Iranisch-Manichäischen Texten: Die Neudeutung der biblischen Menschenschöpfung im Šābuhragān' (not yet published)
- , 'Mt 25:31–46 in der Deutung Manis', *NT* 33, 3 (1991) 276–282
- F.S. Jones, 'The *Book of Elchasai* in its Relevance for Manichaean Institutions; with a Supplement: The *Book of Elchasai* Reconstructed and Translated', *ARAM* 16 (2004) 179–215
- A.F.J. Klijn, *Edessa, de stad van de apostel Thomas. Het oudste christendom in Syrië*, Baarn 1962
- O. Klíma, *Manis Zeit und Leben*, Prag 1962
- H.-J. Klimkeit, 'Der Gebrauch Heiliger Schriften im Manichäismus', in: G. Schöllgen and C. Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann*, (JbAC—Ergänzungsband 23), Münster 1996, 191–199
- L. Koehler & W. Baumgartner *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, Leiden 1985
- L. Koenen, 'Augustine and Manichaeism in Light of the Cologne Mani Codex', *Illinois Classical Studies* 3 (1978) 154–195
- , 'Manichäische Mission und Klöster in Ägypten', in: G. Grimm *et al.* (eds.), *Das Römisch-Byzantinische Ägypten*, Mainz 1983, 93–108
- A. Kotzé, 'The "Anti-Manichaean" Passage in *Confessions* 3 and its "Manichaean Audience"', *VC* 62 (2008) 187–200
- A. Kunzelmann, 'Die Chronologie der Sermones des hl. Augustins', in: *MA*, vol. 2, Roma 1931, 430–435
- G.W.H. Lampe (ed.), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961
- H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon. With a revised supplement*, Oxford 1996

- S.N.C. Lieu, 'An Early Byzantine Formula for the Renunciation of Manichaeism—The "Capita VII contra Manichaeos" of (Zacharias of Mitylene). Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary', *JbAC* 26 (1983), 152–218; reprint in idem: *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1999² (1994), 203–305
- , *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*, Tübingen 1992²
- , 'Precept and Practice in Manichaean Monasticism', in: idem, *Manichaeism in Central Asia & China*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 1998, 76–97
- S.N.C. Lieu & D.A.S. Montserrat, 'From Mesopotamia to the Roman East—The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Eastern Roman Empire', in: S.N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1999², 22–131
- R. Lim, 'Manichaeans and Public Disputation in Late Antiquity', *RA* 25 (1993) 233–272
- W.A. Löhr, 'Die Auslegung des Gesetzes bei Markion, den Gnostikern und den Manichäern', in: G. Schöllgen und C. Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann*, (JbAC—Ergänzungsband 23), Münster 1996, 77–95
- , 'Did Marcion distinguish between a just god and a good god?', in: G. May et al. (eds.), *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung*, Berlin-New York 2002, 131–146
- G.P. Luttikhuisen, *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*, Leiden-Boston 2006
- C. Marksches, 'Die valentinianische Gnosis und Marcion', in: G. May et al. (eds.), *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung*, Berlin-New York 2002, 159–175
- G. May, 'Marcion in Contemporary Views: Results and Open Questions', *SecCent* 6,3 (1987/88) 129–151
- , 'Marcions Genesis Auslegung und die "Antithesen"', in: D. Wyrwa et al. (eds.), *Die Weltlichkeit des Glaubens in der Alten Kirche. Festschrift für Ulrich Wickert zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Berlin/New York 1997, 189–198
- , 'Marcion ohne Harnack', in: G. May et al. (eds.), *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung*, Berlin-New York 2002, 1–7
- C. Mayer (ed.), *Augustinus-Lexikon*, vol. 1, Basel 1986–1994
- R. Merkelbach, 'Manichaica (1–3)', *ZPE* 56 (1984) 45–53
- , 'Manichaica (5–6)', *ZPE* 58 (1985) 55–58
- , 'Die Täufer, bei denen Mani aufwuchs', in: P. Bryder (ed.), *Manichaean Studies. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism*, Lund 1988, 106–133
- , 'Der manichäische Codex von Tebessa', in: idem, 229–264
- P. Monceaux, *Le manichéen Faustus de Milev. Restitution de ses Capitula*, Paris 1924
- P. Nagel, 'Die Auslegung der Paradieserzählung in der Gnosis', in: K.-W. Tröger, *Altes Testament—Frühjudentum—Gnosis. Neue Studien zu "Gnosis und Bibel"*, Gütersloh 1980, 49–70
- J. van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon. A Study into Augustine's City of God and the*

- Sources of his Doctrine of the Two Cities*, Leiden-New York-Copenhagen-Köln 1991
- , ‘Manicheïsme: Nieuwe ontdekkingen, nieuwe visies’, *NTT* 47 (1993) 21–36
- , *Mani, Manichaeism & Augustine. The Rediscovery of Manichaeism & Its Influence on Western Christianity. Lectures delivered at the State University of Tbilisi & the K. Kekelidze Institute of Manuscripts of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, Tbilisi, Georgia, 26–29 September, 1995*, Tbilisi 1996
- , ‘The Study of the Cologne Mani Codex 1970–1994’, *MSN* 13 (1996) 22–30
- , ‘Manichaeism. Its Sources and Influences on Western Christianity’, in: R. van de Broek & W.J. Hanegraaff (eds.), *Gnosis and Hermeticism from Antiquity to Modern Times*, New York 1998, 37–51
- , ‘Hegemonius’, *RGG* 3 (2000), 1509–1510
- , ‘Mani and Manichaeism in Augustine’s *De Haeresibus*. An analysis of *haer.* 46,1’, in: R.E. Emmerick *et al.* (eds.), *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin 14.–18. Juli 1997*, Berlin 2000, 451–463
- , ‘Würdiging Isaac de Beausobres (1659–1738)’, in: idem, 658–666
- , ‘*Secundi Manichaei Epistula*: Roman Manichaeen Biblical Argument in the Age of Augustine’, in: J. van Oort *et al.* (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001, 161–173
- , ‘Manichäismus’, *RGG* 5 (2002), 732–741
- , *Augustinus’ Confessiones. Gnostische en christelijke spiritualiteit in een diepzinnig document*, Turnhout 2002
- , ‘The Paraclete Mani as the Apostle of Jesus Christ and the Origins of a New Christian Church’, in: A. Hilhorst (ed.), *The Apostolic Age in Patristic Thought*, Leiden-Boston 2004, 139–157
- , ‘The Emergence of Gnostic-Manichaean Christianity as a Case of Religious Identity in the Making’, in: J. Frishman *et al.* (eds.), *Religious Identity and the Problem of Historical Foundation*, Leiden-Boston 2004, 275–285
- , ‘Van Vergilij en Mani tot de Catholica: Augustinus’ oorspronkelijke spiritualiteit’, in: P. van Geest & J. van Oort (eds.), *Augustiniana Neerlandica. Aspecten van Augustinus’ spiritualiteit en haar doorwerking*, Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA 2005, 11–29
- , ‘Heeding and Hiding their particular Knowledge? An Analysis of Augustine’s Dispute with Fortunatus’, in: Thérèse Fuhrer (ed.), *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike* (Philosophie der Antike), Stuttgart 2007, 113–121
- , ‘Young Augustine’s Knowledge of Manichaeism. An Analysis of the *Confessiones* and Some Other Relevant Texts’, *VC* 62 (2008) 425–451
- N.A. Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof in Defence of God. A Study of Titus Bostra’s Contra Manichaeos—The Work’s Sources, Aims and Relation to its Contemporary Theology*, Leiden-Boston 2004
- W.L. Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron. Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1994
- T. Pettipiece, ‘The Faces of the Father: “Pentadization” in the Manichaean *Kephalaia* (Chapter 21)’, *VC* 61 (2007) 407–477

- , *Counting the Cosmos: Pentadic Redaction in the Manichaean Kephalaia*, Leiden-Boston (in the press)
- H.J. Polotsky, 'Manichäismus', in: G. Widengren (ed.), *Der Manichäismus*, Darmstadt 1977, 101–144
- G. Quispel, *Tatian and the Gospel of Thomas: Studies in the History of the Western Diatesseron*, Leiden 1975
- T. Raveaux, 'Adversarium legis et prophetarum (Contra)', *AL*, vol I., 107–112
- C. Reck, 'Die Bekehrung einer Christin zum manichäischen Glauben? Probleme bei der Interpretation eines fragmentarischen Textes', in: A. Mustafa et al. (eds.), *Inkulturation des Christentums im Sasanidenreich*, Wiesbaden 2007, 55–70
- J.C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony. Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions*, Cincinnati 1992
- , *Heralds of that Good Realm; Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1996
- J. Ries, 'Commendements de la justice et vie missionnaire dans l'église de Mani', in: M. Krause (ed.), *Gnosis and Gnosticism*, Leiden 1977, 93–106
- J.M. Robinson, 'The Fate of the Manichaean Codices of Medinet Madi 1929–1989', in: G. Wiefßner and H.-J. Klimkeit (eds.), *Studia Manichaica. II. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, 6.-10. August 1989, St. Augustin/Bonn*, Wiesbaden 1992
- C.E. Römer, *Manis frühe Missionsreisen nach der Kölner Manibibliographie. Textkritischer Kommentar und Erläuterungen zu p. 121–p. 192 des Kölner Mani-Codex*, Opladen 1994
- E. Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie*, Wiesbaden 1979
- , 'Die manichäische Christologie', *ZRG* 32 (1980) 219–231
- K. Rudolph, 'Die Bedeutung des Kölner Mani-Codex für die Manichäismusforschung. Vorläufige Anmerkungen', in: idem, *Gnosis & spätantike Religionsgeschichte. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1996, 667–685
- , 'Jüdische und Christliche Täufertraditionen im Spiegel des Kölner Mani-Codex', in: idem, 686–697
- H.H. Schaeder, *Iranica. 1. Das Auge des Königs. 2. Fu-lin*, Berlin 1934
- C. Schmidt & H.J. Polotsky, 'Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten. Originalschriften des Mani und seiner Schüler', *SPAW* I, Berlin 1933, 4–91
- M. Scopello, 'Hégémonius, les Actes Archelai et l'histoire de la controverse anti-manichéenne', in: R.E. Emmerick et al. (eds.), *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin 14.-18. Juli 1997*, Berlin 2000, 528–545
- W. Seston, 'L'Égypte manichéenne', *Chronique d'Égypte* 14 (1939), 362–372
- G. Sfameni Gasparro, 'Addas-Adimantus unus ex discipulis Manichaei: for the History of Manichaeism in the West', in: R.E. Emmerick et al. (eds.), *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin 14.-18. Juli 1997*, Berlin 2000, 546–599
- N. Sims-Williams, 'The Manichaean Commandments: a Survey of the Sources', in: A.D.H. Bivar (ed.), *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*, ii (Acta Iranica 25, Hommages et Opera Minora 11), Téhéran-Liège 1985, 573–582

- M. Stein, 'Bemerkungen zum Kodex von Tebessa', in: J. van Oort *et al.* (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001, 250–271
- G.G. Stroumsa, 'Monachisme et Marranisme chez les Manichéens d'Égypte', *Numen* 29 (1982) 184–201
- , 'Gnostics and Manichaeans in Byzantine Palestine', in: E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica XVIII*, vol. 1, Kalamazoo 1985, 273–278
- , 'The Manichaean Challenge to Egyptian Christianity', in: B.A. Pearson & J.E. Goehring (eds.), *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, Philadelphia 1986, 306–319
- , 'Isaac de Beausobre Revisited: The Birth of Manichaean Studies', in: R.E. Emmerick *et al.* (eds.), *Studia Manichaica. IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin 14.-18. Juli 1997*, Berlin 2000, 601–612
- W. Sundermann, 'Christliche Evangelientexte in der Überlieferung der iranisch-manichäischen Literatur', *MIO* 14 (1968) 386–405
- , 'Zur frühen missionarischen Wirksamkeit Manis', *AOH* 24 (1971) 79–125
- , 'Iranische Lebensbeschreibungen Manis', *AOH* 36 (1974) 125–149
- , 'Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer', I, II en III, *AF* 13/1 (1986) 40–92, 13/2 (1986) 239–317 and 14/1 (1987) 41–107
- , 'Der Paraklet in ostmanichäischen Überlieferung', in: P. Bryder (ed.), *Manichaeism. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism*, Lund 1988, 201–212
- , 'Iranische Peronennamen der Manichäer', *Die Sprache* 36/2 (1994) 244–270
- M. Tardieu, *Le manichéisme*, Paris 1981
- , 'Les Manichéens en Égypte', *Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie*, 94 (1982) 5–19
- , 'Principes de l'exégèse manichéenne du Nouveau Testament', in: idem, *Les règles de l'interprétation*, Paris 1987, 123–146
- J. Tubach, 'Nochmals Addas-Adeimantos', *ZPE* 106 (1995) 170–174
- , 'Die Namen von Mani's Jungern und ihre Herkunft', in: L. Cirillo and A. Van Tongerloo (eds.), *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di studi Manicheismo e Oriente Cristiano Antico*, Lovanii-Neapoli 1997, 375–393
- B. Utas, 'Mânistân and Xânaqâh', in: A.D.H. Bivar (ed.), *Papers in Honour of Mary Boyce*, ii, *Acta Iranica* 25, *Hommages et Opera Minora* 11, Téhéran-Liège, 1985, 655–664
- A.C. de Veer, 'La date des sermons I, XII et L de saint Augustine', *REA* 15 (1969) 241–246
- J. Vergote, 'Coptica. Het Manichaeisme in Egypte', *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* 9 (1944) 77–83
- , 'L'Expansion du Manichéisme en Égypte', in: C. Laga *et al.* (eds.), *After Chalcedon. Studies in Theology and Church History offered to Professor Albert Van Roey for his Seventieth Birthday*, Leuven 1985, 471–478
- D. Weber, 'De Genesi aduersus Manicheos', *AL* 3, 132–140
- M. Willing, 'Die neue Frage des Marcionschülers Apelles—zur Rezeption mar-

- cionitischen Gedankenguts', in: G. May *et al.* (eds.), *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung*, Berlin-New York 2002, 221–231
- G. Wurst, 'Bemerkungen zu Struktur und *genus litterarium* der *Capitula* des Faustus von Mileve', in: J. van Oort *et al.* (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeic Studies (IAMS)*, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001, 307–324

INDICES

1. *Index of persons*

- Abimelech, 186
Abizachias (disciple of Mani), 20
Abraham, 88, 98, 112, 186, 187
Abzakya (disciple of Mani), 32
Adam (first man), 87, 106, 108, 128, 131, 171, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 204, 210
Adam (supposed disciple of Mani) 14
Adam, A., 6, 13, 14, 15, 34, 39, 195
Addas see Adimantus
Adimantus *passim*
Aland, B., 139, 141
Aland, K., 125, 145
Alcock, A., 37
Alexander of Lycopolis, 21, 22, 35, 38
Alfaric, P., 8, 17, 19, 20, 94, 201
Allbery, C.R.C., 21
Ambrose of Milan, 191, 192
Ananias, 83
Andreas, F.C., 7, 14, 28
Apelles, 172, 173, 189, 190, 191, 192, 194, 218, 220
Asmussen, J.P., 28, 45
Augustine of Hippo *passim*
Aurades (disciple of Mani), 23

Bagnall, R.S., 45
Baker-Brian, N.J., 53, 73, 74, 166
Baraies (disciple of Mani) 13, 171
Bardy, G., 76
Bathsheba, 186
Baumgartner, W., 22
Beausobre, I. de, 12, 16, 17, 38, 39
BeDuhn, J., 3, 9, 23, 42, 156, 178, 208, 219
Berg, J.A. van den, 175
Bivar, A.D.H., 42, 46

Blaise, A., 44
Böhlig, A., 3, 140, 210, 211
Boyce, M., 7, 28
Broek, R. van de 2
Brown, P., 2, 52, 102
Bryder, P., 170, 195, 219

Cain, 106, 108, 128
Chatillon, F., 17
Chrysostomus (Johannes), 20
Cirillo, L., 1, 20, 42, 206
Coyle, J.K., 58, 59, 60

David (king of Israel), 69, 98, 186, 187
Decret, F., 6, 8, 12, 18, 20, 38, 39, 50, 52, 53, 64, 65, 66, 67, 71, 76, 129, 152, 153, 181
Diocletian (Roman emperor)
Diodore of Tarsus, 46, 178
Dolbeau, F., 77, 80, 81, 82, 94, 120, 152
Drijvers, H.J.W., 6, 12, 13, 15, 18

Elchasai, 170, 171
Elijah, 83
Elliger, K., 125
Emmerick, R.E., 9, 40, 156, 172, 180

Enoch, 171
Enosh, 171
Evans, E., 141, 154
Eve (first woman), 106, 108, 127, 128, 190, 210

Faustus of Milevis (Manichaean Bishop), 3, 4, 9, 38, 39, 40, 46, 57, 59, 60, 67, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 120, 126, 132, 156,

- Faustus of Milevis (Manichaean Bishop) (*continued*), 168, 169, 177, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 206, 208, 211, 215, 217, 219
 Feldmann, E., 3, 55
 Ficker, G., 6, 13, 15, 16
 Franzmann, M., 160
 Frend, W.H.C., 24, 40, 140, 155, 156, 157
 Frishman, J., 26
 Fuhrer, T., 60
 Funk, W.-P., 9, 22, 23, 37, 178, 208, 209, 210, 211

 Gabriabios (disciple of Mani), 13
 Gardner, I., 1, 2, 3, 7, 23, 27, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 140, 207, 209, 210
 Geest, P. van, 1, 56, 175
 Glare, P.W.G., 202
 Goar, J., 15
 Goehring, J.E., 35
 Greschat, K., 173, 191, 192
 Grimm, G., 7, 26

 Hagar, 186
 Hanegraaff, W.J., 2
 Harnack, A. von, 139, 141, 145, 153, 157, 173
 Harrison, G., 219
 Hegemonius, 17, 156
 Henning, W., 7, 14, 28
 Henrichs, A., 1, 42, 170
 Henry, R., 46, 178
 Heraclianus (of Chalcedon), 46, 177, 178, 188, 189, 200, 205
 Hilhorst, A., 2, 195
 Hoffmann, A., 53, 206
 Hoffmann, G., 32
 Hope, C.A., 2
 Hosea, 186, 187
 Hutter, M., 102

 Innaïos (disciple of Mani), 13
 Isaac, 186

 Jacob, 186, 187
 Jolivet, R., 44
 Jones, F.S., 172
 Jourjon, M., 44, 54, 67, 129
 Judah, 187

 Klijn, A.F.J., 130
 Klimkeit, H.-J., 4, 27, 30, 220
 Koehler, L., 22
 Koenen, L., 1, 7, 25, 26, 34, 42, 43, 45, 46, 170, 171
 Kotzé, A., 56
 Krause, M., 42
 Kunzelmann, A., 78

 Laga, C., 7, 34
 Lagarde, P. de, 9, 189, 204, 206
 Lampe, G.W.H., 200
 Layton, B., 191
 Leah, 186
 Liddell, H.G., 200
 Lim, R., 47, 201
 Löhr, W.A., 24, 140
 Lot, 186, 187
 Luttkhuizen, G.P., 171

 Makarios (Egyptian Manichaean), 41, 42
 Mani (*sive* Manichaeus), 2, 3, 6, 12, 13, 14, 17, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 55, 57, 58, 59, 96, 123, 140, 154, 165, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 177, 178, 179, 181, 184, 188, 189, 192, 194, 195, 196, 201, 203, 204, 206, 207, 209, 212, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220
 Mani (Manichaean Abbot), 26, 28, 30
 Marcion, 9, 24, 123, 124, 139, 140, 141, 143, 145, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 168, 170, 172, 218, 220
 Maria, 182
 Marksches, C., 140
 May, G., 139, 140, 141, 158, 173
 Mayer, C.

- Merkelbach, R., 6, 14, 15, 16, 19, 24, 140, 170, 219
- Migne, J.-P., 15
- Mirecki, P., 3, 9, 23, 42, 156, 178, 208, 219
- Monceaux, P., 183
- Montserrat, D.A.S., 7, 25
- Moses, 14, 16, 98, 99, 109, 110, 155, 164, 186, 187, 215
- Mustafa, A., 220
- Nafṣā, 28, 32, 35, 36, 38, 40
- Nagel, P., 145, 190, 213
- Nestle, E., 125, 130
- Odaenathus (Septimus), 32, 33, 40
- Oort, J. van, 1, 2, 3, 4, 12, 23, 24, 26, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 67, 102, 104, 133, 140, 156, 159, 160, 171, 175, 181, 195, 219
- Paapis (disciple of Mani), 13
- Pappos (disciple of Mani), 21, 22, 23, 35, 38
- Patticius (*sive* Pattīg Manichæan Teacher), 22, 26, 27, 28, 30, 33, 35, 40, 47
- Paul (apostle), 43, 44, 68, 72, 73, 91, 92, 94, 109, 110, 116, 118, 119, 120, 133, 134, 135, 136, 146, 147, 160, 161, 164, 166, 167, 173, 174, 202
- Pearson, B.A., 35, 190
- Pedersen, N.A., 2, 9, 58, 177, 178, 180, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 198, 205, 206, 210
- Peter (apostle), 83, 132, 143, 155
- Petersen, W.L., 132
- Pettipiece, T., 10, 178, 208
- Pharaoh, 186
- Photius (bishop of Constantinople), 46, 177, 178, 200
- Piène (Egyptian Manichæan), 42, 43
- Polotsky, H.J., 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 42, 207, 210, 211
- Possidius, 75, 76, 88, 100, 102, 120
- Prosper, 39
- Quispel, G., 132, 171
- Rachel, 186
- Rahlf's, A., 125
- Reck, C., 220
- Reeves, J.C., 171
- Ries, J., 42
- Roberts, C.H., 34
- Robinson, J.M., 27
- Römer, C.E., 1, 25, 170, 171
- Rose, E., 160
- Rudolph, K., 170
- Rudolph, W., 125
- Salmaios (disciple of Mani), 13
- Sapphira, 83
- Sarah, 186
- Sarthion (disciple of Mani), 23
- Schmidt, C., 21, 22, 23, 27, 207, 210, 211
- Schmidt-Glitzler, H., 32, 165
- Schöllgen, G., 4, 24, 140
- Scholten, C., 4, 24, 140
- Scopello, M., 156
- Scott, R., 200
- Seston, W., 21, 22
- Seth, 171
- Sfameni Gasparro, G., 9, 180, 188, 203, 204, 205, 206
- Shâpûr I (king of Persia), 25, 32, 33, 34
- Shem, 171
- Simplicianus, 51
- Sims-Williams, N., 42
- Sisinnios (disciple of Mani), 23, 209
- Solomon, 117, 129, 186, 187
- Staples, H., 10
- Staples, P., 10
- Stein, M., 219
- Stroumsa, G.G., 7, 12, 21, 22, 34, 35, 44
- Sundermann W., 3, 7, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 133, 195
- Tadi see Zenobia
- Tamar, 186, 187

- Tardieu, M., 7, 9, 21, 22, 26, 27, 33,
34, 35, 36, 42, 133, 178, 206, 208,
209, 211
- Tatian, 26, 132, 133
- Tertullian, 24, 140, 141, 153, 155
- Thomas (apostle), 83, 142
- Thomas (disciple of Mani), 13, 35,
38
- Timothy, 119
- Titus of Bostra, 9, 18, 46, 177, 180,
188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 198, 203,
204, 205, 206, 207, 217, 220
- Tongerloo, A. Van, 1, 3, 20, 42, 55,
206
- Tröger, K.-W., 145, 190, 213
- Tubach, J., 6, 9, 16, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24,
25
- Uriah, 186, 187
- Utas, B., 46
- Uzziah, 118
- Veer, A.C. de, 8, 76, 78
- Vergote, J., 7, 34, 37, 46
- Villey, A., 21, 22, 35
- Waldstein, M., 190
- Weber, D., 102
- Weber, R., 126
- Wengst, K., 43
- Widengren, G., 26
- Wießner, G., 27
- Willing, M., 173
- Wilmart, A., 76
- Wisse, F., 190
- Wurst, G., 22, 67, 181, 183, 184
- Wyrwa, D., 139
- Zacharias of Mytilene 13
- Zarouas (disciple of Mani) 13
- Zenobia, 32, 33, 38

2. Index of Bible texts

GEN.		18:9–16	97
1	77, 158	22	86, 88, 89
1–3	219	22:2	100
1:1	63, 72, 73 f., 75, 141	Ex.	
1:2	97	3:2	173
1:3	63	20:5	62, 106, 110, 128, 150
1:1–5	62, 78, 79, 105, 126, 127, 150, 161	20:8 f.	97
1:6 f.	55	20:12	72 f., 80, 81, 106, 131, 150
1:26	107, 150, 158, 159	21:24	108, 128, 150, 156, 162
2–3	188, 193, 205	23:22 ff.	74, 114, 151
2–4	108, 128, 150	25:2–8	109, 150
2:1 ff.	103, 104, 105, 151, 210	34:15	110, 128, 150
2:2	162	35:2	97
2:16 f.	97	LEV.	
2:18–24	106, 127, 130, 150	1–7	100
2:22	130	11:14 f.	97, 112, 150
2:24	130	17:12 ff.	110, 150, 163
3:9	97, 190		
4:10 f.	72, 106, 150		
17:9–14	100, 113, 150		

20:25	97, 101, 112, 150	145 (LXX)	83, 93
26:3-10	62, 115, 139, 151, 166	145:6 (LXX)	92
NUM.		PROV.	
15	151	3:13-15	129
15:32-36	100, 116, 151	6:6ff.	44, 83, 92, 117, 151
		6:11	129
		10:10	90, 91, 92, 121
DT.		22:2	129
4:1	97		
4:23 f.	62, 111, 150	ISA.	
5:12-15	112, 150	6:1 f.	71, 118, 135
12:15 f.	111, 131, 150	31:9 (LXX)	94, 97, 99, 120
12:23	97	45:7	118, 151, 153, 154
13:3	89, 90, 121		
14:8	101	DAN.	
14:13	97, 112, 150	7:10	171
16	101		
17:3 ff.	210	HOS.	
19:21	82	9:14 ff.	117, 151
21:23	97, 99, 116, 130, 151, 157	AMOS	
28:1-6	114, 151	3:3-6	118, 151, 154, 210
28:13 f.	97	ZEPH.	
28:18	129	1:14 f.	76, 102, 151
33:9	80		
JOS.		HAG.	
6	141	2:9	75, 86, 119, 151
1 KI.		MT.	
3:13	129	1:1-17	196
2 KI.		5:3	115, 148, 149, 151
1	83	5:3-10	97, 102, 199
JOB		5:4	148, 149
1:6	76, 84, 85, 119, 151, 167	5:8	76, 84, 97, 119, 151
PS.		5:9	118, 151, 154
35:7 (LXX)	92, 93, 94, 120, 151	5:15	201
106:1 (LXX)	69	5:17	100, 101, 183, 197, 203
126:3 (LXX)	129	5:21	71, 134
127:3 f. (LXX)	117, 129, 144, 151	5:33	97
143 (LXX)	64, 65	5:34 f.	109, 150
		5:38-40	82, 97, 108, 128, 150, 156, 162
		5:43	97

Mt. (<i>continued</i>)		8:38	114, 151
5:44	74, 82, 114, 151	10:17f.	111, 132, 150
5:45	108, 150		
6:25	198	Lk.	139, 141
6:26	93, 106, 133, 150	3:23-38	196
6:34	44, 94, 97, 106, 117, 133, 137, 150, 151	6:1-11	157
7:16f.	97	6:24	115, 151
7:17	118, 151, 155, 210	6:27-31	156
7:17-20	209	6:43	153
7:21	199	8:1-8	74
9:13	100, 101, 120, 151	8:16	201
10:9f.	116, 139, 151, 166	8:20	155
10:28	110, 146, 150, 163	8:43-49	81
10:29	97	9:54	83
10:29ff.	93, 94	9:59f.	80, 81, 106, 150
12:7	100, 101, 120, 151	12:20	71, 116, 139, 151, 166
12:10-13	100, 116, 151	13:1-5	81
12:47	155	14:26f.	81
13:22	135	16:9	86, 119, 151
15:11	97, 98, 101, 112, 148, 150	18:18f.	132
16:24	99, 116, 133, 151, 157	21:34	111, 135, 150, 198
16:24ff.	114, 151	JOHN	
18:10	136	1	77f., 158
18:15	91, 92, 121	1:1	75, 78
18:22	92, 108, 132, 150	1:1-3	79, 127, 141
19:3-9	142	1:3	134
19:4f.	130	1:10	63, 79, 105, 134, 150, 160
19:12	72, 97, 151	1:18	109, 150
19:12f.	117, 144	5:17	97, 103, 104, 105, 150, 210
19:16f.	132	5:37	109, 150
19:21	97, 99, 116, 133, 151, 199	6:5f.	88, 89
19:26f.	97	8:13-18	185
19:29	97, 106, 150, 198	8:25	78
22:30	71, 117, 132, 151	8:44	107, 150, 158, 159
23:15	97, 100, 113, 138, 150	10	97
23:33	106, 150, 158	10:9	84, 119, 135, 151, 167
25:31-40	102, 120, 151, 199	14:6	84, 119, 135, 151
28:19	199	15:10	199
Mk.		15:14	199
3:28f.	89	16	3
7:14	101, 112, 148, 150	16:7	195
		17:25	110, 150

ACTS	143	GAL.	
5:1-11	83	3:13	99, 116, 130, 157
		4:10 f.	71, 101, 113, 134, 150
ROM.		EPH.	
2:9-29	3	1:21	136, 137
7	76	3:10	84, 119, 137, 151, 167
11:36	63	6:2 f.	81
14:21	54, 111, 147, 148, 150	COL.	
		1:15 f.	63, 78, 79, 105, 133 f., 150, 160, 161
1 COR.		1:16a	134
2:6 ff.	136	2:16	135
7	43	1 TIM.	
7:18 f.	113, 150	1:17	118, 135, 151
7:29	94, 95, 99, 120, 151	5:16	44
9:9	92, 93, 120, 151	6:10	86, 119, 151
10:4	144	6:11	97
10:20	112, 150	6:16	109, 150
10:21	111, 150	JAS.	
14:33	116, 139, 151	1:13	89, 90, 121
15:24	136, 137		
15:50	68, 110, 146, 147, 150, 163, 164		
2 COR.			
3:5 f.	202		
4:7	203		

NAG HAMMADI AND MANICHAEAN STUDIES

9. Schmidt, C. (ed.). *Pistis Sophia*. Translation and notes by V. MacDermot. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05635 1
10. Fallon, F.T. *The enthronement of Sabaoth*. Jewish elements in Gnostic creation myths. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05683 1
11. Parrott, D.M. *Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VI with Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, 1 and 4*. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05798 6
12. Koschorke, K. *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum*. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Nag Hammadi-Traktate 'Apokalypse des Petrus' (NHC VII, 3) und 'Testimonium Veritatis' (NHC IX, 3). 1978. ISBN 90 04 05709 9
13. Schmidt, C. (ed.). *The Books of Jeu and the untitled text in the Bruce Codex*. Translation and notes by V. MacDermot. 1978. ISBN 90 04 05754 4
14. McL. Wilson, R. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis*. Papers read at the First International Congress of Coptology (Cairo, December 1976). 1978. ISBN 90 04 05760 9
15. Pearson, B.A. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X*. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06377 3
16. Barns, J.W.B., G.M. Browne, & J.C. Shelton, (eds.). *Nag Hammadi Codices*. Greek and Coptic papyri from the cartonnage of the covers. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06277 7
17. Krause, M. (ed.). *Gnosis and Gnosticism*. Papers read at the Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies. Oxford, September 3rd-8th, 1979. 1981. ISBN 90 04 06399 4
18. Helderman, J. *Die Anapausis im Evangelium Veritatis*. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung des valentinianisch-gnostischen Heilsgutes der Ruhe im Evangelium Veritatis und in anderen Schriften der Nag-Hammadi Bibliothek. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07260 8
19. Frickel, J. *Hellenistische Erlösung in christlicher Deutung*. Die gnostische Naassenerschrift. Quellen, kritische Studien, Strukturanalyse, Schichtenscheidung, Rekonstruktion der Anthropos-Lehrschrift. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07227 6
- 20-21. Layton, B. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7, together with XIII, 2** *Brit. Lib. Or. 4926(1) and P. Oxy. 1, 654, 655*. I. Gospel according to Thomas, Gospel according to Philip, Hypostasis of the Archons, Indexes. II. On the origin of the world, Expository treatise on the Soul, Book of Thomas the Contender. 1989. 2 volumes. ISBN 90 04 09019 3
22. Attridge, H.W. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex)*. I. Introductions, texts, translations, indices. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07677 8
23. Attridge, H.W. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex)*. II. Notes. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07678 6
24. Stroumsa, G.A.G. *Another seed. Studies in Gnostic mythology*. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07419 8
25. Scopello, M. *L'exégèse de l'âme*. Nag Hammadi Codex II, 6. Introduction, traduction et commentaire. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07469 4
26. Emmel, S. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex III, 5*. The Dialogue of the Savior. 1984. ISBN 90 04 07558 5

27. Parrott, D.M. (ed.) *Nag Hammadi Codices III, 3-4 and V, 1 with Papyrus Bero-linensis 8502,3 and Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1081*. Eugnostos and the Sophia of Jesus Christ. 1991. ISBN 90 04 08366 9
28. Hedrick, C.W. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codices XI, XII, XIII*. 1990. ISBN 90 04 07825 8
29. Williams, M.A. *The immovable race*. A gnostic designation and the theme of stability in Late Antiquity. 1985. ISBN 90 04 07597 6
30. Pearson, B.A. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex VII*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10451 8
31. Sieber, J.H. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi Codex VIII*. 1991. ISBN 90 04 09477 6
32. Scholer, D.M. *Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1970-1994*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 09473 3
33. Wisse, F. & M. Waldstein, (eds.). *The Apocryphon of John*. Synopsis of Nag Ham-madi Codices II,1; III,1; and IV,1 with BG 8502,2. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10395 3
34. Lelyveld, M. *Les logia de la vie dans l'Evangile selon Thomas*. A la recherche d'une tradition et d'une rédaction. 1988. ISBN 90 04 07610 7
35. Williams, F. (Tr.). *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Book I (Sects 1-46). 1987. Reprint 1997. ISBN 90 04 07926 2
36. Williams, F. (Tr.). *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. Books II and III (Sects 47-80, *De Fide*). 1994. ISBN 90 04 09898 4
37. Gardner, I. *The Kephalaia of the Teacher*. The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation with Commentary. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10248 5
38. Turner, M.L. *The Gospel according to Philip*. The Sources and Coherence of an Early Christian Collection. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10443 7
39. van den Broek, R. *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10654 5
40. Marjanen, A. *The Woman Jesus Loved*. Mary Magdalene in the Nag Hammadi Library and Related Documents. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10658 8
41. Reeves, J.C. *Heralds of that Good Realm*. Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10459 3
42. Rudolph, K. *Gnosis & spätantike Religionsgeschichte*. Gesammelte Aufsätze. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10625 1
43. Mirecki, P. & J. BeDuhn, (eds.). *Emerging from Darkness*. Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10760 6
44. Turner, J.D. & A. McGuire, (eds.). *The Nag Hammadi Library after Fifty Years*. Proceedings of the 1995 Society of Biblical Literature Commemoration. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10824 6
45. Lieu, S.N.C. *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China*. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10405 4
46. Heuser, M & H.-J. Klimkeit. *Studies in Manichaean Literature and Art*. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10716 9
47. Zöckler, T. *Jesu Lehren im Thomasevangelium*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11445 9
48. Petersen, S. "Zerstört die Werke der Weiblichkeit!". Maria Magdalena, Salome und andere Jüngerinnen Jesu in christlich-gnostischen Schriften. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11449 1
49. Van Oort, J., O. Wermelinger & G. Wurst (eds.). *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht International Symposium of the IAMS. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11423 8
50. Mirecki, P. & J. BeDuhn (eds.). *The Light and the Darkness*. Studies in Mani-chaism and its World. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11673 7

51. Williams, F.E. *Mental Perception*. A Commentary on NHC, VI,4: The Concept of Our Great Power. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11692 3
52. Pleše, Z. *Poetics of the Gnostic Universe*. Narrative and Cosmology in the *Apocryphon of John*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 11674 5
53. Scopello, M. *Femme, Gnose et manichéisme*. De l'espace mythique au territoire du réel. 2005. ISBN 90 04 11452 1
54. Bethge, H., S. Emmel, K.L. King, & I. Schletterer (eds.). *For the Children, Perfect Instruction*. Studies in Honor of Hans-Martin Schenke on the Occasion of the Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften's Thirtieth Year. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12672 4
55. Van Oort, J. (ed.). *Gnostica, Judaica, Catholica. Collected Essays of Gilles Quispel*. With additional Prefaces by A. DeConick & J.-P. Mahé. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 13945 9
56. Pedersen, N., *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. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13883 8
57. Gulácsi, Z. *Mediaeval Manichaean Book Art*. A Codicological Study of Iranian and Turkic Illuminated Book Fragments from 8th-11th Century East Central Asia. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13994 X
58. Luttikhuisen, G.P. *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14510 9
59. Asgeirsson, J.M., A.D. DeConick & R. Uro (eds.). *Thomasine Traditions in Antiquity*. The Social and Cultural World of the Gospel of Thomas. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14779 9
60. Thomassen, E., *The Spiritual Seed – The Church of the 'Valentinians'*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14802 7
61. BeDuhn, J. & P. Mirecki (eds.). *Frontiers of Faith*. The Christian Encounter with Manichaeism in the Acts of Archelaus. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16180 1
62. Scopello, M. (ed.). *The Gospel of Judas in Context*. Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Gospel of Judas Paris, Sorbonne, October 27th-28th, 2006. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16721 6
63. Williams, F. (tr.). *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book I. (Sects 1-46)* Second Edition, Revised and Expanded. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17017 9
64. BeDuhn, J.D. (ed.). *New Light on Manichaeism*. Papers from the Sixth International Congress on Manichaeism. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17285 2
65. Scholer, D.M. *Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1995-2006*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17240 1
66. Pettipiece, T. *Pentadic Redaction in the Manichaean Kephalaia*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17436 8
67. Tite, P.L. *Valentinian Ethics and Paraenetic Discourse*. Determining the Social Function of Moral Exhortation in Valentinian Christianity. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17507 5
68. Rasimus, T. *Paradise Reconsidered in Gnostic Mythmaking*. Rethinking Sethianism in Light of the Ophite Evidence. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17323 1
69. Coyle, J.K. *Manichaeism and Its Legacy*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17574 7
70. Van den Berg, J.A. *Biblical Argument in Manichaean Missionary Practice*. The Case of Adimantus and Augustine. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 18034 5
71. DeConick, A.D. (ed.). *The Codex Judas Papers*. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Tchacos Codex Held at Rice University, Houston Texas, March 13-16, 2008. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 18141 0