

Augustine's *Contra Epistulam Fundamenti*: A Study of the
Epistula Fundamenti, Augustine's Knowledge of Manichaean
Cosmogony and His Response to this *Epistula*, with Commentary

Kevin Warren Kaatz

B.S., University of Michigan, 1987
B.A., Honours, University of Michigan, 1996
M.A., Graduate Theological Union, 1998

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Ancient History, Division of Humanities
Macquarie University, Sydney

June 2003



**HIGHER DEGREE THESIS
AUTHOR'S CONSENT
(DOCTORAL)**

This is to certify that I, Kevin W. Kaatz
being a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
am aware of the policy of the University relating to the retention and use of
higher degree theses as contained in the University's Doctoral Rules
generally, and in particular Rule 7(10).

In the light of this policy and the policy of the above Rules, I agree to allow
a copy of my thesis to be deposited in the University Library for
consultation, loan and photocopying forthwith.

Patricia Linder
Signature of Witness

Kevin W. Kaatz
Signature of Candidate

Dated this 25 day of June 2003

Office Use Only

The Academic Senate on 17 February 04 resolved that the candidate
had satisfied requirements for admission to the degree of Ph.D.
This thesis represents a major part of the prescribed program of study.

Acknowledgments

First of all I would like to thank my primary supervisor, Prof. Sam Lieu, and my associate supervisor, Associate Prof. Alanna Nobbs, for all of their help and encouragement during my time in Australia. I would also like to thank Sam for allowing access to the *Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum* database held at Macquarie University as well as the opportunity to have a desk in the Manichaean room. This meant that all my time spent on campus was in that room, but this dissertation would have been much poorer without that amazing collection of Manichaean texts and related books. Special thanks must also go to Dr. Andrew Gillett. Andrew, who despite not being my supervisor, spent a great deal of time proof-reading my dissertation (some of it while on holiday at the beach!). I am very grateful for all of his help and advice. This dissertation also greatly benefited from the amazing linguistic abilities of Rev. Greg Fox. Greg played an important part in helping me with Latin.

One bonus of having a desk in the Manichaean Room was the opportunity to be surrounded by a number of friends. I would like to thank Dr. Malcolm Choat, Peter Edwell, Dr. Trevor Evans, and Dr. Norman Ricklefs for their friendship and enthusiasm for all things Late Antique throughout my time in Australia. Mrs. Pat Geidans and Mrs. Beth Lewis are also two other people at the Ancient History Documentary Centre at Macquarie who made me feel instantly at home when I arrived in Australia. The idea of a “morning tea” was very foreign to me, but now I have grown to appreciate that it wasn’t just a time to stop work and drink tea – it was a time to get to know the people who would become my very good friends. Without Pat and Beth around, my experience would have no doubt been very different. I also need to thank my good friend Elizabeth Hinton. I met Elizabeth at one of the night seminars at Macquarie and we have been good friends ever since. Her friendship and support has been very important to me.

My interest in Late Antiquity and Augustine in particular began the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California. I would like to thank my advisor, Prof. Bill Countryman for his help during my two years there. A special thanks must also go to two other people as well. Margo Webster, the Registrar of the Church Divinity School of the Pacific (CDSP) at the GTU, was the prime reason why I chose to attend CDSP and the GTU. She was (and is) a major source of inspiration and friendship. Prof. Mark Delp, at the Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology at the GTU, was the main factor in helping me decide to study Augustine. He is an enthusiastic teacher and I hope that some of that will rub off on me.

Before beginning a Ph.D. in Ancient History, I worked in Dr. Roger Albin’s Neuroscience lab at the University of Michigan for nearly nine years. Roger was always a kind and enthusiastic employer and without his support, understanding, and his love of ancient history, I would not have been able to begin my second Bachelor’s Degree in Religious Studies while working with him.

My time as a Ph.D. student was also greatly enhanced by receiving an International Postgraduate Research Scholarship. For this I would like to thank the Australian Government. I would also like to thank Macquarie University for the opportunity to receive a Postgraduate Research Grant, which allowed me to do research at both the Graduate Theological Union and the St. Paul University Library in Ottawa, Canada, in 2002.

I would also like to thank my parents, Warren and Sharon, my sister Laura and her family, as well as Doug’s parents, Mac and Cheryl and all of Doug’s family for their love and friendship throughout my M.A. and Ph.D. This also goes for all of my friends, both here and in the States, that I have made on my journey.

Finally, I would like to thank Doug for everything. Without his unfailing love and support through all of these years and over two continents, this dissertation never would have gotten off the ground.

For Doug

Table of Contents

Synopsis.....	iii
Declaration.....	v
Abbreviations.....	vi
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 The <i>Contra ep. fund.</i> and the <i>Ep. Fund.</i>	3
1.2 Preliminaries.....	9
1.2.1 Authenticity	9
1.2.2 Dating the <i>Contra ep. fund.</i>	10
1.2.3 Dating the <i>Ep. fund.</i>	12
1.2.4 Audience: The Complex of Persons	13
1.2.4.1 The Manichaeans in General	14
1.2.4.2 To a Single, Nameless Manichaean	14
1.2.4.3 The Rest of his Audience.....	15
1.3 The Topical Outline of <i>Contra ep. fund.</i>	17
2 The Mystery of the <i>Epistula Fundamenti</i>	21
2.1 The <i>Living Gospel</i> or its replacement.....	25
2.2 The Text to the <i>Picture Book (Ardahang)?</i>	29
2.3 <i>Ep. fund.</i> and the <i>Kephalaia</i>	32
2.4 A Handbook for Initiates	38
2.5 The <i>Precepts of the Hearers and the Elect?</i>	41
2.6 The <i>Ep. fund.</i> as a part of the Mani Epistles?	43
2.7 Summary.....	45
3 Augustine's Knowledge of Manichaean Cosmogony.....	48
3.1 The Early Life of Augustine (354-400)	48
3.2 Augustine the Manichaean Hearer.....	56
3.3 Augustine's History as a Hearer	64
3.3.1 <i>Utilitate Credendi (Util. cred.)</i>	65
3.3.2 <i>Duabus Animabus (Duab. an.)</i>	66
3.3.3 The Letter of Secundinus to Augustine and His Response.....	68
3.4 Augustine's Manichaean Cosmogonic Comments (386-396) and the <i>Ep. fund.</i>	71

3.4.1	His Anti-Manichaean Works	73
3.5	Possible Problems	79
3.6	Summary	81
4	Augustine's Response (1): Use of Scripture	83
4.1	Jerome, Augustine, and the Vulgate	85
4.2	Potential Pitfalls	88
4.3	The Texts	90
4.4	Summary	122
4.4.1	His Use of Scripture	122
4.4.2	The Texts	123
5	Augustine's Response (2): The Ascent	126
5.1	Augustine's Teaching Method and the Rarity of Understanding	129
5.2	The Ascent in Augustine's Writings	133
5.3	The Ascent in the <i>Contra ep. fund.</i>	143
5.3.1	Ascent One	143
5.3.2	Ascent Two: Understanding Materiality	145
5.3.2.1	Space: Aliud habentem hic et aliud alibi	147
5.3.3	The Soul	150
5.3.4	From Memory To God	154
5.3.5	Matter: Its Application in the <i>Ep. fund.</i>	156
5.3.5.1	The Border Issue and materiality	157
5.3.5.2	God, <i>Creatio de nihilo</i> and Goodness	162
5.4	Summary	167
6	Conclusions	169
7	Commentary	174
8	Bibliography	307

SYNOPSIS

Augustine's *Contra epistolam quam uocant Fundamenti* (*Contra ep. fund.*), written in 396 soon after he became bishop, is a little-studied work. It is, in effect, two works in one: the Manichaean *Epistula Fundamenti* (*Ep. fund.*) and Augustine's response to this letter. Therefore the dissertation was broken up into two parts, followed by a commentary: the first (Chapters Two and Three) examines what the *Ep. fund.* might have been, followed by an analysis of Augustine's knowledge of Manichaean cosmogony, from his own words. The second half of the dissertation (Chapters Four and Five) examines Augustine's response to the *Ep. fund.*

Chapter Two is a detailed analysis of what the *Ep. fund.* might be. While the *Epistula Fundamenti* has been the object of two studies, there has been no detailed investigation of what this work might have been. It was determined that, as the title suggests, it was a letter from the hand of Mani, the founder of Manichaeism. Following from this, the dissertation then examines how the *Ep. fund.* can be used to show what kind of Manichaean Augustine really was (Chapter Three). It was determined that while Augustine was knowledgeable about Manichaean cosmogony, it was only after he had become a bishop that this particular knowledge grew, aided mostly by the *Epistula Fundamenti*.

Unlike the *Ep. fund.* itself, Augustine's response to this particular letter has never been studied. Thus the second part of the dissertation deals with Augustine's response. This was broken up into two parts. First, Augustine's use of scripture against the Manichaeans was examined (Chapter Four). Second, Augustine's response to the *Ep. fund.* (Chapter Five) was investigated. It was found that this response was primarily a philosophical one, guided by the idea of an ascent of the soul. It was shown that Augustine was using this ascent to teach the Manichaeans both the correct way to think about matter and therefore the correct way to think

about God. A commentary on the Latin text of the *Contra ep. fund.* completes the dissertation.

DECLARATION

I, Kevin W. Kaatz, certify that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other university or institution.

Kevin W. Kaatz

Date:

Jan 13, 2004

ABBREVIATIONS

BA *Bibliothèque Augustinienne, Oeuvres de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1949-)

CCL *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* (Turnhout, 1953-)

CSEL *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna, 1865-)

PL *Patrologia Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, J. P. Migne (ed.) (Paris, 1844-64)

Works of Augustine

Abbreviation	Full Latin Name	Edition
Adn. Iob	Adnotationes in Iob	CSEL 28.2
Agon.	De agone christiano liber unus	CSEL 41
An. et or.	De anima et eius origine	CSEL 60
B. uita	De beata uita	CSEL 29
Cath.	Ad catholicos fratres	PL 43
C. Acad.	Contra Academicos	CSEL 29
C. Adim.	Contra Adimantum	CSEL 25,1
C. adu. leg.	Contra aduersarium legis et prophetarum	CSEL 49
C. ep. fund.	Contra epistulam quam uocant fundamenti	CSEL 25,1
C. Faust.	Contra Faustum Manicheum	CSEL 25,1
C. Fel.	Contra Felicem Manicheum	CSEL 25,2
C. Fort.	Acta contra Fortunatum Manichaeum	CSEL 25,1
C. Gaud.	Contra Gaudentium	CSEL 53
C. Iul.	Contra Julianum	PL 44
C. Iul. imp.	Contra Julianum opus imperfectum	CSEL 85,1, Books 1-3; PL 45
C. litt. Pet.	Contra litteras Petiliani	CSEL 52
C. Sec.	Contra Secundinum Manicheum	CSEL 25,2
Ciu. Dei	De ciuitate Dei	CCL 47, 48
Conf.	Confessiones	CCL 27
Cons. Eu.	De Consensu Euangelistarum	CSEL 43
Cont.	De Continentia	CSEL 41
Cres.	Ad Cresconium grammaticum partis Donati	CSEL 52
Cura mort.	De cura pro mortuis gerenda	CSEL 41
Diu. qu.	De diuersis quaestionibus octoginta tribus	CCL 44A
Doc. Chr.	De doctrina christiana	CCL 32
Duab. an.	De duabus animabus	CSEL 25,1
En. Ps.	Enarrationes in Psalmos	CCL 38-40
Ench.	Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide spe et caritate	CCL 46
ep. (epp.)	Epistula(e)	CSEL 34, 44, 57, 58, 88
ep.*	epistula (newly discovered)	BA 46B

Abbreviation	Full Latin Name	Edition
Ep. fund.	epistula Fundamenti	
Ep. Io.	In epistulam Ioannis ad Parthos tractatus	PL 35
Ep. Rom. inch.	Epistulae ad Romanos inchoata expositio	CSEL 84,1
Ex. Gal.	Expositio Epistulae ad Galatas	CSEL 84
Exp. prop. Rom.	Expositio quarundam propositioneum ex epistula Apostoli ad Romanos	CSEL 84
F. et symb.	De fide et symbolo	CSEL 41
Gn. adu. Man.	De Genesi aduersus Manichaeos	CSEL 91
Gn. litt. imp.	De Genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber	CSEL 28.1
Gn. litt.	De Genesi ad litteram	CSEL 28.1
Gr. et pecc. or.	De gratia Christi et de peccato originali	CSEL 42
Gr. et. lib. arb.	De gratia et libero arbitrio	PL 44
Haer.	De haeresibus	CCL 46
Imm. an.	De immortalitate animae	CSEL 89,1
Io. eu. tr.	In Iohannis euangelium tractatus	CCL 36
Lib. arb.	De libero arbitrio	CCL 29
Mag.	De magistro	CCL 29
Mend.	De mendacio	CSEL 41
Mor. I	De moribus ecclesiae catholicae	CSEL 90
Mor. II	De moribus Manichaeorum	CSEL 90
Mus.	De musica	PL 32
Nat. b.	De natura boni	CSEL 25,1
Nat. et gr.	De natura et gratia	CSEL 60
Nupt. et conc.	De nuptiis et concupiscentia	CSEL 42
Ord.	De ordine	CCL 29
Pec. mer.	De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo paruulorum	CSEL 60
Praed. sanct	De praedestinatione sanctorum	PL 44
Qu.	Quaestiones in Heptateuchum	CCL 33
Quant.	De animae quantitate	CSEL 89
Retr.	Retractationes	CCL 57
s.	Sermones	CCL 41
S. Dom. mon.	De sermone Domini in monte	CCL 35
Simp.	Ad Simplicianum	CCL 44
Sol.	Soliloquia	CSEL 89
Spir. et litt.	De spiritu et littera	CSEL 60
Trin.	De Trinitate	CCL 50, 50A
Uera rel.	De uera religione	CCL 32
Util. cred.	De utilitate credendi	CSEL 25,1

Other Works

APAW	Abhandlungen der königlichen preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
AugMag	Augustinus Magister: Congrès International Augustinien, 3 vol., (Paris, 1954)
AugLex	Augustinus-Lexikon, ed. C. Mayer (Basel, 1986-)
AugStud	Augustinian Studies

BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
c. Manich.	Evodius, <i>de Fide contra Manichaeos</i> (CSEL 25,2)
CETEDOC	CETEDOC Library of Christian Latin Texts, 4 th ed., (Turnhout, 2000)
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum, Continuation Mediaevalis (Turnhout, 1953-)
CMC	<i>Cologne Mani Codex</i>
comm.	<i>Commonitorium Sancti Augustini</i>
CTh	<i>Codex Theodosianus</i>
De nat. deo	Cicero's <i>De natura deorum</i>
EEC	Encyclopedia of Early Christianity, 2 nd Edition
enl.	enlarged
Enn.	<i>Enneads</i>
Fort.	Cyprian's <i>Ad Fortunatum</i> (CCL 3)
FOTC	Fathers of the Church (1946-)
Hex.	Ambrose' <i>Hexameron</i>
Hom.	The Manichaean <i>Homilies</i>
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
Int J Phil Rel	International Journal for the Philosophy of Religion
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
JThS	Journal of Theological Studies
Keph.	<i>The Kephalaia of the Teacher</i>
MA	Miscellanea Agostiniana, 2 vol., (Rome, 1930-1931).
MSRies	Manichaica Selecta: Studies Presented to Professor Julien Ries (Manichaean Studies, 1) (Lovanii, 1991).
n.	note
Nestle- Aland	E. Nestle, K. Aland, B. Aland, <i>Novum Testamentum Latine</i> (Stuttgart, 1992).
PB II	<i>The Manichaean Psalm Book</i> , Part Two
Ps.	The Book of Psalms
Quir.	Cyprian's <i>epistle to Quirinus</i> (CCL 3)
ReAug	Recherches Augustiniennes
rev. ed.	revised edition
Rom.	Romans
s.v.	<i>sub uerbo</i> "under the word"
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin)
Tusc. Disp.	Cicero's <i>Tusculan Disputations</i>
VigChr	Vigiliae Christianae: A Review of Early Christian Life and Language (Amsterdam, 1947-)
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche (New York, 1900-)
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik (Bonn)
var.	variation

Translations and Editions

The primary Latin text for the *Contra ep. fund.* used in the dissertation is from *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. 25. Migne's text (*Patrologia Latina*, vol. 42) and the Latin text from Jolivet and Jourjon were also consulted.

Modern Translations:

P. Schaff (ed.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 4 (Edinburgh, 1887; reprint Grand Rapids, 1996) (English); R. Jolivet, M. Jourjon (trans.), *Bibliothèque Augustinienne*, vol. 17, *Six Traités Anti-Manichéens* (Paris, 1961) (French).

1 INTRODUCTION

Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings are often overlooked in Augustinian scholarship. There are three reasons for this: 1) these writings are believed to only be controversial works, which contain little to nothing to help determine the history and development of Augustine's theological thoughts; 2) there is sometimes a reluctance to question the motives and the very statements that Augustine gives in his writings regarding the Manichaeans;¹ and 3) there is the occasional harsh criticism of the religion of the Manichaeans which exceeds the scholarly boundaries normally accepted in the study of ancient religions.² Unfortunately, the result is that there are only a few in-depth studies of Augustine's writings against the Manichaeans.

This absence has been noted by other scholars as well.³ This in itself is surprising considering the importance of Augustine on the history of Christianity, the importance of the *Ep. fund.* in Manichaean studies, and the importance of Manichaeism in Augustine's own intellectual development.⁴ Ignoring these texts would be a mistake,⁵ for as Augustine says,

¹ See J. D. BeDuhn, *The Manichaean Body in Discipline and Ritual* (Baltimore, 2000), p. 8.

² For example, see J. Rickaby, *The Manichees as Saint Augustine Saw Them* (London, 1925), p. 4: "Manicheism was a tissue of absurdity, obscenity, and blasphemy, glossed over with an affection of pious language and verbal logic, but destitute of the slightest claim to science or accurate thought." Even G. Bonner, in *St. Augustine of Hippo: Life and Controversies* (Norwich, 1986), p. 224 states "Absurd as the idea seems to us today, Manichaeism represented itself as a reasonable faith, as reasonable as anything that the eighteenth century produced, and held that it was the Catholics who were the irrational authoritarians." I also disagree with P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (Berkeley, 1969), p. 59 when he stated that Manichaeism was a "static religion" (In this work I will be referring to the 1969 edition of this work, since the 2000 edition is the exact same text, other than the epilogue). Augustine stated that he could make no progress in it (*Conf.* 5.10.18), but this is more due to his desire not to follow the rules set down by the Manichaeans rather than a religion which "avoided the tensions of growth on all levels." On his history of being an inattentive Manichaean, see *Util. cred.* 3, discussed in chapter two.

³ See J. K. Coyle, *Augustine's De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae: A Study of the Work, its Composition and its Sources* (Fribourg, 1978), p. 3. Although written in 1978, very little has changed in the subsequent years. See also R. J. Teske (trans.), *Saint Augustine on Genesis: Two Books on Genesis Against the Manichees and On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis: An Unfinished Book* in T. P. Halton (ed.), *The Fathers of the Church, A New Translation*, vol. 84 (Washington, D. C., 1991), p. 36 who also notes that Augustine's works on Genesis have been neglected.

⁴ See J. Ries, "La Bible chez saint Augustin et chez les Manichéens," *REAug* 7 (1961), p. 233 who states "L'étude de sa controverse avec les manichéens reste pratiquement à faire. Cette période de la vie d'Augustin nous semble cependant importante." See also J. Van Oort, in *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine: The Rediscovery of Manichaeism and Its Influence on Western Christianity* (Tbilisi, 1996), p. 40; and J. K. Coyle, "Saint Augustine's Manichaean Legacy," *Augustinian Studies* 34:1 (2003), pp. 20-22.

(in *ep.* 143 and *Retr.* prologue) it would be best to study his thought if one began to read him in chronological order.⁶ Thus, one cannot study and understand the thought of Augustine without studying his anti-Manichaean works.⁷

One of these texts which has received no thorough examination is Augustine's *Contra epistolam quam uocant fundamenti* (*Contra ep. fund.*),⁸ probably written in 396 (see below). Like many of Augustine's anti-Manichaean texts, the *Contra ep. fund.* is usually mined for its Manichaean components, but his response to the Manichaean text is almost always ignored. This has also been the case with other anti-Manichaean writers such as Titus of Bostra and the Platonist, Alexander of Lycopolis.⁹

The *Ep. fund.*, on the other hand, has been the object of study twice in the last fifteen years, by Feldmann and now Stein (2002).¹⁰ Thus this dissertation will not examine the contents of the *Ep. fund.* except in the *Commentary*. The goal of Feldmann's work was to look at the *Ep. fund.* as a Manichaean writing which sat firmly within the context of other cosmogonical treatises. He is successful at showing that the ideas in the *Ep. fund.* are found

⁵ Bonner (1986), p. 193. "It might very plausibly be assumed that, of all Augustine's writings, those directed against the Manichees were least likely to have any enduring value. The study of the refutation of a system so alien and apparently irrelevant to modern thought would appear to pertain to the realm of literary archaeology rather than to problems of perennial interest and to be of greater value as a monument to the range of Augustine's thought than as a guide to Christian doctrine. Such an assumption would be very wide of the mark."

⁶ J. M. Rist, *Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptized* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 9 and E. Portalié, *A Guide to the Thought of Saint Augustine*, R. J. Bastian (trans.), (Chicago, 1960), p. 89.

⁷ Coyle (1978), p. 5, 6.

⁸ For smaller but very important studies on *Contra ep. fund.*, see F. Decret, *L'Afrique Manichéenne (IV-V siècles): Étude historique et doctrinale* (Paris, 1978), vol. 1, pp. 107-124 and vol. 2, pp. 79-88; J. Ries, "Notes de lecture du *contra Epistolam Fundamenti* d'Augustin, à la lumière de quelques documents Manichéens," *Augustinianum* 2 (1995): 537-548; N. J. Torchia, *Creatio Ex Nihilo and the Theology of St. Augustine: The Anti-Manichaean Polemic and Beyond* (New York, 1999), pp. 135-163; M. Scoppello, "Agostino contro Mani: note sull'opera polemica del *Contra epistolam Manichaei quam uocant fundamenti*" in *La polemica con i manichei di Agostino di Ippona: Lectio Augustini XIV—Settimana Agostiniana Pavese*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 69 (Rome, 2000), pp. 7-34; M. Scoppello, "L'Epistula Fundamenti à la Lumière Des Sources Manichéennes du Fayoum" in J. Van Oort, O. Wermelinger, G. Wurst (ed.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 205-229; and R. Jolivet, M. Jourjon, *Six Traités anti-Manichéens*, *Œuvres de Saint Augustin*, vol. 17 (Paris, 1961), pp. 780-787.

⁹ G. G. Stroumsa, "Titus of Bostra and Alexander of Lycopolis: A Christian and a Platonic Refutation of Manichaean Dualism," in R. T. Wallis (ed.), *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, *Studies in Neoplatonism: Ancient and Modern*, vol. 6 (New York, 1992), p. 338.

¹⁰ E. Feldmann, *Die Epistula Fundamenti der Nordafrikanischen Manichäer: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion* (Altenberge, 1987) and M. Stein, *Manichaei epistula fundamenti: Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterungen*, *Manichaica Latina* 2, *Papyrological Coloniensia* vol. XXVII/2 (Paderborn, 2002). Some fragments can also be found in A. Adam (ed.), *Texte zum Manichäismus*, (Berlin, 1954), p. 27-30; R. Haardt, J. F. Hendry (trans.), *Gnosis, Character and Testimony* (Leiden, 1971), pp. 295-301; Feldmann (1987), pp. 10-23. These works have been superseded by Stein (2002).

in other Manichaean works and that it was clearly not a work written in a vacuum. Stein's important work carries on from Feldmann with reports of new fragments and a discussion of allusions to the text.

1.1 THE *CONTRA EP. FUND.* AND THE *EP. FUND.*

The importance of examining Augustine's response to Manichaean cosmogony lies in Augustine's interactions with his Neoplatonic learning. The basis of the argument found in *Contra ep. fund.* can be found in his ideas on the nature of the soul, the ascent of the soul, and ultimately, the immateriality of God. These aspects of the soul and God are taken by Augustine from the works of the Platonists, in particular, the group of Platonists that were in Milan at the same time as Augustine.¹¹ This aspect of *Contra ep. fund.* is one that cannot be stressed enough.

The *Contra ep. fund.*, for all intents and purposes, is a didactic manual for those who read it. Augustine was trying to teach both the Manichaeans and others in his audience how they could raise themselves up to see the difference between God the immaterial and everything else which He has created from nothing. These things are all good. In effect he is trying to lead his readers out of the materialistic viewpoints of the *Ep. fund.* and the Manichaean idea of Two Natures. He structures his discussion by first presenting parts of the *Ep. fund.* and then replying with his own commentary. From these comments there is a coherent guide for those who are willing to put in the effort of understanding the nature of God by ascending from the world of the senses, to the soul, mind and memory, and finally to God.

There are a number of very important reasons to study the entire text of *Contra ep. fund.*, but before doing that, Augustine must be placed in his context. Rist states:

Augustine's writings are almost all the work of a controversialist: they grow from arguments with his earlier self and with views current among his

¹¹ R. Ferwerda, "Plotinus' Presence in Augustine," in J. den Boeft, J. van Oort (ed.), *Augustiniana Traiectina* (Paris, 1987), p. 117. See also Chapter 5.

contemporaries, both within North Africa and throughout the wider world of the late Roman Empire. They have a setting; they depend on assumptions known but not always spelled out by the parties involved, and these assumptions may be either religious or secular. They may be philosophical, about the nature of knowledge, or historical, about the world-historical role of Rome or of the patriarchs and people of Israel...Because of this character, formal accounts of Augustine's views on grace or free will, or more broadly on human nature and human expectations, prove sapless dogma at best and dry detail or ecclesiastical pedantry at worst, once they are removed from the soil in which they took form.¹²

Rist's case provides a good starting point for looking at the reasons to study *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine had been writing against the Manichaeans for the past eight years. The "assumptions" that Rist has mentioned need to be dug out of the texts.¹³ Without such an investigation, *Contra ep. fund.* may indeed look like "sapless dogma" or "ecclesiastical pedantry." Therefore, finishing Rist's agricultural metaphors, this work must be planted back into the soil from which it came.

Interest in questions of a cosmogonical nature is shared by a wide range of ancient philosophies and religions. This can be seen in writers such as Plato¹⁴, Pythagoras, those groups referred to as the Gnostics¹⁵ and most famously to western ears, the Genesis story in the *Old Testament*.¹⁶ The Manichaeans were no exception to this.¹⁷ They devised a world scheme that attempted to explain the very source and nature of evil in this world. In doing so, they created a cosmogony that is both highly detailed and sometimes a bit confusing for the

¹² Rist (1994), p. 11.

¹³ This is the purpose of a commentary. See below.

¹⁴ The *Timaeus*.

¹⁵ See M. A. Williams, *Rethinking Gnosticism: An Argument for Dismantling A Dubious Category* (Princeton, 1996) for an argument on the scholarly misuse of the term 'gnostic.' Williams argues that this term has lost "any reliably identifiable meaning for the larger reading public" (p. 3).

¹⁶ *Gen.* 1-3.

¹⁷ For one of the best descriptions of Manichaean cosmogony, see W. Sundermann, "Manichaeism, Cosmogony and Cosmology III" in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, E. Yarshater (ed.), vol. 6.3 (Costa Mesa, 1992), p. 310.

Manichaean writers themselves.¹⁸ This cosmogony explains, in sometimes minute detail, the nature of both this world and the rest of the universe.¹⁹

One of the most important primary Manichaean documents on cosmogony is the *Epistula Fundamenti* or the *Foundation Letter* (hereafter *Ep. fund.*).²⁰ Not all of the letter has been preserved, but what survives can be found in various writings of both Augustine and his friend and fellow bishop Evodius in his *De fide contra Manichaeos* (*C. Manich.*).²¹ The introduction to this letter (as found in the works of Augustine) contains a response by Mani to Patticius, his disciple, regarding a question on Adam and Eve. What follows is an account of the cosmogonic drama, which starts with the First Time, a total separation of the nature of the Good from the nature of the Evil, a Middle Time when the two are mixed, and the End Time,

¹⁸ L. Koenen, in "How Dualistic is Mani's Dualism?" in L. Cirillo (ed.), *Codex Manichaeicus Coloniensis*, Atti del Secondo Simposio Internazionale (Cosenza, 1990) states "The Manichaean myth is not a rigorously logical system" (p. 28). For some Manichaean confusion in relation to Jesus, see M. Franzmann, "Jesus in the Manichaean Writings—Work in Progress," R.E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, P. Zieme (ed.), *Studia Manichaica*, vol. 4 (Berlin, 2000), p. 241. For confusion in the Manichaean *Kephalaia* (*Keph.*) see I. Gardner (ed.), *The Kephalaia of the Teacher: The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation with Commentary* (Leiden, 1995), p. 34. All English translations from the *Keph.* are from Gardner, and references to the *Keph.* will be given as follows: the chapter number followed by the page and line number(s) as found in the Coptic in H.-J. Polotsky, A. Böhlig (ed.), *Kephalaia* (Stuttgart, 1940).

¹⁹ W. B. Henning's comments, in "A Sogdian Fragment of the Manichaean Cosmogony," *BSOAS* 12 (1948): 306-18, reprinted in *W.B. Henning: Selected Papers*, vol. 2, *Acta Iranica*, *Hommages et Opera Minora* (Leiden, 1977) with original pagination, "Its comprehensiveness made it so complicated that it required--and still requires--a strong effort to remember all its details." For these details, see for example *Keph.* 70 (169.23-175.24), titled "Concerning the Body: It was Constructed after the Pattern of the Universe."

²⁰ The critical edition can be found in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Prague, 1891; reprint, New York, 1972) (CSEL) 25,1/193. The standard form of reference will be to give the volume of CSEL or the *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* (Turnholt, 1953-) (CCL), followed by the page number and then the line number. Hence, CSEL 25,1/193.1 is vol. 25 of CSEL, part 1, page 193, line 1. The translations are taken from R. Stothert and A. H. Newman (trans.), *St. Augustin: The Writings Against the Manichaeans and Against the Donatists*, in P. S. Schaff, (ed.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. IV (Edinburgh, 1887; reprint, Grand Rapids, 1996). Abbreviations to Augustine's work will follow A. D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, 1999), pp. xxxv-xlii. I have, however, chosen to use *Contra ep. fund.* instead of *c. ep. Man.*, since this is the more common usage. I will also be using *Ep. fund.* for *Epistula Fundamenti*. See Sundermann (1992), p. 310 for the most important sources of Manichaean cosmogony. He lists the *Ep. fund.*, the Persian *Shaburagan*, the Greek works of Alexander of Lycopolis and *Acta Archelai*, Theodore Bar Konai (Syriac); the late Zoroastrian Skand-gumanig wizar, as well as al-Nadim, Buiruni and Sahrestani. Henning (1948, reprint 1977, p. 306) states that the chief versions are the *Ep. fund.*, the Middle Persian fragments *M98/9*, the Middle Persian book *T iii D 260*, the Uigur fragments *T ii D 173*, the book of Theodor bar Konai, the source found in al-Nadim, and a Sogdian fragment which he discusses in his article.

²¹ The critical edition of *C. Manich.* can be found in CSEL 25/951. The English translations are my own. Although CSEL 25,2 gives *De Fide contra Manichaeos* as the title of this work by Evodius, this title is actually *contra Manichaeos* (*C. Manich.*). On this, see F. Decret, "Le Traité d'Evodius Contre Les Manichéens: Un compendium à l'usage du parfait controversiste," *Augustinianum* 31 (1991): 387-409, p. 388, n.3.

when they will once again be separated.²² The *Ep. fund.*, however, was not the most detailed cosmogonical explanation that Mani had produced, at least according to Augustine. Other Manichaeian writings gave more description, but it appears that these detailed works were probably seen by only a “few men and were therefore less of a danger” to the public.²³

As stated, the *Ep. fund.* has been the object of two studies, but neither attempted an in-depth look at what the epistle might have been.²⁴ What was the original function of the *Ep. fund.*? There have been numerous hypotheses put forward on what this work could be. Is it part of Mani’s *Living Gospel*? The text to Mani’s *Picture Book*? Part of the *Kephalaia*? A handbook for initiates? Or simply an epistle from the hand of Mani? It will be shown that the *Ep. fund.*, in the beginning, was just what its title suggests: simply one of Mani’s letters.²⁵ By the time of Augustine it had become something more important than just another of Mani’s canonical letters, since it was now being read out during the Manichaeian Bema Festival, a yearly event commemorating the anniversary of the death of Mani. Its use suggests it had now become a didactic manual. It is also possible that the *Ep. fund.* will be seen, at least by the eleventh century, as part of Mani’s original canonical writings. This is examined in Chapter 2.

²² See J. Ries, “Une version liturgique copte de l’*Epistula Fundamenti* de Mani réfutée par Saint Augustin,” *Studia Patristica* 11 (1972), p. 348 who states “L’*Epître du fondement* contenait les dogmes essentiels de la gnose dualiste de Mani: la révélation du commencement, du milieu et de la fin.” The surviving fragments of the *Ep. fund.* do not contain the entire story, but we know that Felix, a Manichaeian with whom Augustine debated in 398, had stated that the *Ep. fund.* contained the description of the Beginning, the Middle and the End, in *C. Fel.* 2.1 (CSEL 25,2/828.23) “Ista enim epistula Fundamenti est, quod et sanctitas tua bene scit, quod et ego dixi, quia ipsa continet initium, medium et finem.” For these Three Times in Manichaeism, see Puech, *Le Manichéisme, son Fondateur – sa Doctrine* (Paris, 1949) p. 74 and 157 n. 284 and F. Decret, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l’Afrique romaine: Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Felix avec saint Augustin*, (Paris, 1970).

²³ See Augustine’s comments in *Contra ep. fund.* 25 (CSEL 25,1/224.24-27) “non dico alias, quibus expressius ista descripsit -- fortassis enim quia paucioribus notae sunt, minus periculi habere uideantur -- sed istas ipsas, de quibus nunc agitur, epistulae fundamenti...”

²⁴ A full account of the Manichaeian religion is not needed at this point since it has been the object of intense study in the last twenty five years. For excellent overall works, see S. N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China: A Historical Survey*, rev. 2d ed. (1992) and *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East* (Leiden, 1994); Coyle (1978), pp. 9-57; H.-Ch. Puech (1949), and a much older, but still useful study by I. Beausobre, *Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme* (Amsterdam, 1724; reprint, New York, 1984).

²⁵ We know that Mani had written a number of letters and these, as a whole, are considered to be one of his canonical writings. See Gardner (2001), p. 93, n. 3 for a list of sources for the letters.

There are also debates on how much knowledge of the Manichaean religion Augustine actually knew, which must be dealt with before looking at Augustine's response. Did he obtain his information from personal experience from his (at least) nine years as a Manichaean? Or did he learn more of Manichaeism after he ceased to be a Manichaean by way of the texts that he obtains? Or does it really matter whether he learned details as a Hearer or later as a Catholic priest and bishop? Chapter 3 will include a short introduction to Augustine's life, followed by an examination of his knowledge of Manichaeism and of the *Ep. fund.* itself. It will be shown that Augustine's application of his personal knowledge was greatly enhanced by what he learned from obtaining primary Manichaean documents *after* leaving Manichaeism, especially from the *Ep. fund.*

After showing the importance of the *Ep. fund.* to Augustine, the focus will move to the *Contra ep. fund.* and Augustine's response against it. This is the first time that he had made such a detailed attack against the Manichaean religion and this attack takes two forms. The first is his limited use of scripture and the second is his use of the Neoplatonic ascent. In Chapter 4 the examination of the scriptures will consist of two parts. The first is how Augustine used specific biblical citations. Surprisingly, Augustine made little use of direct citations (there are only sixteen), although what he used guided his arguments throughout the work. Secondly, one cannot ignore the issue of what biblical manuscripts Augustine might have been using; thus a textual analysis of these citations will follow. It is well known that there were many different Latin translations of the bible. This analysis will show that Augustine, in 396, was using a scattering of different manuscript families.²⁶ These citations also include clues to the relationship between Augustine and Jerome. Although it is not clear whether or not Jerome had made a new translation of the Latin New Testament apart from the Gospels, it is clear that Augustine, even if he knew of such translations, did not use them in the *Contra ep. fund.* These results will also show that the manuscript family of the *Contra ep.*

²⁶ Of course Augustine was using what he considered to be the best translations he could find. Manuscript families are a modern distinction. See the beginning of Chapter 4 for a detailed discussion of these families.

fund. escaped the “vulgarization” by later transcribers that often occurred with Augustine’s works.

In Chapter 5 his use of the ascent of the soul will be examined. It is no secret that Augustine was greatly indebted to the Platonists in his escape from the materiality of the Manichaeans.²⁷ His debt is clear in this work, especially in his discussions on the ascent.²⁸ He attempted to teach the Manichaeans (as well as others who would undoubtedly read this work) that Mani’s idea of the Land of Light and the Land of Darkness was nothing but a figment of his imagination.

To prove this, he begins with an introduction to the ascent of the soul, followed by a much more detailed ascent teaching in chapters sixteen to nineteen. Directly after this, he then brings his readers back to the material world and begins to dissect the *Ep. fund.* From here he once again leads the mind from material objects back to God. The primary argument, although still focusing on the ascent as a whole, is on materiality, the foundation of the ascent teaching. By using the ascent, he teaches that the things which the Manichaeans thought were absolutely evil are in fact good, because they were created by God from nothing. The ascent teaching is the most important concept in this work as all of his arguments against Mani’s Land of Light/Darkness revolve around this issue.

Finally, because there has never been a detailed study of the *Contra ep. fund.*, a commentary is crucial to understanding not only the text, but the ideas that sit behind this work. This commentary will allow the text and therefore Augustine to speak for himself by showing the parallels and the divergences in Augustine’s knowledge of Manichaean

²⁷ See B. Stock, *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge and the Ethics of Interpretation* (Cambridge, MA, 1996), pp. 65-74; P. Brown (1969), pp. 88-100; J. J. O’Meara, *The Young Augustine: The Growth of St. Augustine’s Mind up to His Conversion* (London, 1954); P. Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1950; 2nd edition, Paris, 1968); Coyle (1978), pp. 104-114 and S. Lancel, A. Nevill (trans.), *Saint Augustine* (London, 2002), pp. 82-88.

²⁸ P. F. Landes, *Augustine On Romans: Propositions From the Epistle to the Romans and An Unfinished Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Chico, CA., 1982), p. xii, argues that from 394, when Augustine wrote these commentaries, he began to move away from philosophical argumentation and moved more towards a Pauline exegesis when dealing with the Manichaeans. But this is not the case in 396 when he wrote *Contra ep. fund.* His Christian/Neoplatonic ideas are used as the primary tool of argument into this work.

cosmogony and his Christian (and Neoplatonistic) thought. Very few of Augustine's anti-Manichaean works have had this type of investigation.

1.2 PRELIMINARIES

Before beginning, there are four issues that must be dealt with before examining the *Ep. fund.* and Augustine's response to this Manichaean letter, the *Contra ep. fund.*: the first is the authenticity of the *Contra ep. fund.* (the authenticity of the *Ep. fund.* will be the subject of Chapter 2); the second, the dating of the *Contra ep. fund.*; the third, the possible dating of the *Ep. fund.* itself; and finally, the intended audience of the *Contra ep. fund.* This will be followed by a topical outline.

1.2.1 Authenticity

Because of the *Retr.*, Augustine's authorship has never been denied.²⁹ He has, however, very little to say about the *Contra ep. fund.* and what he does say amounts to one line plus, the first line of the work (as is usual in the *Retr.*):

The book, *Against the Letter of Mani which is called 'the Foundation,'* refuted only the beginning of that letter; but in its other parts, wherever it seemed best, I added notes which refute it in its entirety and which would be suggestive to me, if, at some time, I should have leisure to write against the whole letter. This book begins thus: 'One true, omnipotent God.'³⁰

His lack of comments on this work probably means that he still agreed with everything that he had written in it years before. Despite this, he never recommends this work later, although, as will be shown, he mentions the *Ep. fund.* numerous times. For outside testimony,

²⁹ S. M. Zarb, "Chronologia Operum Sancti Augustini," in *Angelicum* 10 (1933), p. 361 notes "Duo igitur *Retractationum* libri sunt momentosi sub multiplici aspectu: non solum enim nobis manifestant ordinem chronologicum operum augustinianorum, quem nos studiu isto specialiter considerare intendimus, sed etiam praestant invictissimum argumentum pro cognoscendis authenticis operibus Hipponensis, ac tandem non parum iuvant ad genuinam doctrinam sancti Doctoris cognoscendam..." J. Burnaby, "The <<Retractationes>> of Saint Augustine: Self-criticism or Apologia?" in *AugMag* 1 (Paris, 1954), p. 85 is correct to point out that Augustine's use of the word *retractationes* means a 're-handling or 're-consideration.' See also M. F. Eller, "The *Retractationes* of Saint Augustine," *Church History* 18 (1949), p. 173.

³⁰ *Retr.* 2.2 (CCL 57/91.1-7) "Liber contra epistulam Manichaei quam uocant fundamenti principia eius sola redarguit; sed in ceteris illius partibus adnotationes ubi uidebatur adfixae sunt, quibus tota subuertitur et quibus commoneretur, si quando contra totam scribere uacuisset. Hic liber sic incipit: Unum uerum deum omnipotentem." Translation taken from M. I. Bogan, "St. Augustine: The Retractions," in R. J. Deferrari (ed.), *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation* (Washington, 1968).

there is Possidius, one of Augustine's priests and later bishop of Calama, who also makes note of this work in his *Indiculus*, a catalogue of Augustine's works.³¹ Much later, for what its worth, Peter Abelard and Johanne Scottus Eriugena state that this work was authored Augustine. These references will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.

1.2.2 Dating the *Contra ep. fund.*

Unfortunately there is nothing obvious in the text that would help to date it. Although there has been no overt debate on the possible date, it would be incorrect to state that there has been no discussion on this subject. There are two issues that revolve around the dating: the first is the dating of Augustine's ordination as bishop of Hippo; the second, the dating of the works written just after his ordination. These two dates will give an approximate year for the writing of *Contra ep. fund.*³² Augustine compiled a list of his own writings in the *Retractationes* (*Retr.*) Although loosely based on the chronological order in which they were written, Augustine did not make it clear whether this order was based on when the works were started or when they were finished.³³ Zarb believed that the *Retr.* show the time that Augustine began his works, but not the time of completion.³⁴ Whatever the case may be, the *Retr.* can be relied upon to give some idea of when the works listed were written, although it would be best to take it as a relative guide in the use of dating.³⁵

The *Retr.* note that the first three works written after Augustine's ordination to bishop are *Ad. Simp.*, *Contra ep. fund.*, and *Agon.* Below is a table of the past and current state of dating these works of Augustine. As will be seen, there is rarely a consensus on an exact date

³¹ As also noted by Zarb (1933), p. 361. For the critical text of Possidius, see D. A. Wilmart, "Operum S. Augustini elenchus a Possidio eiusdem discipulo Calamensi episcopo digestus post Marinorum labores novis curis editus critico apparatu numeris tabellis instructus," in *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 2 (Rome, 1930), pp. 149-233.

³² In this time period there are only a few works that can be absolutely dated; see Zarb (1933), p. 479.

³³ On the problem of the chronological order of the *Retr.*, see Zarb (1933), pp. 364-374.

³⁴ Zarb (1933), p. 373. This is also the position of G. Bardy, *Les Révisions*, Oeuvres de saint Augustin, vol. 12 (Paris, 1950), as noted by Coyle (1978), p. 69.

³⁵ Fitzgerald (1999), s.v. "Retractiones," pp. 723-724.

unless there is a historical episode mentioned in a work which can be precisely dated.

Therefore the discussion that follows is provisional.

	Zarb ³⁶	Portalié ³⁷	Mutzenbecher (following Perler) ³⁸	Brown ³⁹	Fitzgerald ⁴⁰
Elevation to bishop	395	396	(probably 396, since he dates <i>Ad Simpl.</i> to 396)	395	395-7
<i>Ad Simp.</i>	395	no date given	396	396	396
<i>Contra ep. fund.</i>	396 ⁴¹	393-396	396	396	397 ⁴²
<i>Agon.</i>	396	no date given	396	396	396
<i>Doc. Chr.</i>	396	After 397	397	396	(begun) 396
<i>Conf.</i>	397	~400	397	397	397

As shown, there is generally no agreement on when Augustine was made bishop. The dates vary between 395 and 397, although 397 is probably too late. If it were 397, then many dates would have to be adjusted. There is general consensus that *Ad. Simpl.*, which was the first work Augustine had started after his elevation, was written in 396. There is also no consensus on the date of *Contra ep. fund.*, but there is for *Agon.* Parts of *Agon.* (especially chapter four) are intensely anti-Manichaean. The similar topics and tone in *Contra ep. fund.* and parts of *Agon.* suggest that the two works were written simultaneously or perhaps in the order listed in *Retr.* Portalié's early dating can be dismissed, since that assumes that the order

³⁶ Zarb (1933), p. 396 and pp. 479-480.

³⁷ Portalié (1960), pp. 39-77.

³⁸ *Retr.*, in CCL 57.

³⁹ Brown (1969), *passim*.

⁴⁰ Fitzgerald (1999), pp. xliii-il and p. 501. The dates that Fitzgerald has used come from a variety of sources (see p. il) and he states that they should be "regarded as approximations..." See also O'Donnell, *Augustine Confessions*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1992), p. lxvi.

⁴¹ For others who also date this to 396, see O'Donnell (1992), vol. 1, p. xliii, n. 69 and S. Lancel, *Saint Augustine*, A. Nevill (trans.), (London, 2002), p. 534.

⁴² Fitzgerald dates *Agon.* to 396 and *Contra ep. fund.* to 397, yet the *Retr.* lists *Agon.* after *Contra ep. fund.* Torchia (1999), p. 135, also states that it was written "around 397."

given by Augustine's *Retr.* is incorrect. Based on these conjectures, the *Contra ep. fund.* should be dated to 396.

1.2.3 Dating the *Ep. fund.*

The dating of the *Ep. fund.*, however, is an altogether different issue. Anticipating our conclusions, that this is a genuine letter of Mani, there is therefore a terminal date of 276, the year of Mani's death. Beyond this it would be hard to guess what in specific year this letter was written by him. It is known, however, that there were a number of missions sent by Mani between the years 244 and 261, including to the Roman Empire.⁴³ Two of these missionaries were named Addas, a Bishop, and Pateg, a Teacher. In *MMII*, a Middle Persian text, the author wrote that Addai and Pateg went to the Roman Empire and "many Elect and Hearers were chosen."⁴⁴ This text also states that (presbyter) Pateg went back to Mani, who then sent back to Addas three scribes, the *Gospel* and two other unnamed writings. Another text, *M 4575* (Parthian) also states that the presbyter Pateg went to India.⁴⁵ Pateg was obviously an important part of the early Manichaean mission.⁴⁶ Thus it is not improbable that the Pateg of *MMII* and *M 4575* is the same Patticius to whom the epistle was directed. If this is the case, then the *Ep. Fund.* could have been written at some point between 244 and 261.

It is even more difficult to determine where this translation from the Syriac original to Latin might have occurred, but speculation is possible. One difference, otherwise unnoticed, between the known letters of Mani and the *Ep. fund.* is Mani's title.⁴⁷ In the *Cologne Mani Codex (CMC)*, Mani calls himself an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God. This title is taken from the writings of Paul. As will be discussed in more detail in the *Commentary*, the self-designation in the *Ep. fund.* (I, Mani, an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the providence of

⁴³ For a discussion of these missions, see Lieu (1994), pp. 26-38.

⁴⁴ Translated in J. P. Assmussen (ed. and trans.), *Manichaean Literature: Representative Texts Chiefly from Middle Persian and Parthian Writings*, Persian Heritage Series 22, E. Yar-Shater (ed.), (New York, 1975), p. 21.

⁴⁵ Translated in Assmussen (1975), p. 20.

⁴⁶ See Decret (1978), vol. 1, pp. 118-123; Lieu (1994), pp. 26-38 and Stein (2002), pp. 76-77.

⁴⁷ See also *Commentary* 197.10 for a discussion of this issue.

God⁴⁸) is not from Paul, but the translator had taken this from 1 Peter 1.1-2.⁴⁹ There is only one Vetus Latina text of 1 Peter where the variation of *providentia* is found for *praescientiam*, and that is in a pseudonymous work thought to be by Vigilius titled *Contra Marimadum Arianum libri 3*, written sometime between 445-480 in Africa.⁵⁰ This is the only place, outside of the *Ep. fund.*, where *providentia* is used in this manner. It is possible to speculate that the use of *providentia* is an African variation, perhaps based on the Syriac original (although the Syriac versions do not contain this variant). Beyond this nothing else can be said regarding the date of the creation of the Syriac original or the Latin translation.

1.2.4 Audience: The Complex of Persons

The *Contra ep. Fund.* suggests a very rich and sometimes confusingly complex of different audiences. It is rich because there are at least six different groups or individuals that Augustine directs his comments to. It is also confusing because he seemingly switches at random between addressing the main target of his comments, the Manichaeans in the second person plural, and then immediately after, a single Manichaean in the second person singular. Sometimes this person is Mani. Augustine also directly addresses his non-Manichaean audience, who are presumably Catholic. And finally, there are two instances where Augustine briefly addresses both God and the soul. These categories, as will be shown, are also fluid, so that the overarching audience is the Manichaeans, but he is also writing to his Catholic audience.⁵¹

⁴⁸ *Contra ep. fund.* 5 (CSEL 25,1/197.10) “Manichaeus apostolus Iesu Christi providentia dei patris.”

⁴⁹ Petrus apostolus Iesu Christi...secundum *praescientiam* Dei Patris.

⁵⁰ W. Thiele (ed.), *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bible*, Epistulae Catholicae, vol. 26.1 (1956-1969), p. 71-71. For information on Ps. Vigilius, see H. J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Sigel* (Freiburg, 1995).

⁵¹ This is true for nearly all of his works. See Teske (1991), p. 7, who discusses the audience in Augustine’s two early works on Genesis: “However, the intended audience is not merely or principally the Manichees. Rather, like any apologetic work, DGnM is aimed to a large extent at the defense of those who already believe, or at the protection of those who are wavering. Indeed the opening paragraphs of DGnM show that Augustine wrote for the uneducated Catholic who understood his previous writings only with difficulty or not at all...(1.1.2). Hence, we can distinguish between the Manichees against whom Augustine wrote and the uneducated Catholic for whom Augustine wrote.”

1.2.4.1 The Manichaeans in General

This switching back and forth between the singular and plural occurs throughout the work. This has also been noted in *Mor. I* and *II*, which could be due to Augustine's "intensity of feeling."⁵² This might also be the case for a large part of *Contra ep. fund.* as well.

Augustine, in chapter three, asks that the Manichaeans become less aggressive with him and not oppose him so that they can examine the truth together. This indicates that he has had confrontations with the Manichaeans, like that with Fortunatus just four years before.⁵³ It is probable that he continued to confront them (and probably vice versa as well) in Hippo.

In the very first chapter of this work Augustine indicates that his comments are directed mainly towards the Manichaeans as a group (*haeresi uestra, Manichaei, cui et uos fortasse imprudentius quam malitiosius adhaesistis...*).⁵⁴ The use of the second person plural will continue until chapter five when Augustine asks who Mani is, and the respondents, who are the Manichaeans in general, are in the plural (*respondebitis...*). The Manichaeans are again addressed from the middle of chapter six to the middle of eight, where he stops to address his non-Manichaean audience for one sentence: "Who would not mourn that people, who wish to call themselves Christian, should be frightened that the Truth might be polluted because of a virgin's womb and yet are not afraid of a falsehood?"⁵⁵ In the middle of chapter twenty-one, twenty-four until the end of twenty-six, and from thirty-four through the middle of thirty-seven he addresses the Manichaeans again.

1.2.4.2 To a Single, Nameless Manichaean

There are also a number of times where Augustine stops directing his comments to the Manichaeans and switches directly to an unnamed Manichaean. As mentioned above, this occurs sometimes in the middle of a paragraph. It is not clear who this Manichaean might be,

⁵² Coyle (1978), p. 85 "Augustine's intensity of feeling also shows up in the somewhat disorganised appearance of *mor. I*. Sometimes he addresses the Manichaeans in the singular (line 264), sometimes in the plural (line 609)."

⁵³ *C. Fort.* (CSEL 25,1/83-112).

⁵⁴ *Contra ep. fund.* 1 (CSEL 25,1/193.6-7).

⁵⁵ *Contra ep. Fund.* 8 (CSEL 25,1/ 202.18-20) "Quis non gemescat homines, qui se christianos dici uolunt, timere, ne polluat ueritas de uirginis utero, et de mendacio non timere?"

or even if he is directing his comments to a real person or using a rhetorical device. Nothing indicates a break in the text, although it would be difficult to say where Augustine might have stopped writing or dictating at a certain point, only to pick it up later and forget who he was directing his comments to. But this happens too many times in this work for it to be an accident. It is likely to be a rhetorical technique, since it appears that the conversation which Augustine has with this Manichaean is sometimes based on conjecture, using the combination of *fortasse* and the second person singular (“Perhaps you are going to read to me the Gospel”) and the combination of *si* and the second person singular, which is used ten times in chapter five, and two more times at the beginning of chapter six.⁵⁶ This occurs again when he addresses this Manichaean in chapter fourteen up through his teaching on the ascent of the soul through chapter nineteen.⁵⁷

1.2.4.3 The Rest of his Audience

There are four other audiences that Augustine directs his comments to: the first is his Catholic audience. At chapter twenty he addresses them and “descends” to those who cannot think of immaterial ideas. He does this again in chapter thirty-nine and the very last chapter (forty three). The second is Mani. He speaks directly to him in chapter twenty and again in chapter thirty and part of thirty-one, and lastly, in thirty-two. He also directs his comments to the soul itself. This begins at the end of chapter thirty-seven and continues until the end of chapter thirty-nine. Finally, he directs his comments to God, for the first and only time, in chapter twenty seven. Immediately before, he shows his frustration at the Manichaeans for their inability to reject the fantasies of Mani. This provokes the call to God.

In summary, there are two primary intended audiences for the *Contra ep. fund.*: the Manichaeans and the Catholics. All of Augustine’s works have been written for his Catholic audience, so directing his comments to them in the *Contra ep. fund.* is not surprising, especially since his intention is to expose the Manichaean myth. But can it be assumed that

⁵⁶ CSEL 25,1/199.18.

⁵⁷ See also in middle of chapter forty.

the Manichaeans actually read this work or any work of Augustine's? As will be discussed, Secundinus the Manichaean had written a letter to Augustine asking him to come back to the Manichaean fold. Secundinus states that he had read a number of Augustine's writings. What is not known, however, is whether or not the *Contra ep. fund.* was one of them. Despite this, if one Manichaean had access to Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings, it can be assumed that others did as well.

1.3 THE TOPICAL OUTLINE OF *CONTRA EP. FUND.*

	Direct Citation of Scripture	Allusion
I. Introduction	Rom. 11.36; II Tim. 2.24-5	Rom. 13.13
A. Correction of the Manichaeans rather than punish them (Chapter One)		
1. Punishment of the body		
2. Punishment of the soul		
3. The justice of God		
B. The errors of the Manichaeans (Chapter Two)	Mal. 4.2; John 1.9	
1. The rarity of finding the Truth		
C. The past errors of Augustine (Chapter Three)		
D. Reasons for staying in the Catholic Church (Chapter Four)		John 21.16
1. The assent of the people and nations		
2. The authority of the Church, by means of:		
a. Miracles		
b. Hope		
c. Love		
d. Antiquity		
e. The succession of apostles up to the present episcopate		
f. The name "Catholic"		
II. The beginning of the <i>Epistula Fundamenti</i> (Chapter Five)		
A. Mani, an Apostle of Jesus Christ		Acts 1.13; Acts 9.3-26; John 14.16
B. Belief and Authority		
1. In the Church		
2. In Mani		
C. Mani the Paraclete/Holy Spirit (Chapter Six)	John 10:30	John 14.16; 1 Cor. 1.24

1. The body of Mani and the body of Christ (Chapter Seven and Eight)		
a. The Bema Festival		
D. When the Paraclete came (Chapter Nine and Ten)	Acts 1.1-8; Acts 2.1-13; John 7.39; John 20.22	Mt. 16.19; Lk. 24.51
E. More of the beginning of the <i>Epistula Fundamenti</i> (Chapter Eleven to Fifteen)		Col. 1.11; II Tim 2.24
1. The beneficial words from the perennial and living Fount		
2. The promise and delivery of the truth		
3. The birth of Adam and Eve (Chapter Twelve)		
4. Before the construction of the world		
5. The Land of Light (Chapter Thirteen)		
a. Belief vs. knowledge (Chapter Fourteen)		
6. The Land of Darkness and its Five Natures (Chapter Fifteen)		
III. The nature of God and the Ascent		
A. The nature of material objects (Chapter Sixteen)		
1. Material objects are divisible		
B. The nature of the soul (Chapter Sixteen)		
1. The soul is not divisible		
C. The nature of the memory (Chapter Seventeen)		
1. The shaping of images		
2. The lack of size and shape of the Memory (Chapter Eighteen)		
D. The mind can change by		
1. Desire		
2. The abundance or lack of material objects		
3. Fantasies		
4. Learning and ignorance		
E. The nature of God (Chapter Nineteen)		
1. God cannot change like the mind		
2. He is above the rational mind		
3. Cannot be extended in space		

IV. The descent back to the Manichaeans (Chapter Twenty)		
A. The nature of the border		
B. The corporeality of the Land of Darkness and its impossible joining to the Land of Light (Chapter Twenty One)		
1. The shape of the Land of Light and Darkness (Chapter Twenty One)		
a. The four quadrants and the wedge of Darkness (Chapter Twenty Two)		
C. The “shape” of God (Chapter Twenty Three)		Sir. 11.23, 15.20, 18.26, 34.15; James 5.4; 1 Peter 3.12; 1 Cor. 3.2; Heb. 5.12-13.1; 1 Peter 2.2; Mt. 7.7-8/Luke 11.9-10; Mt. 23.37; Eph. 6.13-17
D. The Land of Light		
1. The Manichaean God, kingdoms and the region of Light (Chapter Twenty Four)		
2. God created everything from nothing		
E. <i>Creatio de nihilo</i> (Chapter Twenty Five)		Isaiah 45.7 Gen. 1.31
1. God made all natures that are graded in terms of excellence		
2. All natures are good		
V. The return to the <i>Epistula Fundamenti</i> (Chapter Twenty Six)		
A. The border		
B. Substance is not evil (Chapter 27)		
C. The contents of the Land of Darkness (Chapters 28-34)		1 Peter 3.22; James 1.17
1. It contains life, harmony and order		
D. Whence is Evil?		
1. Evil is corruption of the good (Chapter 35-37)		Mt. 7.7-8 or Lk. 11.9-

		10; Phil. 2.7, 2.8, 2.9
E. God is supreme (Chapter 37)	John 1.14; Rom. 8.29	Col. 1.18
1. Evil is nothing because matter is from nothing (Chapter 38)	Ps. 72.28	Rom. 1.24-26, 28-32
2. More on corruption	Isaiah 45.7; 1 Cor. 3.16-17	Luke 12.4
3. Existence and non-existence (Chapter 40)		
4. The Beauty of order (Chapter 41)		
VI. Conclusion (Chapter 42-43)	Mt. 5.8	1 Cor. 2.15; Job 28.28

2 THE MYSTERY OF THE *EPISTULA FUNDAMENTI*

During the first year of his episcopate,¹ Augustine began to attack the Manichaean religion in a new way: for the first time he was writing against a work of Mani, entitled the *Epistula Fundamenti* (*Ep. fund.*).² This *Ep. fund.* is of great interest to Manichaean scholars because it is a primary Manichaean source for cosmogony.³ It contains, according to Augustine, nearly everything that the Manichaeans believe.⁴ If this is true, one would expect that what it contains (and indeed the epistle itself) would be found in much more of the Manichaean and anti-Manichaean material. But later writers made little to no use of this work. There are, however, possible parallels, especially between the *Ep. fund.* and the Manichaean *Psalm Book II* (*PB II*).⁵ Ries and Scopello have also shown that there are parallels with certain parts of the Manichaean *Kephalaia* (*Keph.*).⁶ These will be discussed in detail below.

This *Ep. fund.* was also a primary source for Manichaean cosmogony before the great finds of the last century both in Egypt and Central Asia. Presently, Augustine and his friend Evodius are the only primary sources for this letter.⁷ Both are North African writers, but this

¹ On the dating of this event, see Chapter 1.

² Decret (1978), p. 113: "Avec le *Contra Epistulam Fundamenti*, l'évêque d'Hippone amorçait une nouvelle étape de sa controverse." See also Ries (1995), pp. 544-5 "Avec le *Contra Epistulam Fundamenti*, nous nous trouvons en présence d'une nouvelle stratégie dans la controverse contre les manichéens: l'attaque des Ecritures de la secte"; and Scopello (2001), especially p. 206.

³ The *Ep. fund.* is one of the few cosmogonical texts which have a specific name. It must be kept in mind, however, that there are many cosmogonical works written by the Manichaeans and it is difficult to locate the original source for many of the cosmogonical details unless the source is specifically named. See Sundermann (1992), p. 310.

⁴ According to Augustine: *Contra ep. fund.* 5 (CSEL 25,1/197.7-8) "...quem Fundamenti epistulam dicitis, ubi totum paene, quod creditis, continetur."

⁵ See Ries (1972), p. 349. Feldmann (1987), p. 2, is not convinced of this link. See also G. Wurst, "Bemapsalm 223. Eine liturgische Version der *Epistula Fundamenti*?", in *Manichaica Selecta: Studies Presented to Professor Julien Ries*, Manichaean Studies 1 (Turnhout, 1991), pp. 391-99. For the *PB II*, see C. R. C. Allberry (ed.), with a contribution by H. Ibscher, *A Manichaean Psalm-Book. Part II*, Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection, 2 (Stuttgart, 1938).

⁶ Ries (1995), pp. 545-546 and Scopello (2001), pp. 225-227. For the *Kephalaia*, see Gardner (1995). All English translations from the *Keph.* are from Gardner.

⁷ For Evodius' text, see *De fide contra Manichaeos* (*C. Manich.*) in CSEL 25,2/951.1-975. Translations are my own. On the title of this work, see Decret (1991), p. 388, n. 3 where he notes that the correct title of this work should be "*Contra Manichaeos*" as opposed to "*de fide Contra Manichaeos*." It is not clear where Evodius obtained his *Ep. fund.*, although it could have been sometime after 415. At about this time Evodius had written to Augustine and asked for copies of his works. Augustine responds that his copiers were very busy and that if Evodius wanted anything, he would have to send his own to copy the works (*ep.* 169.1.1 and 169.4.12).

does not guarantee that this is an African work. Augustine was an active Manichaean in North Africa, Milan and in Rome⁸ and this work was read to him during the Bema Festival, a yearly event.⁹ The western branch of the Manichaeans spread from one end of the Mediterranean to the other,¹⁰ therefore there is the possibility that the *Ep. fund.* was used both in North Africa and elsewhere in the Roman West.¹¹ Unfortunately Augustine does not state where he had heard this text read aloud at the Bema Festival.

There are also other Manichaean texts which show up in Africa (and here the same caveat applies). But there is a difference between the *Ep. fund.* and the other North African material. The *Tebessa Codex*, found in 1918 in a cave sixty kilometers southwest of Tebessa in Northern Algeria and originally thought to have been written by Christians at the time of the Islamic conquest, describes the separation of the Manichaean Elect from the Hearer.¹² This text uses many biblical quotations for the reasoning behind this separation. BeDuhn and Harrison point out that this text as well as that of Faustus' *Capitula*, the *Ad Augustinum Epistola* of Secundinus¹³ and the arguments made by Fortunatus and Felix, all rely on the use of New Testament passages and not the sayings of Mani to justify their beliefs.¹⁴ We can also

⁸ Augustine mentions Rome in *Conf.* 5.10.18 and Milan in 5.14.24.

⁹ On the Manichaean Bema festival, see C. R. C. Alberry, 'Das Manichäische Bema-Fest,' *ZNW* XXXVII (1938): 2-10; G. A. M. Rouwhorst, "Das manichäische Bema-fest und das Passafest der syrischen Christen," *VigChr* XXXV (1981): 397-411; Wurst (1991), pp. 391-99; G. Wurst, *Das Bema-fest der ägyptischen Manichäer*, Arbeiten zum spätantiken und koptischen Ägypten, 8 (Altenberge, 1995); and G. Wurst (ed.), *Die Bema-Psalmen*, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, 4; Series Coptica, I, The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library, Psalm Book, Part II.1 (Turnhout, 1996).

¹⁰ See S. N. C. Lieu, "From Mesopotamia to the Roman East—The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Eastern Roman Empire," in *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East* (Leiden, 1994), pp. 22-129 and Lieu (1992).

¹¹ It is almost certain that the *Ep. fund.* (also titled the *Epistle to Patticius*) was used in Italy, since Julian of Eclanum mentions it. This will be discussed shortly.

¹² On the *Tebessa Codex*, see R. Merkelbach, "Der manichäische Codex von Tebessa," *Manichaean Studies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism*, P. Bryder (ed.), (Lund, 1988), pp. 229-264; J. BeDuhn and G. Harrison, "The Tebessa Codex: A Manichaean Treatise on Biblical Exegesis and Church Order," in P. Mirecki and J. BeDuhn (ed.), *Emerging From Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, vol. XLIII (Leiden, 1997), pp. 33-87.

¹³ On this letter of the Manichaean Secundinus to Augustine, see J. Van Oort, "Secundini Manichaei Epistula: Roman Manichaean 'Biblical' Argument in the Age of Augustine" in J. Van Oort, O. Wermelinger, G. Wurst (2001), pp. 161-173. He points out that Secundinus' letter is "permeated by Biblical literature," which includes not only the New Testament, but also gives evidence for the use of Tatian's *Diatessaron* and the *Gospel of Thomas* (pp. 172-3).

¹⁴ J. BeDuhn and G. Harrison (1997), p. 87.

add the work of Adimantus found in Augustine's *C. Adim.*¹⁵ From the available evidence, the *Ep. fund.* does not use biblical material in its explanation of Manichaean cosmogony. The only reference to any biblical material can be found in the title which Mani uses: "I, Mani, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the providence of God the Father" (*Manichaeus apostolus Iesu Christi prouidentia Dei Patris*). This is not taken from the works of Paul. The use of *prouidentia* instead of the Pauline *uoluntas* rules this out. Instead, the translator of the *Ep. fund.* takes this title from 1 Peter: "Petrus apostolus Iesu Christi electis dispensationis Ponti, Galatiea, Cappadociae, Asiae et Bithyniae, *secundum praescientiam Dei Patris.*" This will be discussed further in the *Commentary*.¹⁶

Because of its importance not only to the Manichaeans but also to Augustine, one would think that the *Ep. fund.* would have been used by many authors, but this is not the case.¹⁷ Outside of Augustine and Evodius there is evidence that Julian of Eclanum had read it (probably from the works of Augustine)¹⁸ and of its possible existence as shown in one Coptic text and evidence from two Arabic writers. This evidence will be examined shortly. The same is true for Augustine's *Contra ep. fund.* In the Latin-speaking world, *Contra ep. fund.* is mentioned only three times. These three are Possidius (370-440), who was Augustine's biographer and student; Peter Abelard (1079-1142); and Johannes Scottus Eriugena (810-877).

The work of Possidius adds nothing on the *Contra ep. fund.*, since Possidius only mentioned it in his list of works written by Augustine.¹⁹ The same is probably true of Peter Abelard. He refers to *Contra ep. fund.* twice in his *Sic et Non*. In the first case, he remarks

¹⁵ Critical text can be found in CSEL 25, 1/115-190.

¹⁶ This will be looked at closer in *Commentary* 197.11 on the use of *prouidentia*.

¹⁷ Decret (1970), pp. 93-121 comments on this absence. See below for more details.

¹⁸ Julian calls it the *Epistle to Patticius*. See *C. Iul. imp.* 3, 4, 5.

¹⁹ See A. Wilmart, "Operum sancti Augustini elenchus a Possidio eiusdem discipulo Calamensi episcopo digestus post Maurinorum labores novis curis editus critico apparatu numeris tabellis instructus" in *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 2 (Rome, 1931), pp. 149-233.

“De omni natura incorporea quamvis mutabili, sicuti est anima.”²⁰ This is obviously the barest of summaries found in his section on *Quod solus Deus incorporeus sic et non*. His second mention of the work occurs when he lists the works of Augustine as found in Augustine’s *Retractationes*.²¹

Eriugena, on the other hand, probably did read the work. In his *De diuina praedestinatione* he directly copies a portion of *Contra ep. fund.* 27 after stating “Sed, si quis dubitat nihil esse malum nisi boni corruptionem, uideat quid de hac ratione Augustinus dicat, scribens contra epistolam fundamenti.”²²

Discite non substantiam malum esse, sed sicut in corpore commutatione formae in deterius amitti speciem uel potius minui, et foedum dicitur quod pulchrum antea dicebatur, et displicere corpus quod antea placuerat, sic in animo recte uoluntatis decus, quo pie iuste que uiuitur, commutata in deterius uoluntate deprauari, quo peccato effici animam miseram, quae honestate rectae uoluntatis beatitatem obtinebat, nulla addita detracta ue substantia.

Therefore Eriugena had used Augustine’s *Contra ep. fund.* to prove a point about evil and corruption but he did not use the text to deal with any Manichaean problem. He is the only medieval writer who uses this work of Augustine.

Because of this lack of information on the *Ep. fund.*, there is a debate as to what this *Ep. fund.* really is. It has been suggested that it could be: 1) a version of Mani’s *Living Gospel* or a supplanting of the *Living Gospel*; 2) the text of Mani’s *Picture Book*; 3) a part of the *Kephalaia* that became detached because of the importance of its topic; 4) a handbook or study guide for initiating the Manichaean hearers (or catechumen) into the religion or 5) a letter from the canonical Mani epistles. Each of these possibilities will be considered below.

²⁰ *Sic et Non*, question 44.9, line 71-72. The critical text can be found in B. Boyer, R. McKeon (ed.), *Peter Abailard, Sic et Non: A Critical Edition* (Chicago, 1976-77), p. 202.

²¹ *Sic et Non, Excerpta Retractationum Augustini*, p. 529, line 28 “Contra epistolam Manichaei quam dicunt Fundamenti liber I.”

²² *De diuina praedestinatione* 10.3. The critical text can be found in *Corpus Christianorum, Continuation Mediaevalis* (CCCM) 50/64.61-71).

2.1 THE *LIVING GOSPEL* OR ITS REPLACEMENT

There are at least seven writings that were considered canonical for the Manichaeans.²³ One of these, the *Living Gospel*, is found in part in the *Cologne Mani Codex* (CMC).²⁴ It has been suggested that the *Ep. fund.* might have supplanted the role of the *Living Gospel*²⁵ or that it is the *Living Gospel* itself.²⁶ Because a large amount of text exists, it will be possible to compare it to the *Ep. fund.* (italicized text shows parallel areas).

CMC 66	<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 5, 10
<i>I, Mani, Apostle of Jesus Christ, through the will of God, the Father of Truth, from whom I also came into being. He lives and abides for all eternity. Before everything, he is and he remains after everything. Everything which has happened and will happen, is established through his might. From him I came and I am also from his will. And from him all that is true was revealed to me and I am from [his] truth. I saw [the truth of eternity which he revealed.] And (67) I revealed the truth to my companions; I preached peace to the children of peace; I proclaimed hope to the undying generation; I chose the elect and showed the path leading to the height to those who go up according to this truth. I have proclaimed hope and revealed this revelation; and have written this immortal Gospel, in which I have put down these preeminent mysteries and majestic ones of the [all] powerful works of [preeminence, And] these things which [he revealed] I have made known [to</i>	<i>Manichaeus, an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the providence of God the Father. These are the wholesome words from the perennial and living fount; and whoever shall have heard them, and shall have first believed them, and then observed the truths they set forth, shall never suffer death, but shall enjoy eternal life in glory. For he is to be judged truly blessed who has been instructed in this divine knowledge, by which he is made free and shall abide in everlasting life. May the Peace of the invisible God and the knowledge of truth be with my holy and beloved brethren who both believe and also yield obedience to the divine precepts. May also the right hand of light protect you and deliver you from every hostile assault, and from the snares of the world.</i>

²³ *The Living Gospel, The Treasure of Life, The Pragmateia, The Book of Mysteries, The Book of the Giants, The Letters and the Psalms and Prayers.* There are a number of texts that give this canonical list, and occasionally there are variations. On this list see Puech (1949), pp. 67; S. Lieu (1985), p. 6 and J. C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Tradition* (Cincinnati, 1992), pp. 9-19.

²⁴ For the critical edition of the CMC, see L. Koenen, R., C. Römer (ed.), *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex: Über das Werden seines Leibes; Kritische Edition aufgrund der von A. Henrichs und L. Koenen besorgten Erstedition* (Opladen, 1988) and for an English translation, see R. Cameron, A. J. Dewey (ed.), *The Cologne Mani Codex: 'Concerning the Origin of his Body', Early Christian Literature series 3, Texts and Translations, Society of Biblical Literature*, 15 (Missoula, 1979). All English translations are taken from here. See also A. Henrichs, L. Koenen, "Ein griechischer Mani-Codex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780)," *ZPE* 5 (1970): 97-216 and D. N. MacKenzie, "I, Mani..." in H. Preißler, H. Seiwert (ed.), *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte Festschrift Für Kurt Rudolph zum 65 Geburtstag* (Marburg, 1994), pp. 183-198.

²⁵ 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, 1991), pp. 79-80.

²⁶ See I. Gardner, "The Reconstruction of Mani's Epistles from Three Coptic Codices," in P. Mirecki, J. Beduhn (2001), p. 104, who thinks the *Ep. fund.* may be a "descriptive title" for the *Living Gospel*.

CMC 66	<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 5, 10
those who live from] (68) the sight of the truth which I have seen and from the most glorious revelation which was revealed to me."	

The only textual similarity between the *Ep. fund.* and the *Living Gospel* is the beginning of the work: "I, Mani, Apostle of Jesus Christ, through the will of God, the Father of Truth..."²⁷ The *Ep. fund.* starts with "I Mani, apostle of Jesus Christ, by the providence of God the Father."²⁸ As stated previously, this title was taken from 1 Peter in the *Contra ep. fund.*, but this is not the case with the title in the *Living Gospel*, which undoubtedly has been taken from the works of Paul. Even if it were the same wording, this does not establish that they are one and the same work, since Augustine states that all of Mani's letters begin with this formula.²⁹ This title also corresponds to the letters found at Kellis.³⁰ The two works are similar in that Mani details his revelations in the *CMC* concerned with God, his revelation and his divine orders to spread the faith. The *Ep. fund.* is concerned primarily with the message of the letter, that of the cosmogony and the importance of believing these words. It is hard to imagine how these two texts could have been the same.³¹

There is also more information regarding a possible link between the *Living Gospel* and the *Ep. fund.* in two other texts. The Parthian text *M 5569* has a description of a number of items that were passed on to Mani's successor, Sissinos, after his death: "*Gospel*, the *Ardahang* and (his) garment and hands(s) (i.e., the relics) ...the province ... Sisin."³² Although fragmentary, it can be assumed that Sissinos received these objects from Mani.

²⁷ *CMC* 66.4.

²⁸ On this beginning, see *Commentary* 197.10. See also *Commentary* 197.11 on the use of *providentia* and its difference from Paul's writings.

²⁹ See *Commentary* 197.10 for the use of this title.

³⁰ Gardner (2001), pp. 93-104.

³¹ Gardner (2001), 103 n. 32, also states that if the *Living Gospel* was in fact the *Ep. fund.*, then one would have to account for the differences in the prologue of the two.

³² Assmussen (1975), p. 56. For the original text, see W. Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*, Berliner Turfantext XI (Berlin, 1981) 30 and M. Boyce (ed.), *A Reader in Manichaeism Middle Persian and Parthian* (Leiden, 1975), p. 48.

This text by itself does not help with the possible identification of the *Ep. fund.*, but there is another text that is very similar to *M 5569* found in a Coptic manuscript discussed by Gardner. This passage is found in the *Kephalaia of the Wisdom of My Lord Mani*.³³ There is a fragmentary line which Gardner reconstructs:

ΒΙ ΠΑΝΑΘ ΝΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ [... .. /] ΘΕΜΕΛΙΟΣ ΜΗ ΤΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ
ΕΤΑΪC [... .. / ΛΥ]Ω ΜΗ ΤΑΒΑΛΕC

“Take my great Gospel, [my letter of] foundation (Θεμέλιος), and the letter that I have [sealed; together] with my tunic...”

There is space for “my letter of” and as Gardner points out, the text is fragmentary.

Based on this reconstruction Gardner states that this could indicate that the title *Ep. fund.* was a descriptive title for the *Living Gospel*. But as shown above, there is very little similarity between the *Ep. fund.* and the *Living Gospel*, thus here is no reason to think that the *Gospel* in this Coptic passage is equivalent to the *Ep. fund.* (that is, if the Θεμέλιος is the *Ep. fund.*).

If anything, it appears that a comparison of *M 5569* and the Coptic text shows that the *Ardahang* and the Θεμέλιος are equivalent. Wurst also discusses this passage but reconstructs the text differently:³⁴

ΒΙ ΠΑΝΑΘ ΝΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ [ΕΤΑΪ ΤΕΟΥΑΦ Ν – vel ΕΤΑΪΤΕ ΟΥΑΦ
ΖΩC] ΘΕΜΕΛΙΟΣ ΜΗ ΤΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΕΤΑΪC

“Take my Great Gospel which I proclaimed as (the) Foundation and the letter which...”

The Greek word ΘΕΜΕΛΙΟΣ can mean foundation as in the foundation of a building or as in ‘the foundations of the world.’ It can also be used as a proper noun, as with Gardner and Wurst. But as stated above, the texts of the *Living Gospel* and that of the *Epistula Fundamenti* are too dissimilar to state that they are one and the same.

³³ Gardner (2001), p. 103 and S. Giversen, *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library, I. Kephalaia; Facsimile Edition*, Cahiers d’Orientalisme, 14 (Genève, 1986), Plate 212, lines 12-14. I would also like to thank Dr. Malcolm Choat, Macquarie University, for his assistance with this passage.

³⁴ See G. Wurst, as noted by M. Stein, *Manichaei epistula fundamenti: Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterungen*, Manichaica Latina 2, Papyrologica Coloniensia vol. XXVII/2 (Paderborn, 2002), p. 16 and 68-70.

From the Coptic text it is also possible that Mani is passing down his great *Gospel*, as well as the Θεμέλιος, plus another letter and the tunic. In M5569 there are not just three insignia that were given to Sissinos, but four: the *Gospel*, the *Ardahang* (the *Picture Book*), the garment plus the relics.³⁵ Even if there were only three insignia that were passed on, it would seem that the Θεμέλιος here should be equated with the *Ardahang*, and not the *Gospel*. This *Ardahang/Picture Book* will be discussed in detail below.

Therefore it may be dangerous to compare M5569 with the Coptic *Keph. of the Wisdom of My Lord Mani*, especially since it will be shown shortly that this *Ardahang* is not the *Ep. fund.* Despite the danger, it is still hard to imagine that the *Gospel* is the *Ep. fund.* The differences between the two texts are greater than their similarities.

The question of the *Ep. fund.* supplanting the important role of the *Living Gospel* is more difficult. None of the Manichaeans whom Augustine debated with (Fortunatus, Faustus, Felix, Secundinus) made use or mentioned the *Living Gospel*, but this may not have been all that surprising since, from the available evidence, the Manichaeans rarely mentioned their own literature. Felix is the only exception to this. It is more important that Augustine did not mention it in any of his writings. Therefore it seems that it was not an important text to the Manichaeans that Augustine was involved with, if indeed they had knowledge of it in the first place. As Van Oort pointed out, the *Living Gospel* was read aloud, much like the *Ep. fund.*³⁶ The question then is why did these Manichaeans have no knowledge of the *Living Gospel* or made no use of it as they did with the *Ep. fund.*? If it was such an important text to some groups of Manichaeans, then why not to others? There are three possibilities: the first is that the *Living Gospel* was never translated into Latin and therefore was unavailable to these particular Manichaeans; the second, that it was translated and was not deemed to have been an important work; or that it was known by another name.

³⁵ Sundermann thinks there are three (with the garment and the hands being one relic). See Sundermann (1981), p. 30.

³⁶ Van Oort (1991), p. 79-80.

But there is much evidence to show that this *Living Gospel* was an important one, and it certainly seems to have been written by Mani himself which should make it important to the Manichaeans. It was also known (at least the title) to the Manichaeans in Egypt, since the *Gospel* is mentioned in the *Keph.*, the *PB II* and the *Homilies*.³⁷ But Augustine and his Manichaean debaters did not make use of it at all (or at least never mentioned its existence). Therefore one can guess that the *Living Gospel* never made it to the geographical areas in which Augustine and his Manichaean debaters lived and preached, despite its importance to other Manichaean groups. If this is the case, then the *Ep. fund.* could not have supplanted the *Living Gospel*, for to do that the Manichaeans would have had to have both texts available and then choose the best text to use at the Bema Festival.

2.2 THE TEXT TO THE PICTURE BOOK (*ARDAHANG*)?

Some scholars have also questioned whether or not the *Ep. fund.* is the written text to the *Picture Book* (i.e., the *Ardahang*).³⁸ This possibility is likely because of *M 5569* and the text from the *Kephalaia of the Wisdom of My Lord Mani*. As shown above, when one compares the text of the Coptic *Kephalaia* and *M 5569*, the second position in the list in *M 5569* is the *Ardahang* as compared with the Coptic *Foundation* in the *Keph.* It would seem that these two could be the same, and at this stage, it is impossible to rule out, but there are some points that will make it clearer.

There is no question that Mani was an artist and used pictures to help his pupils understand the written word; there are numerous witnesses for this evidence.³⁹ Ephraim stated that some of Mani's disciples claimed that Mani would draw some of the Manichaean

³⁷ For the *Kephalaia* (*Keph.*) see 5.23 in H. J. Polotsky, A. Böhlig (ed.), *Kephalaia* (Stuttgart, 1940); for the *Psalm Book 2* (*PB II*), see 46.21 in Allberry (1938) and the *Homilies* (*Hom.*), see 94.18 in H. J. Polotsky (ed.), *Manichäische Homilien*, *Manichäische Handschriften der Sammlung A. Chester Beatty*, Band I, (Stuttgart, 1934).

³⁸ See especially Van Oort (1996), p. 16.

³⁹ This *Picture Book* is known in the Coptic material as the *Εἰκὼν*; the *Ardahang* in Parthian; the *Ertenk* in Persian; and the *Drawing of the Two Great Principles* in the Chinese *Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of the Buddha of Light Mani*. See Henning (1948), p. 310. For evidence of the *Ardahang*, see *M 5815 II*, Parthian: *MM, III*, translated in Assmussen (1975), p. 23.

cosmogony in order to impress upon the disciples both the evil of the darkness and the good of the light:⁴⁰

So also Mani painted in colors on a scroll -- as some of his disciples say -- the likeness of the wickedness which he created out of his mind, placing on hideous (pictures) the name of the Sons of the Darkness that it might declare to his disciples the ugliness of the Darkness that they might abhor it, and placing on beautiful things the name of the Sons of the Light in order that its beauty may in itself indicate to them that they should desire it.

Ephraim also stated that Mani drew these pictures for those who could not learn the *details from reading*: "...as he said, 'I have written them in books and pictured them in colors; let him who hears them in words also see them in an image, and let him who is unable to learn them from . . . learn them from pictures.'"⁴¹ It is clear, though, that Ephraim did not see these pictures.

There is also evidence from the Middle Persian document *M* 788.⁴² Here we find a young disciple who used pictures to convince the public to join the Manichaean faith:

...Listen, delicate mankind! Direct eye and face (towards this and see) how it is depicted here (?) in front of you! On this picture: idols, idol priests, altars and their god. Close (lit., collect) my mind (to impressions from them): the sacrament(s), the profession, and the belief in them. I will send the preaching... they raise their voice like dogs. Truth is not in their speech. But you, know your own Self! Seize the road of the Gods! Now in the first place, [at] the head of all these (things) that are depicted here (?), this is the temple of the idols, which they call "The Dwelling of the Gods." And corresponding to the name of the dwelling, there are many (?) "gods" (there)! Many are running about, (and) when you ask: "Where (are you going)?" they say: "To the Dwelling of the Gods"! To offer reverence, love, gifts in front of them!" The idol priests raise

⁴⁰ Ephraim's *Fifth Discourse to Hypatius* (*Hyp.*), as found in C. W. Mitchell (trans.), *S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan*, vol. 1, The Discourse Addressed to Hypatius (London, 1912), p. xciii. All English translations are from Mitchell.

⁴¹ Ephraim, *Fifth Discourse to Hypatius*, p. xciii.

⁴² *M* 788, R 2-8, in W. B. Henning, "The Murder of the Magi," *JRAS* (1944), p. 142. Translation is from Henning. See also *M* 47 II (*Middle Persian*), "The garment (and) ornament that he made are the (holy) picture(s) and [book(s)]." Translated in Asmussen (1975), pp. 31-32.

their voice: "Come forth to "The Dwelling of the Gods"!" However, inside "The Dwelling of the Gods" there are no gods! The deceived do not realize that, because their spirits have been made intoxicated. But you...

There is also a description of the "drawing of the two great principles" in the *Keph.*

92. (234.24-236.6). Here an auditor asks Mani why the fate of the auditor is not depicted in the *Picture (Book)*:

You have made clear in that great *Picture (-Book)*; you have depic[t]ed the righteous one, how he shall be released and [brou]ght before the Judge and attain the land of li[ght]. You have] also drawn the sinner, how he shall die. [He] shall be [... / s]et before the Judge and tried [...] the dispenser of justice. And he is thrown into gehenna, where he shall wander for eternity. Now, both of these have been depicted by you in the [grea]t *Picture (-Book)*; but why did you not depict [the ca]techumen?

But could the *Ep. fund.* be the text of the *Picture Book*? Once again we must turn to the only two sources of concrete information about the *Ep. fund.*, that of Augustine and Evodius. If the *Ep. fund.*, as is found in Augustine's and Evodius' writings, is indeed the written part to the *Picture Book*, neither Augustine nor Evodius realize it. The text that Augustine received came without pictures, and Augustine, a Manichaean hearer for nine to twelve years, made no mention of any artwork associated with this letter. In fact, he never saw any drawings of their cosmogony. He states this in *C. Faust.* 20.9, after discussing the Manichaean figures of the World-Bearer, the First Man, Atlas and the Mighty Spirit:

these and countless other absurdities are not represented in painting or sculpture, or in any explanation; and yet you believe and worship things which have no existence, while you taunt the Christians with being credulous for believing in realities with a faith which pacifies the mind under its influence.⁴³

⁴³ *C. Faust.* 20.9 (CSEL 25,1/546.7-11) "et alia innumerabilia pariter inepta et insana nec pingendo aut sculpendo nec interpretando demonstratis et ea, cum omnino nulla sint, creditis et colitis et insuper christianis fide non ficta pias mentes mundantibus tamquam temere credulis insultatis." Translations are taken from R. Stothert, in P. Schaff (ed.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol. 4 (Edinburgh, 1887; reprinted, Grand Rapids, 1996).

Nor do pictures come with the text that Augustine obtained from Felix. This means that the Manichaean Hearers in North Africa and those in Italy which he had been involved with had never used or seen this *Picture Book*, or any depictions for that matter. Augustine also seems unaware of the artistic background of Mani and his texts.⁴⁴ The use of artwork, however, among the Elect that Augustine knew, cannot be ruled out, since Augustine did not know much about the Elect despite claiming to have lived with them.⁴⁵ But there is little reason to think that the Elect would keep secret a work (or works) that would help the hearers understand their own religion, especially since the *Ep. fund.* was read out to the crowd. Pictures to their complicated cosmogony would have been very helpful, as shown by the examples in Ephraim as well as in the *Kephalaia*.

So with this caveat, we will have to state that as a hearer, Augustine had no knowledge of the *Ep. fund.* being the running text for Mani's *Picture Book*. If it were this text, then the people who had read out this letter to him did not reveal this. As shown, *M* 788 states that pictures were used even with the general public, so it is not clear why the Manichaeans who were reading the *Ep. fund.*, if it had come with pictures, would not have used them to help describe the complicated Manichaean cosmogony found in this text. Because of this, it is unlikely that the *Ep. fund.*, as we have it, was part of a *Picture Book*, at least in the areas of Italy and North Africa where Augustine was a Manichaean.

2.3 *EP. FUND. AND THE KEPHALAIA*

Whatever the *Ep. fund.* is, it is part of a subdivision of Manichaean writings that discuss the physical body and related material. In the *Ep. fund.* the question of the origin of the body is important because the answer will lead the followers to eternal life. In order to answer this, the first step is to discuss the entire cosmogonical aspect of the Manichaeans. There are other Manichaean texts that also deal with issues of the body in terms of its origin. These are the *Kephalaia* (*Keph.*) as well as the *Cologne Mani Codex* (*CMC*), whose title is

⁴⁴ On Mani's reputation as an artist, see Assmussen (1975), p. 25.

⁴⁵ See Chapter 3 for more details.

“περὶ τῆς γέννης τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ.” There is no question that the Manichaeans take the issue of the body seriously, despite the fact that they saw the body as being evil in its creation.⁴⁶ These three texts aim at teaching the Manichaeans why it is so important to understand the origin of the body and therefore understand the whole reason behind Manichaeism: its cosmogony. As will be shown, there are some parallels to the *Ep. fund.* and that of the *Keph.* But could the *Ep. fund.* be a part of the *Keph.*?

The *Kephalaia*, found in Egypt along with the *Psalm Book* and the *Homilies*,⁴⁷ is written as a lecture-series given by Mani.⁴⁸ Questions are usually asked at the beginning of most *kephalia*, which Mani proceeds to answer. This same pattern is found in the *Ep. fund.*, with Patticius asking Mani about the method of birth of Adam and Eve:

Of that matter, beloved brother of Patticus, of which you told me, saying that you desired to know the manner of the birth of Adam and Eve, whether they were produced by a word or sprung from matter, I will answer you as is fit. For in various writings and narratives we find different assertions made and different descriptions given by many authors. Now the real truth on the subject is unknown to all peoples, even to those who have long and frequently treated of it. For had they arrived at a clear knowledge of the generation of Adam and Eve, they would not have remained liable to corruption and death.⁴⁹

Mani's answer consists of the need to relate the Manichaean cosmogony in order to understand the mystery of Adam and Eve:

⁴⁶ BeDuhn (2000) does not make use of the *Ep. fund.* in his important work, but he does stress a very important point: the Manichaeans do not hate their bodies (see p. xiv and passim). For Augustine's view of this matter, see T. J. van Bavel, “No One Ever Hated His Own Flesh,” *Eph. 5:29 in Augustine*, *Augustiniana* 45 (1995): 45-93.

⁴⁷ C. G. Schmidt, H. J. Polotsky, *Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten: Originalschriften des Mani und seiner Schüler*, SPAW (1933), pp. 4-90.

⁴⁸ M Scopello (2001), p. 225 briefly discusses some parallels between the *Ep. fund.* and the *Keph.*

⁴⁹ *Contra ep. fund.* 12 (CSEL 25,1/207.25-208.11) “De eo igitur”, inquit, “frater dilectissime Pattici, quod mihi significasti dicens nosse te cupere, cuiusmodi sit natiuitas Adae et Euae, utrum uerbo sint idem prolati, an progeniti ex corpore, respondebitur tibi, ut congruit. Namque de his a plerisque in uariis scripturis reuelationibusque dissimili modo insertum atque commemoratum est. Quapropter ueritas istius rei ut sese habet, ab uniuersis fere gentibus ignoratur et ab omnibus, qui etiam de hoc diu multumque disputarunt. Si enim illis super Adae et Euae generatione prouenisset manifesto cognoscere, numquam corruptioni et morti subiacerent.”

Necessarily, many things have to be said by way of preface, before a discovery of this mystery free from all uncertainty can be made.⁵⁰

The idea of the Three Times and the Two Natures is a fundamental principle of Manichaeism⁵¹ and the *Ep. fund.* contains these three times. The *Keph.* is also full of cosmogonical references to these Three Times and in particular, of questions and answers about the origin of the human body. Roughly the first half of this work is concerned with the minute details of their universal view. In particular, there is an interest in the question of the body which seems very similar to that of the *Ep. fund.*

From the very first chapter (or *kephalaion*), Mani discussed the mysteries that were revealed to him by the Paraclete.⁵² Among these mysteries are the mystery of the Light and Darkness, the mystery of how the universe was established and the most important mystery for our purposes, the mystery of the fashioning of Adam, the first man (ΠΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΝΤΟΙΜΠΑΛΑΚΣΕ ΝΑΔΑΜ ΠΩΑΡΠ).⁵³ There is a resemblance to the *Ep. fund.* in the two different mysteries here: that of the light and darkness and that of the fashioning of Adam. Mani seemed to be following a loose chronological order based on the Three Times in the *Keph.* and this is also true for the *Ep. fund.* where Patticius asked about the nature of the birth of Adam and Eve. Before Mani can expound on this mystery (*Contra ep. fund.* 12) he must first discuss the nature of the light and darkness and the battle that follows.

There is also slight similarity between *Keph.* 55, titled “Concerning the Fashioning of Adam” and the *Ep. fund.*⁵⁴ After discussing the issue of the image received by the evil powers from the Third Ambassador, Mani stated that Adam and Eve were new births since

⁵⁰ *Contra ep. fund.* 12 (CSEL 25,1/208.13-16 and 208.23-26) “Necessario ergo plura sunt ante commemoranda ut ad istud mysterium sine ulla possit ambiguitate perueniri...Unde si tibi uidetur, inquit, ausculta prius, quae fuerint ante constitutionem mundi et quo pacto proelium sit agitatum, ut possis luminis seiungere naturam ac tenebrarum.”

⁵¹ See Decret (1970), especially chapter 3 and S. N. C. Lieu (1992), pp. 10-32.

⁵² *Keph.* 1 (10:30-11:16).

⁵³ *Keph.* 1 (15.11-13).

⁵⁴ This resemblance has been pointed out by Scopello (2001), p. 227 who states that it is similar to *Contra ep. fund.* 25.28.

“there is not a form in their world since the beginning like it; because that image occurs not in the worlds below.” In the *Ep. fund.* Patticius asked a question that this *Kephalaion* could have answered: whether Adam and Eve were born from a word or born from a body:

Of that matter, beloved brother of Patticus, of which you told me, saying that you desired to know the manner of the birth of Adam and Eve, whether they were produced by a word or sprung from matter, I will answer you as is fit.⁵⁵

Mani’s answer comes later in the fragment of the *Ep. fund.* found in *Nat. b.* Here he states that Adam and Eve were born from a body through sexual intercourse and cannibalism between the evil prince and his consort.⁵⁶ It is also clear from the *Keph.* that, despite being new births because of the image they received, they were born from sexual intercourse. Mani then explained that there are only three things that were not fashioned from sexual intercourse: a sea giant; a sea monster that fell to the earth; and the nature that fell on what is dry.

There are also similarities between the *Ep. fund.* and *Keph.* 56 (137.12-144.12) titled “Concerning Saklas and his Powers.”⁵⁷ In the largest fragment of the *Ep. fund.*, found in Augustine’s *Nat. b.*, there is the story of the formation of Adam and Eve by the Prince of Darkness and his consort.⁵⁸ Mani stated that this Prince convinced the male and female demons that they were not strong enough on their own to keep the light which was within their own bodies. The Prince then compelled them to copulate and their offspring contained a larger portion of the light than their parents. He devoured the offspring in order to gain their light. Once that was completed, the Prince called his consort who was just as evil as he since she came from the same source. He then copulated with her. Unfortunately Augustine did not give the rest of the text. From this it appears that the female consort would have given birth to Adam and Eve. The two texts are given below (similarities are italicized):

⁵⁵ *Contra ep. fund.* 12 (CSEL 25,1/207.25-208.4). See also the discussion on *Keph.* 57, below.

⁵⁶ *Nat. b.* 46.

⁵⁷ Ries (1995), p. 546 mentions this *Kephalaion*.

⁵⁸ *Nat. b.* 46.

Nat. b. 46	Kephalaion 56
<p>Therefore with wicked fabrications he addressed those who were present saying: What do you think about this great light that arises. You see how it moves the heavens and shakes the greatest powers. <i>It is better, therefore, for you to give up to me the portion of light which you have in your power. Thus I will make an image of the great one who has appeared gloriously, so that we shall be able to reign free at last from our dark way of life.</i>⁵⁹</p>	<p>Once again the disciples questioned the enlightener. They say to him: All these abortions, amongst them are Saklas and his consort and the ones whom they have served ... they are the ones that shaped Adam and Eve. How did they find this beautiful image laid over their shape, even though when it was displayed to their fathers they were not in existence? They never saw the image of the Ambassador! And how did they take the seal of the image of the Ambassador? They added it to the shape of Adam and Eve...fruits, it assumed them and spoke in the ruler, their leader. <i>He says to his companions: Come! Give me your light, and I will construct for you an image after the likeness of the exalted one. What he said, they did: they gave it to him, and he constructed ...</i> Again the enlightener says: The sin that spurted out ... which is the Matter that saw the image of the Ambassador and that formed the tree and was established in it; afterwards it came up in the fruits ... It went in to the rulers ... they formed Adam and Eve after the likeness of the exalted one. Through the energy of the sin that had seen the image of the Ambassador, it went into the (rulers) through the fruits...</p>

As shown, there is a similar phrase in both works regarding the conversation that the Prince of Darkness had with the demons regarding their inability to hang onto the light. Augustine also mentioned this conversation a few years earlier in *Mor. II* 9.14. If anything, the *Ep. fund.* is more detailed than what is found here in this *keph.*

Keph. 57 also contains another very similar statement to the *Ep. fund.*:

Once again, a Babylonian catechumen questioned the enlightener, saying to him: Speak with me my master, and instruct me about Adam, the first man. When was he fashioned, how did they sculpt him? Or, how did they beget him? Rather, is his begetting like the begetting that is brought forth today, amongst

⁵⁹ English translation is taken from J. S. Burleigh (trans.), *Augustine: Earlier Writings*, The Library of Christian Classics: Ichthus Edition (Philadelphia, 1953).

humankind; or not? Does a distinction exist between his birth and the one that they bring forth today?...Now answer me by what sort of birth was the entire offspring of mankind made from one man and one woman, Adam and Eve?

This Babylonian catechumen seemed very concerned with this issue since he asked Mani no less than six questions based on the generation of Adam and Eve. The *Ep. fund.* begins with a similar question by Patticius, who wanted to know the manner of the birth of Adam and Eve and “whether they came into being by a word, or were born from a body.”⁶⁰ The questions may be similar, but the answers that Mani gives are different. It has already been shown that Mani gave the Manichaean cosmology in the *Ep. fund.* but in this *keph.* Mani will explain that Adam lived longer than people today. He discussed astrology but did not mention the primordial battle and all that followed.

In terms of this specific *kephalaion*, Scoppello asks an intriguing question which she does not answer.⁶¹ She wonders whether the Patticius in the *Ep. fund.* is the same as the Babylonian catechumen found in this *kephalaion*. The questions that each ask are very similar. Although the answers are slightly different, it would not be a stretch to guess that Patticius would have asked for a more detailed explanation from Mani, who then addressed the *Ep. fund.* to him. If this is the case, then Patticius would have had to have been a catechumen at the time of his questioning Mani. As mentioned in the Introduction, there is also information on the missionary journeys of Addas and Pateg to the Roman Empire.

Although it is not possible to give a definite answer whether or not the catechumen from the *Keph.* is the same Patticius from the *Ep. fund.* (if it is, then he moved up from being a catechumen to a presbyter), there is ample proof that Pateg did travel to the Roman Empire and was important to the spread of Manichaeism. With this in mind, it appears that the two could be the same, considering the similarities found in both statements from the *Keph.* and *Ep. fund.*

⁶⁰ *Contra ep. fund.* 12 (CSEL 25,1/208.2) “utrum uerbo sint idem prolati, an progenti ex corpore.”

⁶¹ Scoppello (2001), p. 227.

Could then the *Ep. fund.* be part of the *Kephalaia*? Probably not. More likely this question/answer scheme is a pedagogical method used by the Manichaeans to help their followers to understand their religion and this technique goes back to Mani himself.⁶² This question/answer scheme is certainly like the *Ep. fund.*, but what is more similar is the information that is contained in the *Keph.* when compared to the *Ep. fund.* The first half of the *Keph.* contains a large amount of information regarding the human body, similar to the *Ep. fund.* and it is not unusual to find different Manichaean texts discussing cosmogony. Mani must have thought the topic important enough to repeat over and over and in various texts. It is a possibility that the *Ep. fund.* was generated by Mani because of similar questions as found in the *Kephalaia*, or vice versa -- that certain parts of the *Kephalaia* were generated because of the *Ep. fund.* Here the issue of Patticius is an important one. His question to Mani that generated the *Ep. fund.* is very similar to the questions of this Babylonian catechumen, although the respective answers differ in content.

2.4 A HANDBOOK FOR INITIATES

Although the entire *Ep. fund.* is not extant, it is clear from the comments of Felix, the Manichaean Doctor, that it contained the Manichaean belief of the Three Times and the Two Natures. He tells Augustine “For this is letter of the *Foundation*, because it contains the beginning, the middle and the end, which your holiness knows well, and which I have spoken of.”⁶³ These Three Times are a fundamental belief for the Manichaean religion, much like Genesis and its seven days of creation. Although the *Ep. fund.* is not a detailed cosmogonical text,⁶⁴ it is still very important and because of this it has been assumed that this *Ep. fund.* was some type of handbook that was used by the Manichaeans in order to initiate new followers.

⁶² J. P. Maher, “St. Augustine’s Defense of the Hexaemeron against the Manicheans,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 7 (1945), p. 311.

⁶³ *C. Fel.* 2.1 (CSEL 25,2/828.23-26) “Ista enim epistula Fundamenti est, quod et sanctitas tua bene scit, quod et ego dixi, quia ipsa continet initium, medium et finem.” The translations are my own. On Felix as well as the Three Times, see F. Decret (1970), *passim*.

⁶⁴ In *Contra ep. fund.* 25 (CSEL 25,1/224.24) when Augustine discussed the joining of the two lands he stated that there are other works that are more specific, but only known to a few people: “...non dico alias, quibus expressius ista descripsit...”

Alfaric, in one of the earlier studies of the Manichaean writings, believed that the *Ep. fund.* was part of the canonical epistles of Mani, but then was detached because of its “usefulness as a handbook for the hearers.” It was then given a special status.⁶⁵ Moon, in his commentary on the *Nat. b.*, follows Alfaric.⁶⁶ Polotsky called it “ein Handbuch der Lehre.”⁶⁷ Ries as well believes that it was an “exposé de catéchèse”⁶⁸ and thinks that it is a letter “d’initiation à la doctrine de la gnose dualiste.”⁶⁹ Torchia,⁷⁰ Lee,⁷¹ and Gardner⁷² also state that the *Ep. fund.* might have been an introductory manual to be used by the initiates. For Lee, the title alone signifies a handbook of some sort.⁷³

But what evidence is there to imply that the *Ep. fund.* is a handbook for the initiates? The evidence that exists is conflicting. On the one hand, the *Ep. fund.* contains nearly everything that the Manichaeans believed, according to Augustine. A handbook which explains everything would be useful to the Hearers who would probably need some sort of written documentation on the complexities of Manichaean cosmogony, and as shown above, in some sections of Manichaeism even pictures were used.

All Augustine has to say about the work itself is that it was read aloud to him.⁷⁴ This seems to indicate that it was used for instruction. But if it were a handbook, it would be expected that Augustine would be learned in the cosmogonical features of the letter. But in *Duab. an.*, written in 391, Augustine stated that he did not know the cause of the

⁶⁵ P. Alfaric, *Les écritures manichéennes*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1918-19), pp. 67-68.

⁶⁶ A. A. Moon, *De Natura Boni of St. Augustine, A Translation with and Introduction and Commentary* (Washington, 1955), pp. 212-213.

⁶⁷ H.-J. Polotsky, “Manichäismus,” in G. Wissowa (ed.), *A. Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, suppl. 6 (Stuttgart, 1935), col. 245.

⁶⁸ Ries (1972), p. 349.

⁶⁹ Ries (1995), p. 537.

⁷⁰ Torchia (1999), p. 135. Torchia (p. 135, n.2) refers to M. I. Bogan, in a translation of Augustine’s *Retractationes in Fathers of the Church*, vol. 60 (Washington, D.C., 1968), p. 129, n. 1 and p. 123.

⁷¹ K.-L. E. Lee, *Augustine, Manichaeism, and the Good* (New York, 1999), p. 14. He refers to Feldmann (1987), p. 1; A. H. Newman, in R. Stothert, A. H. Newman (trans.), *St. Augustin: The Writings Against the Manichaeans and Against the Donatists*, A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, vol. IV, P. S. Schaff (ed.), (Edinburgh, 1887; reprint, Grand Rapids, 1996), p. 129, n.1 and Ries (1995), p. 547.

⁷² Gardner (1995), p. 103. See also n. 33 where he refers to Al-Nadim’s *Fihrist*, B. Dodge (ed. and trans.), (1970), p. 798.

⁷³ Lee (1999), p. 14, n.7.

⁷⁴ *Contra ep. fund.* 5 (CSEL 25,1/197.8-10).

commingling of the Good and Evil.⁷⁵ The *Ep. fund.*, however, goes into great detail on the cause of this mixing. This may indicate that the *Ep. fund.* was not read out to gain adherents to the work, but it was read out once they were full-fledged members. This suggests that the *Ep. fund.* is indeed some type of handbook, but not a handbook for initiates.

The Manichaean Felix was also carrying a copy of the *Ep. fund.*, and it must have been a very important work since he had it with five other Manichaean works, one of which (and the only other one that is named) is the canonical *Treasure*.⁷⁶ Felix wanted to use that work with the *Ep. fund.* to answer some of Augustine's questions, neither of which were supplied by Augustine after the texts were taken away from him. Whether he carried it around for his own benefit or for teaching others is not clear. That he wanted to mine it for answers shows that this text was used by him when he did want to look up material.⁷⁷

On the other hand, neither Augustine nor Felix (or Evodius for that matter) ever mention that this text was any type of handbook. This, in and of itself, is not enough to say that it was not. But a handbook would be a useful tool to explain the cosmogony and it would be expected that many more references to the letter should be found in other writings if the initiates were using the *Ep. fund.*; or at least, more mention of the *Ep. fund.* in anti-Manichaean writers could be expected. With such a large geographical spread, something should be known of this "handbook" either from the Manichaeans who were undoubtedly proselytizing or from their detractors. But this is not so.

A very early case of Manichaean proselytizing in Africa, without the use of a handbook, comes from Alexander of Lycopolis. Alexander probably wrote his treatise

⁷⁵ *Duab. an.* 12.16 (CSEL 25,1/71.15) "...Genus quidem commixtionis huius et causam nondum audieram."

⁷⁶ *C. Fel.* I.14 (CSEL 25,2/817.17-19).

⁷⁷ This, of course, would assume that the *Treasure* was a handbook as well, since it was one of the five texts which Felix was carrying.

against them in the first decade of the fourth century.⁷⁸ This alone makes this work very important for Manichaean studies, since Mani himself had been dead for less than thirty years.⁷⁹ Alexander stated that he received his information from at least two named instructors, Papus and Thomas, as well as some others who came after these two.⁸⁰ From them Alexander was told nearly the entire cosmogonical story, from the separation of God and Evil in the beginning, the creation of man, to the fire at the end of time. He made no mention of a handbook being used by these Manichaean disciples. It is possible that the Manichaeans had memorized, from a handbook, what they wanted to say and were just repeating it from memory. Regardless, they were not using a manual to try and bring Alexander over to Manichaeism. What is important for our purposes is that the method used by these Manichaeans in Egypt to gain adherents was different from the Manichaeans who taught Augustine, at least in terms of the content of the cosmogony. Because it was different, the *Ep. fund.* does not seem to be used as a handbook for the initiates to the religion, although it was used as some type of teaching aid.⁸¹

2.5 THE *PRECEPTS OF THE HEARERS AND THE ELECT?*

Within this category of a handbook some scholars have pointed to the possibility that *Ep. fund.* also went by the name of the “*Precepts of the Hearers and the Elect*,” a title found in *Fihrist* of the Arabic writer al-Nadim.⁸² But this possibility can be ruled out. There is absolutely no indication that the *Ep. fund.* contains any rules that the Hearers and the Elect have to follow. In the *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine’s primary argument is with the Manichaean

⁷⁸ See P. W. Van Der Horst, J. Mansfeld (ed.), *An Alexandrian Platonist against Dualism: Alexander of Lycopolis’ Treatise “Critique of the Doctrines of Manichaeus”* (Leiden, 1974), p. 4. All English translations are taken from here. The critical text for Alexander can be found in A. Brinkmann (ed.), *Alexandrii Lycopolitani contra Manichaei opiniones disputatio*, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Leipzig, 1895, reprinted in Stuttgart, 1989).

⁷⁹ On Mani’s death in prison in 276, see S. N. C. Lieu (1992), p. 85 and pp. 79-80.

⁸⁰ Alexander of Lycopolis, *C. Manich. opin.* 2.

⁸¹ To date, the only example we have of a Manichaean handbook is the Chinese *Compendium*. On the *Compendium*, see Lieu (1992), p. 244 and G. Haloun and W. B. Henning, “The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light,” *Asia Major*, n.s. 3 (1952), pp. 184-212.

⁸² Reeves (1992), p. 38 n. 6 states that the *Precepts* as mentioned in al-Razi is commonly identified with the *Ep. fund.* Reeves also states that this title is otherwise unattested (p. 18).

cosmogony. This is also the case with his debates with Felix as well as what is found in the writing of Evodius. There is also another list of Mani's works from al-Biruni, an Arab scholar who wrote a survey of Indian history (d. 1048).⁸³ In his search for information on Mani's *Book of the Mysteries*, he came across a volume of Mani's writings in the works of the Arab physician al-Razi.⁸⁴ Among the usual list of canonical writings this work contained (included the *Epistles*), it included a work titled the *Dawn of Truth and Foundation*. It is not clear whether this is a single work or two.⁸⁵ Unfortunately, Al-Biruni does not discuss the contents of this work. Reeves states that if they were one work, it may be similar to the *Precepts for Hearers and the Elect*.⁸⁶ But earlier Reeves has previously pointed out that the *Precepts for the Hearers and the Elect* is commonly identified with the *Ep. fund.*, which has already been ruled out.⁸⁷ It would be more likely that these *Precepts* are Mani's letter of the *Rule of the Living*, which will be discussed shortly.

Therefore if the *Dawn of Truth and Foundation*, whether it be a single work or whether the *Foundation* is a work on its own, is indeed Mani's *Ep. fund.*, then this shows an evolution in the use of the text itself. It would mean that by the Eleventh Century, the *Ep. fund.*, which began as a letter of Mani (as will be discussed shortly), became something more important than just a letter, and then much later on was to be included in Mani's canonical works. Another example of this type of evolution could have happened to the epistle of Mani titled the *Rule of the Living*, which Augustine discusses in his *Mor. II*.⁸⁸ If anything, this *Rule of the Living* sounds more like a list of precepts for the hearers and elect. If this were

⁸³ S. N. C. Lieu (1992), p. 73. See also Reeves (1992), p. 18.

⁸⁴ On al-Razi, see J. Ruska "Al-Biruni als Quelle für das Leben und die Schriften al-Razi's," *Isis* 5 (1923): 26-50 and D. M. Dunlop, *Arab Civilization to A.D. 1500* (New York, 1971), pp. 238-9.

⁸⁵ As pointed out by Reeves (1992), p. 40, n. 72. He points the reader to J. Ruska (1923), pp. 26-50, who stated that it to be two works: *The Dawn of Truth* and the *Book of the Foundation*.

⁸⁶ Reeves (1992), p. 40, n. 72.

⁸⁷ Reeves (1992), p.38, n. 60. Earlier Reeves also lists the canonical works of Mani as the *Book of the Mysteries*, *Book of the Giants*, *Precepts for the Hearers and for the Elect*, *Shaburagan*, the *Book of the Living*, the *Pragmateia* and possibly the *Epistles* (p. 17).

⁸⁸ *Mor. II.20.74* (CSEL 90,7/155.7-9) "Proposita est uiuendi regula de Manichaei epistola, multis intolerabile uisum est, abscesserunt, remanserunt tamen pudore non pauci" (The rule of life in the epistle of Manichaeus was laid before them. Many thought it intolerable, and left; not a few felt ashamed, and stayed). On this letter, see S. N. C. Lieu "Precept and Practice in Manichaean Monasticism," *JThS* n.s. 32 (1981), pp. 153-155.

true, then here is another case for a letter that eventually becomes part of Mani's canonical texts.

2.6 THE *EP. FUND.* AS A PART OF THE MANI EPISTLES?

As stated earlier, the *Ep. fund.* begins with the Petrine-like phrase, "*Manichaeus apostolus Iesu Christi prouidentia dei patris.*"⁸⁹ This is not the only place that the letters of Mani begin in this fashion. Augustine tells us that all of the letters that were written by him began like this.⁹⁰ Gardner has shown that many letters found in Kellis also begin with this phrase,⁹¹ and he points out that letters were very important to the Manichaean community from North Africa to Central Asia.⁹² But he reserves judgment whether or not the *Ep. fund.* is a part of Mani's canonical epistles because the work is concerned with cosmogonical details while the letters from Kellis are more concerned with pastoral issues.⁹³

The *Ep. fund.*'s structure is like a letter and it fits some of the criteria for a letter that Augustine gave in *Ep. Rom. inch.* He stated that Paul's letters began with the writer stating his name,⁹⁴ followed by the recipient,⁹⁵ and finally the salutation.⁹⁶ Augustine comments that Paul does not follow the usual method, which would be "Paul, to whomever, greetings." Instead Paul just writes "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."⁹⁷

The *Ep. fund.* has some similarities with this protocol. The letter begins with Mani stating his name and title. Unlike Paul's letters, Mani has included a fairly long introduction,

⁸⁹ *Contra ep. fund.* 5 (CSEL 197.10-11). For more detail, see *Commentary* 197.10.

⁹⁰ *C. Faust.* 13.4 (CSEL 25,1/381.4-5) "Omnes tamen eius epistolae ita exordiantur: 'Manichaeus apostolus Iesus Christi.'"

⁹¹ Gardner (2001), pp. 93-104.

⁹² Gardner (2001), p. 94.

⁹³ Gardner (2001), p. 102. Gardner (2001) also states that he would prefer to see the *Ep. fund.* as outside of Mani's canonical epistles until further evidence comes to light (p. 104).

⁹⁴ *Ep. Rom. inch.* 7.1 (CSEL 84,1/154.11-14) "Huc usque dixit ipse, quis esset qui scribit epistolam. Est enim qui scribit epistolam Paulus seruus Iesu Christi, uocatus apostolus, segregatus in euangelium dei..."

⁹⁵ *Ep. Rom. inch.* 7.1 (CSEL 84,1/154.26-28) "Nunc deinde adiungit ex more epistolae quibus scribat: Omnibus, inquit, qui sunt Romae, dilectis dei, uocatis sanctis."

⁹⁶ *Ep. Rom. inch.* 8.1 (CSEL 84,1/155.9-12) "Restat ergo ut salutem dicat, ut compleatur usitatum epistolae principium, tamquam ille illis salutem. Pro ea autem ac si diceret salutem: gratia uobis, inquit, ex pax a deo patre nostro et domino Iesu Christo."

⁹⁷ For example, see Romans 1.7 and 1Cor. 1.3.

declaring that whoever hears the words of this work and believes in them shall have everlasting life.⁹⁸ Mani continues and hopes that what he has to say will be beneficial to his “holy and most dear brothers.”⁹⁹ Here Feldmann notes that the beginning of this letter may be an add-on to the original letter.¹⁰⁰ I, however, do not think this is the case. This will be examined later, but it is enough to state here that it would not be unusual for an author of a letter to know and assume that the intended recipient will not be the only reader. Mani must have known that this letter to Patticius would be read by others and the teaching found within it would be passed on. Augustine himself is a good example for this.¹⁰¹

Later in the *Ep. fund.*, the recipient is revealed: Mani’s disciple Patticius.¹⁰² Here there is another difference from the Pauline epistles: Mani does not give a salutation, unless everything from the very beginning of the epistle to the mention of Patticius is the salutation.

Other letters from antiquity have a large range of topics, with the recipients being both to individuals and to communities. Paul’s letters are perfect examples. There is no reason to think that Mani would not write letters to both individuals as well as to whole communities, as seen from his *Epistle to Edessa*.¹⁰³

Another piece of evidence that it was just a letter is that Felix also carried it and called it a letter. As mentioned, he wanted to use it to help him answer the question put to him by Augustine on why God should have fought against the Darkness. Thus this letter was a very important source of information for the Manichaeans. The last piece of evidence that suggests that the *Ep. fund.* was probably an epistle of Mani can be found in another work of Augustine,

⁹⁸ *Contra ep. fund.* 11 (CSEL 25,1/206.18-206.24).

⁹⁹ *Contra ep. fund.* 11(CSEL 25,1/207.1-213) “Pax, inquit, dei inuisibilis et ueritatis notitia sit cum fratribus sanctis et carissimis, qui mandatis caelestibus credunt pariter atque deseruiunt.”

¹⁰⁰ Feldmann (1987), p. 34. See also *Commentary* 207.12.

¹⁰¹ J. J. O’Meara, *Understanding Augustine* (Dublin, 1997), p. 31.

¹⁰² *Contra ep. fund.* 12 (CSEL 25,1/207.25).

¹⁰³ As found in the CMC 64.4ff. Unfortunately the beginning of this letter is missing.

C. Iul. imp. Here Julian of Eclanum called it Mani's *Epistle to Patticius*.¹⁰⁴ This is undoubtedly the same work as the *Ep. fund.*

It is also fortunate that a large number of titles to Mani's epistles have survived in Al-Nadim's *Fihrist*.¹⁰⁵ If the titles are anything like their contents, then Mani indeed had written on a wide variety of topics. Therefore there is no reason to think that the *Ep. fund.* could not originally have been one of Mani's canonical letters. Although Gardner has questioned, with reservations,¹⁰⁶ the idea that the *Ep. fund.* was part of Mani's canonical letters, he raised there is a possibility that one letter in the collection of al-Nadim that could be identified with the *Ep. fund.*: *The Two Sources*.¹⁰⁷ Alfarić thought that it could have been the *Long Letter of Futtaq*.¹⁰⁸ The name *Futtaq* is probably a form of *Patticius* and because of this, it is probable that the *Ep. fund.* is this *Letter of Futtaq*. This also adds evidence that the *Ep. fund.* is not the *Precepts of the Hearers and the Elect*, since al-Nadim lists this work as well. Therefore it seems that the *Ep. fund.* was just that – a letter of Mani.

2.7 SUMMARY

As shown, there is much debate on what this *Ep. fund.* really was. Part of this quandary comes from the fact that there is not much known about this letter outside of Augustine and Evodius. This seems strange considering that Augustine had given that letter prime importance in his battle with the Manichaeans. Over the centuries various theories have been created on what the *Ep. fund.* really was.

There are some things that it is not. It cannot be the *Living Gospel*. There is enough of this text extant to determine that although they might contain similar information, they cannot be the same text. Nor is it the text version of the *Picture Book*. Again the evidence is found in Augustine. He emphatically denies that the Manichaeans had any pictures to

¹⁰⁴ See *C. Iul. imp.* 4.

¹⁰⁵ English translation from Dodge (1970), p. 797.

¹⁰⁶ See Gardner (2001), p. 104.

¹⁰⁷ Gardner (2001), p. 103 n. 31 and the *Fihrist*, in Dodge, vol. 2 (1970), p. 799.

¹⁰⁸ P. Alfarić, *Les Écritures manichéennes*, p. 59.

describe their complicated cosmogony. If anything, it sounds as though Augustine would have liked to have pictures to understand these details. It is known that the Manichaeans made use of pictures, but the Manichaeans that Augustine was involved with never did. Nor is the *Ep. fund.* part of the *Keph.*, despite being very similar in a number of areas. Mani was fond of his cosmogony and he spared no ink in telling his followers about it. Lastly, it cannot be the *Precepts of the Hearers and Elect*, for the simple reason that the *Ep. fund.* does not contain any such material. If anything, the *Precepts* was probably Mani's epistle on the *Rule of the Living*, which Augustine discusses in *Mor. II*.

It is possible (although unlikely) that the *Ep. fund.* had supplanted the *Living Gospel* in importance. But since there is no evidence that the *Living Gospel* was known in the Manichaean circles that Augustine was involved with, it is hard to imagine that it supplanted it when it seems that no one even knew of its existence in the first place. It is still possible but, as stated, unlikely.

So what might the *Ep. fund.* be? It is most likely that this letter, in the beginning, was just what the title suggested: an epistle from the hand of Mani. Patticius had asked Mani for information regarding the birth of Adam and Eve, and Mani's response was to give him a version of Manichaean cosmogony. There is also evidence of its existence by way of Julian of Eclanum, who called it the *Epistle to Patticius* as mentioned in Augustine's *c. Jul. imp.* (which also matches a letter as found in al-Nadim). This epistle began like all the other epistles that Augustine knew of and this also corresponds to the Mani-epistles now coming out of Kellis. There are differences in content between the *Ep. fund.* and those from Kellis, but as mentioned, if the titles obtained from al-Nadim's work suggest their contents, then Mani was known to have written on many different subjects and to many different people. It is possible that al-Nadim may have even seen a copy of this work, titled the *Long Letter of Futtaq*. This, out of all the titles of epistles that al-Nadim preserves, would be the most likely candidate for the *Ep. fund.*

Then something happened to this letter whereby became a type of handbook of cosmogony, but not for initiates into the religion as shown by the evidence given by Augustine, since he stated that he had not heard the cause of the commingling natures. Augustine, however, did not recognize it as anything other than one of Mani's letters and it was read aloud to him on the Bema festival. This assumes that it played some type of pedagogical role. Felix also was carrying a copy of this letter with him, along with four other works (including the *Treasure*). In the barrage of questions by Augustine, Felix requested the *Ep. fund.* to help him answer those questions. If it is not a handbook, then it was certainly a text that was used to help those who were looking for answers, in much the same way that Paul's letters were used. His letters would not be referred to as "handbooks," but are still used for teaching material.

To stretch this evidence one step further, it may be possible to see that by the time the Arabic writers (especially al-Biruni) had examined the lists of Manichaean material, the *Ep. fund.* had become, to some, part of Mani's canon. This of course is assuming that the *Ep. fund.* is indeed the *Foundation* as found in the writings of Razi (if it can be separated from the *Dawn of Truth* as Ruska has done). The evolution of this work, from epistle to a canonical work of its own, might also be seen with Mani's epistle titled the *Rule of the Living*. Even if this did not occur with the *Ep. fund.*, there is little doubt that it began as a letter of Mani and achieved an important status, at least in the time of Augustine.

3 AUGUSTINE'S KNOWLEDGE OF MANICHAEAN COSMOGONY

After determining what the *Ep. fund.* might have been, it will now be important to look at what Augustine knew of this work. It will also be important to examine Augustine's knowledge of Manichaean cosmogony as revealed by his own writings. Thus the primary focus of this chapter is to examine the state of Augustine's knowledge of Manichaean cosmogony from his own words. It will be shown that his comments regarding his own past as a Manichaean reveal that he was not the model hearer he sometimes makes himself out to be. In fact, he admits that he did not live up to the morals which the Manichaeans tried to teach him. This chapter will also show that the majority of this knowledge of the End Time in Manichaean cosmogony came after he left the Manichaeans as a result of obtaining the *Ep. fund.* and other Manichaean texts. Before examining this issue, it will be important to give a short, general introduction of Augustine's life, focusing primarily on the period up to writing the majority of his anti-Manichaean works.

3.1 THE EARLY LIFE OF AUGUSTINE (354-400)¹

Augustine was born in 354 in Thagaste, a north African town in the province of Proconsular Africa, at a time when Christianity was still in its infancy as the official religion of the Roman empire.² His birth was just seventeen years after the death of Constantine the Great. Augustine was among "an amazing generation of ecclesiastical rulers at the end of the fourth and early fifth centuries: Ambrose at Milan (374-97), Basil at Caesarea (370-79), John Chrysostom at Antioch and Constantinople (398-407)."³ He was one of the most prolific writers and his influence was so great that he became second only to the bible as an

¹ This short introduction will not do justice to the life of Augustine, but there are many studies that do. See P. Courcelle, *Recherches sur les confessions de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1950; 2nd edition, Paris, 1968); Brown (1969); Bonner (1986) and S. Lancel, *Saint Augustine*, A. Nevill (trans.), (London, 2002) (all references are to the translated edition). Our concern here is to introduce his life, focusing more on his Manichaean side. It will also not discuss his life past the early 400's.

² On the state of Christianization on the local level, at least in Italy, see R. Lizzi, "Ambrose's Contemporaries and the Christianization of Northern Italy," *JRS* 80 (1990): 156-173. She demonstrates that at that time Christianity was still attempting inroads into the countryside.

³ P. Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity AD 150-750* (London, 1971), p. 108.

authoritative source in the medieval West.⁴ To understand Augustine the bishop one must place his life in context. Augustine grew up in an uneasy time with Christianity gaining a foothold on the Roman Empire, including the setbacks of Julian the Apostate and numerous controversies in the fight for ecclesiastical superiority.

Even though Augustine denied it, the Manichaeans were a force to be reckoned with.⁵ Within one hundred years of the death of Mani, this religion had spread from its origin in Ctesiphon to Central Asia, the western parts of the Roman Empire as well as Egypt and North Africa.⁶ Although he grew up in a semi-Christian household (his mother Monica was a Christian but his father was not),⁷ when he joined the Manichaeans, he believed that he had joined the true form of Christianity.⁸ After leaving, he would become its greatest detractor; in fact, he played a very large part in its downfall in the Roman Empire. In some Augustinian studies, it is common to state that he only had three conversions in his life: the first to philosophy after studying Cicero's *Hortensius*, the second to the philosophy of the

⁴ M. L. Colish, *The Mirror of Language: A Study in the Medieval Theory of Knowledge* (New Haven, 1968; rev. ed., Lincoln, 1983), p. 7 (page numbers refer to revised edition). See also J. J. O'Meara, "The Immaterial and the Material in Augustine's Thought," in (ed.) J. Petruccione, *Nova & Vetera: Patristic Studies in Honor of Thomas Patrick Halton* (Washington, 1998), p. 181.

⁵ His denial of this comes from his reference to the 'small numbers' of the Manichaeans. For example, see *Mor.* I, 34.75 (CSEL 90,7/81.1) "Nec mirum est in tanta copia populorum, quod non uobis desunt, quorum uita uituperata decipiatis incautos et a catholica salute auertatis, cum in uestra paucitate magnas patiamini angustias..." Even P. Brown (1969), p. 46, states that the Manichaeans were small in numbers. Later however in his *Conf.* Augustine points out that in Rome their numbers were large: 5.10.19 (CCL 27/68.29). The evidence of a large number of writings against them shows the power they had over Augustine and those who listened to them. See also G. R. Evans, in "Neither A Pelagian Nor a Manichee," *VigChr* 35 (1981), p. 235, who points out that one of the reasons that Paulinus requested five of Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings (*ep.* 25.1) was because of the large numbers of Manichaeans in Rome.

⁶ See Lieu (1992), chapters two and three for the spread of the Manichaeans. For the Manichaeans in North Africa, see Decret (1978), vol. 1, pp. 14-15 and "L'Utilisation des Épitres de Paul," repr. *Essais sur l'Église manichéenne en Afrique du Nord et à Rome au temps de Saint Augustin: Recueil d'études, Augustinianum* 47 (Roma, 1995), pp. 55-106.

⁷ There are many studies of Augustine's life and most touch on the fact that Augustine was a Catholic Christian when he was growing up. For example, see J. J. O'Meara, *The Young Augustine*, 2nd Edition (New York, 2001), p. 20-21. He states that "Men have too often forgotten these first years of Christian belief and piety when Augustine was the willing pupil at his mother's knee...Augustine was first, though not formally, and last a Christian: the years between were an important interlude, it is true, but still an interlude." But this is overstated. There is no doubt that the Christianity of Monica had an impact on him. But there is also no doubt that whatever kind of religion she followed, once he left home, he left it behind and in his search for a true religion he rejected his mother's and joined the Manichaeans. See also the comments of G. Bonner (1986), p. 39 and G. R. Evans, *Augustine on Evil* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 6.

⁸ The Manichaeans believed themselves to be the true Christians. On this, see Decret (1970), p. 152. Although they were not the same type of Christians as the Catholics, it is not correct to say that Augustine was a "non-Christian" at the time he was a Manichaean, as J. Quinn does in his "Anti-Manichaean and Other Moral Precisions in Confessions 3.7.12-9.17," *AugStud* 19 (1988), p. 177.

Neoplatonists, and the third, to his conversion to Catholic Christianity.⁹ But another must be added to this list: his conversion to Manichaeism.¹⁰

In 373 at the age of 19, days after reading Cicero's *Hortensius*, and following the advice of Cicero to seek for wisdom, Augustine became a Manichaean.¹¹ He remained in this group for nine years according to his own words but in reality it was probably closer to twelve.¹² At this point he already had a son and a woman he regarded as his wife.

During this time Manichaeism played a fundamental role in the life of Augustine.¹³ He was very active in Manichaeism and seemed to have no doubts that it was the true Christian religion, which is shown by his earlier debates with his fellow countrymen.¹⁴ He recruited nearly all of his friends after he himself had joined.¹⁵ It can also be assumed that his son, Adeodatus, was a Manichaean as well, since it would be hard to believe that Augustine

⁹ It should be pointed out that this is not the case with all studies on Augustine. Many do, in fact, recognize his conversion to Manichaeism. For example, see Bonner (1986), p. 62; Teske (1991), p. 9; and Quinn (1988), p. 165. On the other hand, R. A. Greer, in "Augustine's Transformation of the Free Will Defence," *Faith and Philosophy* 13, no. 4 (October 1996), p. 471 states that "Augustine's first conversion is to the Christian Platonism of his day..." and M. Cameron, "The Christological Substructure of Augustine's Figurative Exegesis," in Pamela Bright (ed. and trans.), *Augustine and the Bible* (Notre Dame, Indiana 1999), p. 74 states that Augustine is a man of many conversions, some large and some small, but fails to mention his conversion to Manichaeism.

¹⁰ On the conversions of Augustine, see Courcelle (1968), p. 60-78; L. Ferrari, *The Conversions of Saint Augustine* (Villanova, 1984); and J. M. Blond, *Les conversions de saint Augustin* (Paris, 1950).

¹¹ On the importance of the *Hortensius* on Augustine, see E. TeSelle, *Augustine the Theologian* (London, 1970), p. 61 as well as J.J. O'Meara (2001, 2nd ed.), p. 42-45.

¹² *Conf.* 3.11.20 (CCL 27/38.32) "Nam nouem ferme anni secuti sunt, quibus ego illo limo profundi ac tenebris falsitatis..." Despite Augustine's words, there is a debate as to how long he was really a Manichaean. See L.C. Ferrari, "Augustine's <<Nine Years>> as a Manichee," *Augustiniana* (1975): 210-216, who believes that Augustine was a Manichaean for ten years. J. van Oort, "Manichaeism in Augustine's *De ciuitate Dei*," in E. Cavalcanti (ed.), *Il De ciuitate Dei. L'opera, le interpretazioni, l'influsso* (Rome, 1996), p. 193 agrees with Ferrari. As noted in Van Oort (p. 193), P. Courcelle, in "Saint Augustin manichéen à Milan," *Orpheus I* (1954), pp. 81-85 "even goes so far as to see a 'réflexe manichéen in 385.'" G. Tavard, in "St. Augustine Between Mani and Christ," *The Patristic and Byzantine Review* 5 (1986), p. 196 states that Augustine was in Manichaeism for eleven years without explanation. P. Fredriksen, in "Beyond the Body/Soul Dichotomy: Augustine on Paul against the Manichees and the Pelagians," *Recherches Augustiniennes* 23 (1988): 87-114, p. 89 also wonders on the time he was a Manichaean and thinks it may have been from 373-385.

¹³ Some would deny this importance. For example, TeSelle (1970), p. 29 calls Augustine's nine years with the Manichaeans "flirtations." Other comments (or lack) show that TeSelle had downgraded or ignored Augustine's interactions with the Manichaeans as well as some of the writings against them. He also states (p. 123) that *Uera rel.* is a "kind of address to the Gentiles" while never mentioning the fact that it was written against the Manichaeans (see *Retr.* 1.13 (CCL 57/36.8-9): "Maxime tamen contra duas naturas Manichaeorum liber hic loquitur").

¹⁴ See *Contra ep. fund.* 3 (195.9-12) "...qui denique omnia illa figmenta, quae uos diuturna consuetudine implicatos et constrictos tenent, et quaesiui curiose et adtente audiui et temere credidi et instanter, quibus potui, persuasi et aduersus alios pertinaciter animoseque defendi." See also *Commentary* 195.12.

¹⁵ Augustine convinced Romanianus, Alypius, Verecundus, Nebridius and Honoratus to become Manichaeans. See *Commentary* 195.12 for a discussion of this and references.

would convince so many of his friends to become Manichaeans while at the same time leaving his son to his own devices or to join the other religions. One can also guess this was the case with the unnamed woman who bore his child.¹⁶ He was one of the most important defenders of this religion in North Africa. In fact, he was known well enough in Carthage “for his name to have been cited by the defense in the *cause célèbre* against the Manichees tried by the proconsul Messianus in 386.”¹⁷

After tiring of the antics of his students and, as he states, beginning to tire of the Manichaeans, Augustine left Thagaste and sailed for Rome in 383.¹⁸ He arrived with hopes of a better future in the imperial government, but when he landed he became very ill. During this time he was still closely associated with a group of Manichaeans in Rome with whom he was staying and who had nursed him back to health. This was nearly ten years after he had joined them. During his stay, some Manichaeans approached the famous Symmachus, who that year had written a petition to reinstall the Altar of Victory in the Roman senate. In this well-known historical episode, the Bishop of Milan countered this move and emperor Valentinian II supported Ambrose.¹⁹ The Manichaeans wanted Symmachus to appoint Augustine to the post of Rhetor of Milan. Symmachus listened to a public oration by Augustine, accepted the Manichaeans’ recommendation and Augustine was made the professor of rhetoric. He began his appointment in 384.²⁰ The recommendation made to Symmachus by the Manichaeans alone shows how influential they were in Rome, despite the

¹⁶ However, Brown (1969), p. 89 thinks that “in all probability” she was a good Catholic. But Augustine appeared to be a very persuasive man, so it is hard to believe the his partner would have remained in another religion, especially when he converted nearly all of his friends to Manichaeism.

¹⁷ W.H.C. Frend, “Manichaeism in the Struggle between Saint Augustine and Petilian of Constantine,” *AugMag* 2 (1955), p. 862.

¹⁸ Brown (1969), p. 16.

¹⁹ A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire: 284-602* (Oklahoma, 1964, reprint Baltimore, 1986), p. 163. All references are to the reprint edition. See also J. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and the Imperial Court A.D. 364-425* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 203-211 for a good overview of this episode. On the interaction between Ambrose and Symmachus, see Neil B. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley, 1994), pp. 263-275. For Ambrose’s letters, see *ep.* 17 and 18 (CSEL 82).

²⁰ *Conf.* 5.13.23. On the date of this event, see P. Courcelle (Paris, 1968, 2nd edition), pp. 78-83. Symmachus was also made prefect of Rome in June or July of 384, a post he held for eight months (Matthews [1975], p. 16).

fact that Manichaeism was outlawed at this time.²¹ It also casts doubt on Augustine's version of the events when he stated that he really wasn't a Manichaean at the time. This could be true, but that would mean that Augustine was a very manipulative person who lied to both his Manichaean friends to get the position and to Symmachus, who believed Augustine to be a Manichaean. It is more probable that Augustine was still a Manichaean in both belief and practice and took the position to help in his growing career.

In Milan²² Augustine went through a brief period in Skepticism and then met some of the most important people of his life. These people and their writings were to change forever the way that Augustine thought about religious things. These were the Neoplatonists, or just the Platonists as they called themselves.²³ They were Zenobius, Hermogenianus, Manlius Theodorus.²⁴ There was also Marius Victorinus,²⁵ and Simplicianus,²⁶ who told Augustine of

²¹ See CTh 16.5.3, 16.5.7, 16.9.1 and 16.9.11 in P. Krueger and T. Mommsen (ed.), *Codex Theodosianus, vol 1: Theodosiani Libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondinis* (Hildesheim, 1990). It is unlikely that these laws were studiously carried out, since Symmachus must have known that Augustine was a Manichaean and yet he still installed him as rhetor.

²² See also Chapter 5 for an in-depth discussion of the impact of Neoplatonism, especially on his anti-Manichaean arguments in the *Contra ep. fund.* For a timeline of Augustine in Milan, see P. Courcelle (1968, 2nd edition), pp. 78-92 and pp. 601-602. On Courcelle, P. Brown (1969), p. 79 n. 1 remarks "(Courcelle) has laid the foundations of all modern views on Augustine's evolution in Milan." See also Matthews (1975), pp. 183-222.

²³ For an excellent overview of his time with the Neoplatonic writings, see P. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus: Recherches sur sa vie et ses oeuvres* (Paris, 1971) and S. Lancel (2002), p. 82-89. In his *B. uita.* 1.4 (CCL 29/67.98-103), Augustine described the importance of the Neoplatonic theory, where he stated "Lectis autem Plotini paucissimis libris, cuius te esse stodiosissimum accepi, conlataque cum eis, quantum potui, etiam illorum auctoritate, qui diuina mysteria tradiderunt, sic exarsi, ut omnes illas uellem ancoras rumpere, nisi me nonnullorum hominum existimatio commoueret." Later in *ep.* 118 (written in late 410/early 411) Augustine will praise the Platonists once again (CSEL 34.2 665-698). See also T. O'Loughlin, "The *Libri Philosophorum* and Augustine's Conversions," in T. Finan, V. Twomey (ed.), *The Relationship between Neoplatonism and Christianity* (Dublin, 1992), pp. 101-125; Rist (1994), pp. 257-8 and Stock (1996), p. 72. Here Stock discusses the impact of reading these works had on Augustine.

²⁴ Evans (1982), p. 17. For these men, see also A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, J. Morris (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 1, A.D. 260-395 (Cambridge, 1971).

²⁵ On Marius Victorinus, see Hadot (1971).

²⁶ On Simplicianus' influence on Augustine, see P. Courcelle (reprint, 1968), pp. 168-174. It was probably Simplicianus who had suggested to Augustine to investigate the Platonic books and compare them to scripture. See A. Fitzgerald, introduction to B. de Margerie, *An Introduction to the History of Exegesis: Saint Augustine*, vol 3, P. de Fontnouvelle (trans.), (Petersham, Mass., 1995), p. ix.

Marius Victorinus' conversion to Christianity.²⁷ Victorinus had translated various Neoplatonic writings into Latin.²⁸

According to the *Confessions*, Augustine also began to listen to the sermons of Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, who must be included in the list of Neoplatonists.²⁹ At this point Augustine was still a Manichaean and was more interested in the mode and technique of Ambrose's sermons rather than their content. Ambrose's personal contact with Augustine, however, remains somewhat a mystery.³⁰ He never mentions Ambrose in his early career as a priest and first mentions him in his *Confessions*.³¹ In all the correspondence available, there is one reference that Augustine had written a letter to Ambrose (whom he credits for lifting the veil of materiality from his eyes³²) asking for advice on what books from scripture to read.³³ One clue is that Ambrose was both an ecclesiastical leader as well as a person who was deeply involved in the issues of the Roman government. Ambrose must have been aware of Augustine's appointment to such an important position in Milan and he probably also knew

²⁷ *Conf.* 8.2.3.

²⁸ Brown (1969), 92. It is not clear when exactly Augustine had read these works (or even what works he had read) of the Platonists. Brown (1969), p. 94, following Courcelle (1950), p. 280 thinks it might have been in the early part of summer, 386. For possible list, see P. Courcelle, *Late Latin Writers and Their Greek Sources* (Cambridge, MA, 1969), H. E. Wedeck (trans.), pp. 135-137. He believes that Augustine had also read Manlius' translation of a work of Celcinus as well as a work written on the human soul, which Augustine mentions in *B. uita.* 1.4. See also O'Donnell (1992), vol. 2, p. 413; 421-4 and R. J. O'Connell, *St. Augustine's Early Theory of Man, A.D. 386-391* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1968).

²⁹ For example, see *Conf.* 6.3.4 and 6.4.6. On Ambrose and his influence on Augustine, see Courcelle (reprint 1968), pp. 93-106. On Ambrose and the Neoplatonists, once again see Courcelle, pp. 106-138 and especially pp. 311-382.

³⁰ Brown (1969), p. 88. It was probably Simplicianus, the spiritual father of Ambrose, who guided Augustine to Catholicism. See Brown (1969), p. 104-105. See also Coyle (1978) p. 112, who earlier showed the immense impact that Ambrose had on Augustine, but, paradoxically, there are no direct references to any of Ambrose's works until 413-414 (*ep.* 147.6.18), although there is a possibility for echoes in some earlier works (p. 112, n. 444). O'Donnell (1992), vol. 2, p. 321 remarks "The part Ambrose played in Augustine's life is difficult to characterize, and has raised controversy." For the influence of Simplicianus, see also Coyle (1978), pp. 113-114.

³¹ *Conf.* 6.3.3 and 6.3.4. See also Stock (1996), p. 58; O' Meara, (2001, 2nd edition), pp. 117-118; and Brown (1969), 81-84.

³² Of course, only a small percentage of the possible letters Augustine had written are extant so it is possible that he had written to Ambrose at some other point. Augustine does, however, refer to Ambrose in some of his letters to other people. See *ep.* 31.8, addressed to Paulinus. Augustine asked him to send the writings of Ambrose. See also *ep.* 36.14.

³³ *Conf.* 9.5.13.

that it was Symmachus who placed him there.³⁴ Because of this, Ambrose must have treated Augustine with suspicion although Augustine states that Ambrose greeted him “as a good bishop would.”³⁵ Ambrose knew of the Manichaeans, since just few years before, Ambrose had refused to help Priscillian of Avila, who was accused of Manichaeism (although Ambrose was horrified when Priscillian was executed in 385 under Maximius).³⁶ In Augustine’s time as priest and bishop, there were many occasions when Manichaeans were found to be attending his church services,³⁷ similarly, Ambrose must have been wondering why an open Manichaean would be attending his services as well.

But there is no doubt that Ambrose played a very important part, if not *the* important part, in Augustine’s conversion to Christianity.³⁸ He explained some passages that Augustine was having difficulty with.³⁹ He also taught Augustine to read the Old Testament in a spiritual as opposed to materialistic viewpoint.⁴⁰ This allowed Augustine to see God not as something material, but as something wholly spiritual.⁴¹ Augustine could then view his

³⁴ See also O’Donnell (1992, vol. 2), p. 340. He points the reader to *Mor.* I 1.1. See also S. Lancel (2002), p. 67; and P. Brown, in “The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire,” in *Religion and Society in the Age of St. Augustine* (London, 1972), p. 109 (originally published in *Journal of Roman Studies* 59 (1969): 92-103. Page numbers refer to the 1972 reprint) also suggests that Symmachus had supported Augustine in opposition to the growing power of the Catholic Church (p. 109). Augustine may have also been familiar with Symmachus from his early Manichaean days, since Symmachus was the proconsul of Africa for about a year, starting in 373 (Matthews [1975], p. 24). It should also be pointed out that Symmachus and Ambrose also had very cordial relations, at least as shown in their correspondence. On this, see T. D. Barnes, “Augustine, Symmachus, and Ambrose,” J. McWilliam (ed.), *Augustine: From Rhetor to Theologian* (Ontario, 1992), pp. 7-13 and Matthews (1975), p. 201. Symmachus may not have been too anti-Christian, especially when it came to protecting his own interests. In 380 he had written to his brother, who was then the vicarius of Africa, regarding the sack of Caesarea by Firmus. Symmachus was backing the spokesman of the city, the Christian bishop, in lowering the tax rates of the city. Symmachus owned property nearby and this would have had a direct impact on himself. On this episode see Matthews (1975), p. 25.

³⁵ *Conf.* 5.13.23.

³⁶ B. Ramsey (trans.), *Ambrose, The Early Church Fathers*, C. Harrison (ed.), (London, 1997), p. 42. On Priscillian and Ambrose, see also H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church* (Oxford, 1976).

³⁷ For example, see s. 116.4.

³⁸ *Conf.* 6.3.4. For this important influence, see C. P. Mayer, *Die Zeichen in der geistigen Entwicklung und in der Theologie des jungen Augustinus*, vol. 1 (Würzburg, 1969), pp. 115-127 and especially Courcelle (1968), pp. 250-7 and Chapter 3. See also P. Rousseau, “Augustine and Ambrose: The Loyalty and Singlemindedness of a Disciple,” *Augustiniana* 27 (1977), p. 155 who states there are two main influences of Ambrose: philosophical and biblical.

³⁹ *Conf.* 5.14.24. See also G. Madec, *Saint Augustin et la philosophie: Notes critiques* (Paris, 1992), pp. 21-26.

⁴⁰ *Conf.* 5.14.12-16.

⁴¹ See *Conf.* 5.10.19, 6.3.4 and 6.4.5. See also Mayer (1969), pp. 99-103 and R. J. O’Connell (1968), p. 31 “Again and again he diagnoses his former religious failings as having stemmed, on the intellectual level, from

Manichaean beliefs of a vicious Old Testament God in a new light and also allowed Augustine to see the bridge that connected the Old Testament with the New. Augustine must have made a rapid transition to his new-found beliefs because, regardless of any possible suspicion that Ambrose might have had about him after first meeting Augustine, Augustine must have proved himself a capable and believable Catholic Christian and he was baptized by Ambrose in 387.⁴²

Augustine would become a man who could not be quiet about problems that occur in the church.⁴³ Almost immediately after his baptism, the Manichaeans occupied a good part of his writings and certainly by 388 he then became very active against the Manichaeans. Nearly all of his writings pre- 400 can be considered anti-Manichaean.⁴⁴ This is because of his own Manichaean past and his need to prove himself no longer Manichaean. In 391 he was forcibly ordained a priest and either because of a genuine need to study the scripture or because of conflict with his bishop⁴⁵ Augustine took some time off and began writing more of his anti-Manichaean works. The Catholic Church at this time was having many problems, not all related to the Manichaeans.⁴⁶ Soon after he became sole bishop (396), he wrote *Contra Epistulam quam uocant Fundamenti* (*Contra ep. fund.*). This work was written at a very important and unsettling time in Augustine's life.⁴⁷ He had just been made bishop. He had

his inability to form an adequate notion of God"; and F. H. Russell, "Only Something Good Can Be Evil": The Genesis of Augustine's Secular Ambivalence," *Theological Studies* 51 (1990), p. 700.

⁴² Brown (1969), p. 124. It should be noted that this dissertation will not deal directly with the discussion on whether or not Augustine was converted to Christianity or to Neoplatonism. It is clear that Augustine was highly affected by the *Platonici* and that this influence played a large part in his arguments against the Manichaeans. For debates on this issue as well as references, see Coyle (1978), pp. 122-126. There is little doubt that Augustine was a full Christian at the time of his conversion, but there can also be no doubt that a good part of the ideas that sit behind his writings are due to these Platonists.

⁴³ For example, see *ep.* 23.6 where he writes a letter regarding rebaptism, but it is clear that his comments can be applied to other problems that will arise in the church. For a later work, see *Ciu. Dei* 1.9.

⁴⁴ O'Donnell, vol. 1 (1992), p. xlix, n. 97. See also Rist (1994), p. 11 "Augustine's writings are almost all the work of a controversialist: they grow from arguments with his earlier self and with views current among his contemporaries, both within North Africa and throughout the wider world of the late Roman Empire."

⁴⁵ J. J. O'Donnell, "Augustine: His Time and Lives," in E. Stump, N. Kretzmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine* (Cambridge, 2001), p. 19.

⁴⁶ Especially the Donatists: see *ep.* 22.1.2 (CSEL 34/55.15-11) and *ep.* 23.5 (CSEL 34/69.21-79.9).

⁴⁷ J. J. O'Donnell, *Augustine* (Boston, 1985), p. 81 "This seemed to unsteady him a bit. The transition was accompanied by some jibing from outside—suspicions of his Manichaean past, rumor of an illicit connection with a married woman... Those things, however, must have been only the surface disturbances. Augustine was more deeply troubled by the implications of his new office..."

also had a major shift in his thinking on the issue of free will and grace after he made a detailed examination of Paul's New Testament letters.⁴⁸ There were still rumors that he was a Manichaean -- Megalius of Calama, the senior bishop of Numidia, "treated (Augustine) as an upstart, and refused for a time to ordain him. 'Augustine,' he said, 'was a crypto-Manichaean.'"⁴⁹

These Manichaean charges caused him to react against the beliefs he once held. Two of these were the idea that God was somehow material and that evil was a nature, real and nearly as powerful as the good.⁵⁰ His solutions to these problems permeate the writings against the Manichaeans, especially in the *Contra ep. fund.* He also had to react against the Donatists, who were the primary Christian sect in control during Augustine's early life in North Africa.⁵¹ He reacted against the pagan claim that Rome was sacked in 410 because of its adoption of Christianity⁵² and he reacted against the sin that gripped his life and congregation.⁵³ It is also significant that his last work before he died in 430 was still dealing with his Manichaean past.⁵⁴ He could never quite escape the charge of being Manichaean and this charge shows how powerful the Manichaean arguments were and how influential these ideas were, both positively and negatively, on the thoughts and life of Augustine.

3.2 AUGUSTINE THE MANICHAEAN HEARER

In studying Augustine's *Contra ep. fund.*, a pattern begins to emerge which suggests that he did not know as much about the "fundamentals" of Manichaean cosmogonical thought

⁴⁸ See Fredriksen (1988), p. 89-90 and Landes Fredriksen (1982).

⁴⁹ Brown (1969), p. 203 and G. Bonner (1986), p. 120. On Augustine's lifelong struggle against the charge of being a secret Manichaean, see W. H. C. Frend, "Manichaeism in the Struggle between Saint Augustine and Petilian of Constantine," *AugMag* 2 (Paris, 1954), pp. 859-866. For this struggle in Augustine's own words, see *C. litt. Petil.* 3.16.10. See also R. Lim, "Manichaeans and Public Disputation in Late Antiquity," *Recherches Augustiniennes* 26 (1992), p. 265 who also notes that when Felix, in 404 anathematized Mani, Augustine did so as well.

⁵⁰ Portalié (1960), p. 87.

⁵¹ E. Cameron (1999), p. 98.

⁵² See especially *Ciu. Dei*.

⁵³ *Ciu. Dei* 1.9.

⁵⁴ See *C. Iul.* and *C. Iul. imp.*

as he and other scholars have led us to believe. How much did Augustine really know of Manichaean cosmogony and in particular, how much did he know of the *Ep. fund.* before he wrote *Contra ep. fund.*? This leads to a more general question of what kind of a Manichaean Augustine was with regard to his Manichaean knowledge: was he an expert in the fundamentals of the Manichaean religion when he was a Manichaean, or did he learn a great deal of the religion once he was outside looking in?

The *Contra ep. fund.* is a perfect work to begin examining these questions, since a closer reading of the *Contra ep. fund.* shows that Augustine more than likely did not know the details of the *Ep. fund.* despite the fact that it was read aloud to him when he was an auditor. If he did know of these details as an auditor, then he most likely forgot them until he obtained a copy of the *Ep. fund.* If this is the case, then Augustine was not well versed in Manichaeism, at least in terms of cosmogony and the End Time.

Maher believes that Augustine “had a complete grasp of their fundamental teachings” and that his conclusions vindicate St. Augustine of the charge that he was not an authority on the teachings of Mani since “the bishop of Hippo knew these teachings well and transmitted them veraciously.”⁵⁵ To back up his claim Maher compares the *Kephalaia* (*Keph.*) and the writings of Augustine. What is suspicious is that most of the works Maher lists are later works such as *C. Faust.* and *Haer.* Van Lindt, on the other hand, states

When reading the anti-Manichaean works of St. Augustine, however, one gets the impression that the *catechumanoi* knew only the main elements of the myth and were therefore not familiar with the works related to the *Kephalaia*.⁵⁶

To examine these questions, it will be necessary first to examine Augustine’s statements which show his knowledge of Manichaeism and focus specifically on what he has to say about reading the Manichaean writings; secondly to look at what kind of a Manichaean

⁵⁵ J. P. Maher, “St. Augustine and Manichean Cosmogony” *AugStud* 10 (1979), p. 92. See also his earlier “St. Augustine’s Defense of the Hexaemeron against the Manicheans,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 7 (1945), p. 215.

⁵⁶ P. Van Lindt, *The Names of Manichaean Mythological Figures: A Comparative Study on Terminology in the Coptic Sources* (Wiesbaden, 1992), p. 224, n. 49.

he was, according to his own words; and thirdly, to examine what his knowledge was of Manichaeism. This will show that his knowledge expands over time and reaches its peak with his rediscovery of the *Ep. fund.* when he was bishop, at least twelve years after leaving Manichaeism.

How reliable is Augustine as a source for Manichaeism? This is important since throughout *Contra ep. fund.* as well as in his other writings, Augustine gives much information on the Manichaeans. But is this information trustworthy, given its source? This is a very old question in Manichaean studies. Beausobre, publishing in 1734-39, thought that Augustine could not have been a good source of valid information because he was only an auditor and that Augustine would not have had access to a good deal of the Manichaean writings because they were in numerous languages.⁵⁷ He is essentially correct on both points, although it is clear from Augustine's own words that there were Manichaean writings in Latin.⁵⁸ His position as an auditor and what this means for his Manichaean knowledge is also being questioned.

Beausobre's reservations have led to two groups of scholars who believe either that Augustine had a very good grasp of Manichaean beliefs or what he knew, he knew well, but that does not mean that he knew everything about the religion. The more recent proponents

⁵⁷ Noted by Coyle (1978), p. 50. See also Torchia (1999), p. 79 for his comments on these passages of I. de Beausobre's, *Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme*, 2 vol. (Amsterdam, 1734-1739, reprint Amsterdam, 1988) and P. Alfarié, 2 vol. (Paris, 1918-19), p. 92. For a history of this discussion, see Coyle (1978), pp. 50-57.

⁵⁸ *Conf.* 5.6.11.

who believe that Augustine had a good grasp of Manichaean knowledge are Van Oort and Giversen.⁵⁹ Van Oort states that

We must first of all stress the fact that the *young* Augustine, the *auditor* Augustine, was already well-acquainted with Manichaeism. This has to be emphasized; because, even today, there are still some scholars who do not take note of this fact or even deny it.⁶⁰

In this same work he believes that Augustine's discussion with Faustus (*C. Faust.*) was "at the highest level," which shows that Augustine was "thoroughly acquainted with the doctrines of Manichaeism."⁶¹ He points out that Augustine, in reading Faustus' *Capitula*, came across new information, but "this new information does not explain all his knowledge which he so evidently displays here."⁶² Torchia as well also looks at this question and based on Maher's comments, states that we can accept Augustine's comments "with some confidence."⁶³

Both Van Oort and Giversen⁶⁴ give some fairly convincing arguments for their case and both rely heavily on quotations from Augustine's *Conf.* There is no doubt that Augustine had read Manichaean material when he was a Manichaean and both Giversen⁶⁵ and Van Oort

⁵⁹ For example, see Van Oort (1996); Van Oort (1996), p. 214 and Van Oort (1991), p. 45. See also S. Giversen, in "Manichaean Literature and the Writings of Augustine" in E. Keck, S. Sondergaard, E. Wulff (ed.), *Living Waters*, Scandinavian Orientalistic Studies: Presented to Prof. Dr. Lokkegaard on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday (Copenhagen, 1990), pp. 63-74, also states "Augustine really tried to study Manichaeism equally before and during and after his Manichaean period. This he clearly testifies himself. When Augustine in his *Conf.* tells about his first meetings with the Manichaeans he immediately mentions that their doctrine was explained to him 'in many books and huge volumes (*Conf.* 3.6)" (p. 67). Unfortunately, Giversen does not explain what Augustine studied after he had left the Manichaeans. See also G. G. Stroumsa, "The Two Souls and the Divided Will," in A. I. Baumgarten, J. Assmann, G. G. Stroumsa (ed.), *Self, Soul and Body in Religious Experience* (Leiden, 1998), p. 199, where he states "It is beyond dispute that Augustine knew Manichaean doctrine well: he had been an auditor in the sect for about ten years." He repeats this again in *Barbarian Philosophy, The Religious Revolution of Early Christianity* (Tubingen, 1999), p. 283. Decret (Paris, 1978) shows that Augustine's account of the African Manichaeans is fundamentally trustworthy.

⁶⁰ Van Oort (1996), p. 41.

⁶¹ Van Oort (1996), p. 43.

⁶² Van Oort (1996), p. 43.

⁶³ Torchia (1999), p. 80. Torchia also states "This is further borne out by the extensive quotes from Mani's own teachings that we encounter in his anti-Manichaean polemic." I disagree. There are certainly extensive quotes from the *Ep. fund.* and the *Treasure* and some found in *C. Adim.*, but beyond that Augustine gives us very little in terms of actual quotes from Manichaean material.

⁶⁴ Giversen (1990), p. 64.

⁶⁵ Giversen (1990), especially p. 67.

make this clear. Van Oort attempts (and is successful) at showing that Augustine had a familiarity with the writings of the Manichaeans. Here he quotes *Conf.*⁶⁶ and *Mor.* II.⁶⁷ Van Oort also points out that Augustine sung Manichaean hymns.⁶⁸

Giversen believes that it is a possibility that Augustine did not know the Manichaean teachings in total, but thinks that Augustine had to have known the Manichaean writings such as the Coptic Manichaean material as well as the *Cologne Mani Codex (CMC)*.⁶⁹ He also examines Augustine's comments in the *Conf.* regarding his associations with the Manichaean Elect, and in particular the text of *Conf.* 5.10.18. He stresses that Augustine's familiarity with both the Manichaean Elect and the Manichaean texts is an important aspect in his anti-Manichaean polemic.⁷⁰ Here in the *Conf.* Augustine described his time with not only the auditors when he was sick, but with the Elect. Earlier in 3.10.18 Augustine also mentioned the Elect, and this time it is in relation to their eating habits (Giversen also discusses this passage as well⁷¹). Augustine also mentioned in *Conf.* 4.1.1 part of his duties as an auditor: he had to carry food to the Elect. These three references are the only places in the *Conf.* where he had mentioned the Elect.

But is this enough to claim that Augustine had "familiarity" with the Elect? He certainly stayed with a number of them, and there is no reason to think that he is not telling the truth here. But there are other comments regarding the Elect that give a different view of his knowledge of them.

In 392 Augustine had a debate with the Manichaean Fortunatus, five years before he started writing his *Conf.*⁷² This debate begins with Augustine stating the principles of the

⁶⁶ 5.3.6 (CCL 27/59-60), 5.7.12 (CCL 27/63), and 5.7.13 (CCL 27/63).

⁶⁷ 12.25 (CSEL 90/110).

⁶⁸ Van Oort (1996), p.38. Giversen points this out as well (1990), p. 73. On the other hand, Stock (1996), p. 46 states that *auditores* had no direct access to canonical books.

⁶⁹ Giversen (1990), p. 66.

⁷⁰ Giversen (1990), p. 68.

⁷¹ Giversen (1990), p. 71.

⁷² The critical text of *C. Fort.* can be found in CSEL 25,1/83-112. For a good overview of this work, see F. Decret, "La Christologie Manichéenne dans la Controverse d'Augustin avec Fortunatus," *Augustinianum* 2 (1995): 443-455 and Decret (1970), *passim*.

Manichaean faith. Fortunatus, however, entered the debate with Augustine in order to clear the Manichaeans of some crimes that Fortunatus believed to be false (*C. Fort.* I.1) and wanted to discuss the Manichaean conduct or their *conuersatio*.⁷³ In his reply, Augustine stated that if the audience wants to hear about their *mores* (he does not repeat Fortunatus' use of *conuersatio*), he would be happy to oblige, but he has one condition: only the Elect of the Manichaean religion could fully know the *mores*, and therefore, Augustine declined to discuss the aspect and would only discuss the Manichaean faith (*fides*).⁷⁴

There are several reasons given by Augustine why he is not able to discuss these *mores*. First of all he states that he was not an Elect but an auditor.⁷⁵ Fortunatus apparently had asked Augustine if he was present at the Manichaean liturgies (*orationi*) and Augustine replied in the affirmative: he saw nothing out of the ordinary at these meetings, but he did not know whether they (Fortunatus and his other Manichaean presbyters?) have a liturgy among themselves: only God and themselves can know that.⁷⁶ He also did not know what the Elect do amongst themselves. He had only heard that they received the Eucharist, but when they might have received this, he was not told.⁷⁷ Therefore, Fortunatus must discuss faith here because Augustine is not qualified to discuss the doctrines of the Elect.⁷⁸

⁷³ *C. Fort.* I.1 (CSEL 25,1/84.10, 14). See also J. K. Coyle, F. Decret, A., et. al., "*De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum*" "*De quantitate animae*" di Agostino d'Ippona (Palermo, 1991) who discusses the meaning of *mores*.

⁷⁴ *C. Fort.* I.3 (CSEL 25,1/85.11-13) "Itaque serua, si placet, quaestionem de moribus, ut inter electos uestros discutiatis, si discuti potest."

⁷⁵ *C. Fort.* I.3 (CSEL 25,1/84.26ff.) "Nostis autem me non electum uestrum, sed auditorem fuisse." This comment alone shows that Giversen (1990) was mistaken when he stated "That Augustine was only an auditor, and not an electus says more about his duties as a devotee than about his insight in the Manichaean writings" (p. 66).

⁷⁶ *C. Fort.* I.3 (CSEL 25,1/85.2-3) "...utrum separatim uobiscum habeatis aliquam orationem, deus solus potest nosse et uos."

⁷⁷ *C. Fort.* I.3 (CSEL 25,1/85.8ff.) "Quid autem inter uos agatis, qui electi estis, ego scire non possum. Nam et eucharistiam audiui a uobis saepe quod accipiatis; tempus autem accipiendi cum me lateret, quid accipiatis unde nosse potui?" But much later in *Haer.* 46.9 he stated that he knows what the Elect do in terms of the eucharist: they use human semen as the eucharist. If anything, this shows that he had learned of this later than when he was a Manichaean, although it undoubtedly is a vicious rumor that he decides to spread. He bases his evidence on the testimony of an eleven year old girl and a woman who was tortured to talk (*Haer.* 46.9). See also *Mor.* II 18.66 on the possible use of animal semen. I thank Prof. Coyle for pointing this out to me.

⁷⁸ Lim (1989), p. 239 believes that Augustine refused to discuss Fortunatus' call to discuss their morals, but I disagree.

In earlier works, Augustine also discussed the Elect. In *Mor.* II 19.68-70 he stated that there were some indecent actions committed by some of them. Most of his complaints are hearsay except for the last which he had witnessed. Augustine discussed the story (which occurred when Augustine was away, so once again this is hearsay) of a hearer who had gathered the Elect and had placed before them the *Uiuendi regula de Manichaei epistula*. Many, he claimed, could not live up to the precepts and left.⁷⁹ In fact, nearly all of his statements regarding the Manichaean elect have to do with their eating habits, and really nothing on what their role in the religion was.⁸⁰

So how then are we to take his comments in the *Conf.* regarding his living with the Elect? As stated above, Giversen uses the evidence of Augustine's words in the *Conf.* in order to show that Augustine had a keen insight into the Manichaean religion. But as shown from his comments given in *C. Fort.*, Augustine did not have any meaningful contact with these Elect. They kept certain parts of the religion within their own group and separate from the Hearers. Therefore Augustine is not an expert in the Manichaean religion. How could he be? It would not be expected that a catechumen in the Catholic Church would be as expert in Catholic doctrine as a priest, so a hearer in the Manichaean religion cannot be expected to have as much knowledge as an Elect. Therefore, to say that Augustine, who knew really nothing of the Elect, was very knowledgeable is a mistake.

On the other hand, Coyle believes that Augustine knew something about his Manichaean religion, but he was not an expert.⁸¹ He states

His works constitute an accurate picture of Manichaeism as he had known it -- but not necessarily a complete one. Indeed, his information enjoys a special authority because, of all anti-Manichaean authors, he alone had once belonged to the religion.⁸²

⁷⁹ *Mor.* II. 20.74. See also Lieu (1981), pp. 153-155 for a discussion of this episode.

⁸⁰ Decret (1970), vol. 1, p. 28 states that Augustine did not have access to the Elect as he claims. See also Lim (1989), p. 239.

⁸¹ J.K. Coyle, "What Did Augustine Know About Manichaeism When He Wrote His Two Treatises *De Moribus*?" in J. Van Oort, O. Wermelinger, G. Wurst (2001), p. 47.

⁸² Coyle (1978), p. 52.

This view of Coyle has remained relatively constant.⁸³ He shows that Augustine made little use of the Manichaean writings and when he does, they are from writings that he had recently acquired.⁸⁴ Decret believes that Augustine's knowledge of Manichaeism was "sparse" at best but is essentially trustworthy.⁸⁵

There is no doubt that Augustine is a very important source for our knowledge of Manichaeism since he is the only member of the anti-Manichaean writers to have been a member of that group.⁸⁶ It is important to remember, however, that Augustine is responding to some Manichaean texts, and at least some of these texts he did not know of when he was a Manichaean, such as the text of Adimantus and Faustus' *Capitula*.⁸⁷ The question is what exactly does he know about his previous religion and what he had learned.⁸⁸

There is also an over-reliance on Augustine's *Confessions* as a source of "factual" statements about his life, especially when it relates to his years as a Manichaean.⁸⁹ One would not expect that the Bishop of Hippo to say that he was a true Manichaean believer or that he came away with some good things when he left. He was a Catholic bishop after all and basically a polemicist throughout his writings. This is a crucial bit of information to

⁸³ Coyle (2001) and (2003), pp. 1-22.

⁸⁴ Coyle (2001), p. 50 and p. 53.

⁸⁵ Decret (1970), vol. 1, p. 10. See also M. A. Vannier, *Creatio, Conuersio, Formatio, chez S. Augustin* (Fribourg, 1991), p. 50 who states that Augustine's polemical interest severely limited his view of the Manichaean religion.

⁸⁶ Despite his years as a Manichaean, he tells us relatively little about the life of Mani. See G. Quispel, "Mani, the Apostle of Jesus Christ," in J. Fontaine, C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *Epektasis. Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (Paris, 1972), pp. 667-72, reprinted in G. Quispel, *Gnostic Studies*, II (Istanbul, 1975), p. 231 (references are made to the reprint edition).

⁸⁷ *C. Faust.* 1.1 (CSEL 25,1/251.9ff.) "Quod cum uenisset in manus nostras lectumque esset a fratribus, desiderauerunt et iure caritatis, per quam eis seruimus, flagitauerunt, ut ei responderemus"; and for *C. Adim.*, see *Retr.* 1.22 (CCL 57/63.1-3) "Eodem tempore uenerunt in manus meas quaedam disputationes Adimanti, qui fuerat discipulus Manichaei, quas conscripsit aduersus legem et prophetas."

⁸⁸ Maher disagrees (1979), p. 99. He does not believe that it is important to separate out what he knew when he was an auditor and what he might have learned after leaving Manichaeism.

⁸⁹ See Bonner (1986), p. 42 for the list of scholars who question the use of the *Confessions* for obtaining "at face value" facts of Augustine's life. This does not mean that Augustine is lying. What it does mean is that he is being selective with how he wants his audience to see his life and his conversion. See J. J. O'Meara, "Augustine's *Confessions*: Elements of Fiction," in J. McWilliam (ed.), *Augustine: From Rhetor to Theologian* (Waterloo, 1992), especially p. 93 "The accumulation of the considerations that I have advanced, to show how qualified must be our expectation of strict historicity in the *Confessions*, does not mean that Augustine tells untruths." And finally, O'Donnell (2001), p. 17.

remember when looking at his statements about Manichaeism. O'Donnell is certainly correct when he states:

He (Augustine) has offered us such a variety of materials, of such high quality, for reconstructing his life that it would be almost impossible not to use them, gratefully, to good advantage. But if we would use them, it is equally almost impossible not to use them to tell the story in the way he would have us tell it — and therein lies the danger.⁹⁰

O'Donnell examines the text of the *Confessions* with a cautious (and correct) undertone. Twice in the article just named he calls the *Conf.* a “retrospective and self-serving” narrative.⁹¹ His words at the end of his article are never more apt than when studying Augustine's comments on Manichaeism:

The second Augustine I have tried to sketch here, one whose life is not defined by the narrative he himself supplies. This Augustine does not succeed in imposing his interiority upon us, does not succeed in making his own interpretation of his religious history the armature of everything we are to know about him. We cannot escape from the Augustine of the *Confessions*, but we owe him and ourselves the effort to see him in other lights, to find other ways of reading his narrative.⁹²

3.3 AUGUSTINE'S HISTORY AS A HEARER

Augustine claims to have been a very devout and active member of the Manichaean religion for nine years, but what does the evidence say? To understand, then, Augustine the Manichaean, there are four important texts must be examined. The first is *De utilitate credendi* (*Util. cred.*), written in 391/2; *On Two Souls* (*Duab. an.*), finished in 392⁹³; *Against*

⁹⁰ O'Donnell (2001), p. 9.

⁹¹ O'Donnell (2001), p. 16, 18.

⁹² O'Donnell (2001), p. 23.

⁹³ P. Brown (1969). R. Jolivet and M. Jourjon (ed.), *Œuvres de Saint Augustin, Vol. 17, Six Traités anti-Manichéens* (Paris, 1961), p. 41 believe it to have been written in 391.

Fortunatus (C. Fort.) written in 392; and the *Letter of Secundinus* (Ep. Sec.) (probably written sometime during or after the writing of the *Confessions*).⁹⁴

3.3.1 *Utilitate Credendi* (*Util. cred.*)

Although he rarely has anything good to say about his Manichaean past, the Manichaeans had taught him some important things that were to remain with him while he was a Catholic. In his *Util. cred.* 18.36 Augustine stated the truths that he learned from the Manichaeans:

God is not the author of evil. He never repented of anything he had made. His mind is disturbed by no emotional storms. No particular part of the earth is his Kingdom. He neither approves nor commands any crimes or evil deeds. He never lies...So I hold fast the truth I learned from them, and I reject the false opinion they taught me.⁹⁵

Despite this, he was not a good Manichaean according to his own words. He remarks to Honoratus, who is still a Manichaean, earlier in *Util. cred.*:

...I have no fear that you will think I was the dwelling-place of light when I was involved in the life of this world, nursing shadowy hopes of a beautiful wife, of the pomp of riches, of empty honors and other pernicious and deadly pleasures. All these things, as you know, I did not cease to desire and hope for when I was their zealous hearer. I do not attribute this to their teaching, for I confess that they carefully warned me to beware of these things.⁹⁶

The Manichaeans attempted to install in Augustine some of their morals, but he refused and instead followed a life of “empty honors and pernicious and deadly pleasures.”

⁹⁴ The exact date that Secundinus wrote this letter is unknown. But there are clues to indicate that Secundinus had read Augustine's *Confessions* (or at least part of it), so the letter was probably written during or right after the *Conf.* Augustine's response (C. Sec.) is usually dated to 399 and as late as 404.

⁹⁵ English translations are taken from J. H. S. Burleigh (trans.), *Augustine: Earlier Writings*, The Library of Christian Classics, Ichthus Edition (Philadelphia, 1953). *Util. cred.* 18.36 (CSEL 25,1/46.24-47.5) “nam neque deus mali auctor est nec umquam eum quicquam fecisse paenituit ne ullius commotionis animi tempestate turbatur nec terrae particula regnum eius est, nulla flagitia uel scelera probat aut imperat, numquam mentitur. haec enim atque huiusmodi nos mouebant, cum ea magnis iniectionibus quaterent et hanc esse ueteris testamenti disciplinam insimularent; quod omnino falsissimum est. itaque illos recte reprehendere ista concedo. quid ergo didici? quid putas, nisi cum ista reprehenduntur, disciplinam catholicam non reprehendi? ita quod apud eos uerum didiceram, teneo. quod falsum puta ueram, respuo.”

⁹⁶ *Util. cred.* 3 (CSEL 25,1/6.7-14) “Non enim uereor, ne me arbitreris inhabitatum lumine, cum uitae huius mundi eram implicatus, tenebrosam spem gerens de pulchritudine uxoris, de pompa diuitiarum, de inanitate honorum ceterisque noxiis et perniciosis uoluptatibus. Haec enim omnia, quod te non latet, cum studiose illos audirem, cupere et sperare non desistebam. Neque hoc eorum doctrinae tribuo; fateor enim et illos sedulo monere, ut ista caueantur.”

3.3.2 *Duabus Animabus (Duab. an.)*

In 392 he completed his *Duab. an.*⁹⁷ Here he looked at the supposed Manichaean belief that there are two “souls” in mankind, one good and the other evil. Mankind is not responsible for any evil deeds because it is the evil soul that causes sins. But there are no Manichaean texts to support this idea and Augustine is our only source for this idea.⁹⁸ What is important for our purposes in this work is Augustine’s comments on Manichaean cosmogony. In chapter sixteen, he discusses the two kinds of souls. He then states

and so they maintain that the one is the highest good, but the other the highest evil, and that these two classes were at one time distinct but are now commingled. *The character and the cause of this commingling I had not yet heard* (emphasis mine).⁹⁹

He was not told about the details of this mixing or the reason for it. This is a very important sentence, since it implies that Augustine, while a Manichaean hearer, did not know the cause of this commingling, and therefore did not know the basic details of their cosmogony. But this cause is found in the *Ep. fund.*, a work that he claims was read aloud to him every year at the Bema Festival. The *Ep. fund.* then continues with the Beginning Time, when the Light and Dark were totally separated. As stated earlier, the *Ep. fund.* contains the story of all Three Times and thus explains the character and cause of the commingling.

It is unfortunate that Augustine does not tell us when he had not heard of this cause and character. It must have been, however, at a time when he was a Manichaean hearer. This indicates that the Manichaean hearers, at least those in Augustine’s group, may have slowly

⁹⁷ For a short discussion of this work, see Decret (1978), p. 81-92. English translations are taken from A. H. Newman (trans.), “St. Augustin: On Two Souls, Against the Manichaeans,” in P. Schaff (ed.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol. 4 (Edinburgh, 1887; reprint, Grand Rapids, 1996). All references are to the reprinted edition.

⁹⁸ Stroumsa (1999), p. 233 believes that the Manichaeans must have believed this, but I am not convinced that just because the idea existed elsewhere that it would have been carried into Manichaeism. For the history of this question, see Stroumsa (1999), p. 283 and n. 5-7.

⁹⁹ *Duab. an.* (CSEL 25,1/71.15-23) “Duo animarum genera esse dicunt: unum bonum, quod ita es deo sit, ut non ex aliqua materia uel ex nihilo ab eo factum, sed de ipsa eius omnino substantia pars quaedam processisse dicatur; alterum autem malum, quod nulla prorsus ex parte ad deum pertinere credunt credendumque commendant. Et ideo illud summum bonum, hoc uero summum malum esse praedicant atque ista duo genera fuisse aliquando discreta, nunc esse commixta. Genus quidem commixtionis huius et causam nondum audieram.”

been introduced to Manichaean cosmogony, possibly after they were firmly entrenched in the religion itself. There is, however, evidence from Alexander of Lycopolis to suggest that other Manichaean proselytizers did teach the basics of Manichaean cosmogony, which implies that the Manichaeans that Augustine was involved with were different in terms of teaching the hearers.

Alexander of Lycopolis is one of the earliest witnesses to the spread of Manichaeism to Egypt.¹⁰⁰ Writing in the early parts of the fourth century (just thirty years after the death of Mani) he stated that there were at least two Manichaean missionaries who stopped in his town to gain adherents. The Manichaeans were successful, based on the fact that Alexander could not understand why people more philosophically inclined were joining the religion.¹⁰¹ He writes:

The account of this man's doctrine as given to us by his pupils is the following. He laid down as principles God and matter, God being good and matter evil...On the side of God are arranged other powers as auxiliaries, all good, and in the same fashion others on the side of matter, all evil...Once upon a time matter grew desirous of reaching the region above...So God sent a certain power, which we call Soul, towards matter, which was to mingle with it throughout. And a future separation from this power would be the death of matter...Then God was filled with pity for the Soul's plight, and sent another power which we call Demiurge...For apart from the Demiurge, there is another power which, having descended towards the luminosity of the sun, fulfils this task...In the sun an image is visible, which resembles the form of man; this image spurred the ambition of matter, so that it created man out of itself...Christ is an intellect. When at some time he arrived from the place above, he liberated the greatest part of the above-mentioned power...They say that when the divine power has been truly separated, the outer fire will collapse and burn up both itself and whatever is left of matter.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ For the text of Alexander of Lycopolis, see van der Horst and J. Mansfeld (1974). All English translations are taken from here. For the critical text, see A. Brinkmann (ed.), *Alexandrii Lycopolitani contra Manichaei opinioniones disputatio*, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, (Leipzig, 1895, reprinted in 1989 (Stuttgart).

¹⁰¹ *Contra Manichaei opinioniones disputatio* 3.1.

¹⁰² *Contra Manichaei opinioniones disputatio* 2.

The Manichaeans who first went to Egypt did not seem to hold back any of their cosmogonical teaching even to those who were not yet Manichaeans. This was different from the Manichaeans Augustine was involved in, since it appears that Augustine was not taught all of the details. Because it was different, the *Ep. fund.* was not used as a handbook for the initiates to the religion, although it was used as some type of teaching aid, as has already been discussed. This would also agree with Augustine's statement that it was read to him during the Bema Festival. It is likely that only Manichaeans would take part in this festival, meaning that those who were going through the initial phases of joining the Manichaeans were not exposed to this work.

3.3.3 The Letter of Secundinus to Augustine and His Response

As mentioned above, at some point in his Manichaean career as a auditor, Augustine did not know the basics of the mixture, which is the foundation of Manichaeism. This lack of cosmogonical knowledge or understanding on Augustine's part is shown in the letter that the Manichaean Secundinus sent to Augustine.¹⁰³ This letter is little used by Augustinian scholars when it comes to dealing with Augustine's Manichaean past.¹⁰⁴

In his letter to Augustine, Secundinus tried to get him to come back to the Manichaeans and become a new Paul for them. He also told Augustine that he had read a number of Augustine's writings, not once but a number of times. These writings were undoubtedly Augustine's anti-Manichaean works and this letter was written to Augustine sometime after he was ordained bishop. It is almost certain that Secundinus had at least read the *Confessions*.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ *Ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/893-901).

¹⁰⁴ See J. Van Oort, "Secundini Manichaei Epistula: Roman Manichaean 'Biblical' Argument in the Age of Augustine" in J. Van Oort, O. Wermelinger, G. Wurst (2001), pp. 161-173. Van Oort states that this letter of Secundinus is "still an almost virgin field of study" (p. 161).

¹⁰⁵ See P. Courcelle (1968), p. 236-237 and O'Donnell (2001), p. 17, n.16.

Secundinus found in these writings a man of great eloquence, but he did not find a Christian, and here we must infer that Christian equates with the Manichaean version of Christianity.¹⁰⁶ In a very revealing statement, Secundinus tells Augustine that he should have been more interested in knowledge than rhetoric.¹⁰⁷ It seemed to him, and as he states, this was definitely the case (*et pro certo sic est*) that Augustine had never been a Manichaean, and had never been able to discover the “unknown mysteries of his secret” (that is, Mani’s secret) and that Augustine was in fact attacking not the Manichaeans but Hannibal or Mithridates.¹⁰⁸

Secundinus may be a bit sarcastic here since he knew that Augustine was a Manichaean, but he was making a point to Augustine and to those who might read the letter: what Augustine had written about the Manichaeans probably has little to do with reality, at least in terms of their cosmogony. In fact, Secundinus told Augustine that he was lying when he wrote against them.¹⁰⁹ To Secundinus, what Augustine had written were “empty accusations and pointless controversies.”¹¹⁰ Augustine, the man of many, many words, made no response to this particular accusation in his response (*C. Sec.*). Here is one specific example of how a Manichaean had examined Augustine’s description of Manichaeism, and in this case, the witness of Secundinus must hold more weight than that of Augustine.

¹⁰⁶ *Ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/895.13) “...nusquam uero conperi christianum...” There is no doubt that the Manichaeism of Augustine (and that of his Manichaean friends) was a Christian religion. Augustine stated many times that the Manichaeans called themselves Christian and we can see here that Secundinus believes no differently.

¹⁰⁷ *Ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/895.13ff.) “...et armatum quidem contra omnia, adfirmanthem uero nihil, cum te magis scientia peritum debueris ostendere, non sermone.”

¹⁰⁸ *Ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/895.17-20) “uisus enim mihi es -- et pro certo sic est -- et numquam fuisse Manichaeum nec eius te potuisse arcana incognita secreti cognoscere atque sub Manichaei nomine persequi te Hannibalem atque Mithridatem.” The link with Mithraism can also be seen in the *Acta Archelai* 40.7 where Archelaus tells Mani “You barbarian priest and conspirator with Mithras; you will worship only the sun, Mithras, the illuminator of places of mystery, according to you, and the self-conscious one...” in M. Vermes, tr., S. N. C. Lieu, K. Kaatz, *Hegemonius: Acta Archelai*, Manichaean Studies, vol. 4 (Turnhout, 2001), p. 105. F. Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, T. J. McCormack (trans.) from the 2d rev. French ed. (New York, 1956), p. 207, believed that Manichaeism was the successor to the religion of Mithraism, but now this is thought not to be the case, especially with the discovery of the *Cologne Mani Codex* and its connections to early Christian/Judaic influences.

¹⁰⁹ *Ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/895.22ff.) “Hanc si uoluisses ueritate concordare, magnum utique nobis extitisset ornamentum.”

¹¹⁰ *Ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/896.2-3) “uanas incusationes, superfluas relinque controuersias.”

Another useful part of Secundinus' letter that deals directly with the topic of what Augustine knew and did not know about Manichaean cosmogony comes near the end of his letter. Secundinus stated that he would be happy to tell Augustine about the "commencement of the battle" as long as he understood that there are some questions that cannot be answered, such as how there are two natures in the first place (which resembles a statement found in *Kephalaion* 23¹¹¹), why God, who cannot suffer anything, decided to fight against the enemy, and the details of the new age to come.¹¹² Later Secundinus also told Augustine that he can fill him in on the battle itself.¹¹³ It is possible that Secundinus is responding to Augustine's statement in *Duab. an.* that he had not yet heard of the nature of the commingling, discussed above. According to Secundinus the Manichaean, Augustine did not understand these issues of the commencement of the battle or of the battle itself.

From these few examples it has been shown that Augustine does not know as much about Manichaeism as he has led us to believe. Augustine's own words show that what he said may not be exactly what happened. The contradiction as to whether or not he knew how the Manichean Elect live or what their rituals were and the fact that he was only a hearer indicates that although Augustine is an important source of information, care must be taken with what he says and why he says it. He is, after all, an ex-Manichaean and seldom are ex-converts a good source of information.¹¹⁴

Another explanation could also indicate that Augustine was not revealing how deeply he may have been involved with the Manichaeans. His position as a Catholic leader in the community was continually questioned throughout his life because of his Manichaean past. Therefore it would not be surprising if he refused to give the entirety of his knowledge of

¹¹¹ *Keph.* 23 (66.15-21) "As for the eternity of [... / ...] which exists from ever, no person is able to [understand] how they exist. For no other power [is manifest]ed to them, in that it might speak or recount about their [origin], how [they e]xist."

¹¹² *Ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/899.16ff.) "Sed si dubitas de principio, si ambigis de pugnae exordio, poterit diurno tractatu pacificoque conloquio reddi ratio. Illud tamen notum facio tuae sagacissimae bonitati, quia sunt quaedam res, quae exponi sic non possunt, ut intellegantur; excedit enim diuina ratio mortalium pectora..."

¹¹³ *Ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/900.5ff.) "Ita quoque et de pugna..."

¹¹⁴ See H. Chadwick, *Augustine* (Oxford, 1986), p. 204.

them, thus some see a reticence on the part of Augustine when dealing with the Manichaeans.¹¹⁵

Van Oort mentions this reticence when he discusses *Conf.* 5.7.13 and his debate with Fortunatus.¹¹⁶ Decret mentions a reticence as well regarding Augustine's lack of comments on the Manichaean End Time.¹¹⁷ Augustine, however, would seem to have more of a reason to mention his Manichaean past: he would supposedly have the knowledge that would allow him to publicly embarrass the Manichaeans with their own texts. This should outweigh any reticence on his part, but the fact is that he did not use this information in his earlier writings, only later. This indicates that Augustine was not familiar enough with Manichaean cosmogony, especially on the End Time, until he obtained Manichaean texts after he left the Manichaeans.

3.4 AUGUSTINE'S MANICHAEAN COSMOGONIC COMMENTS (386-396) AND THE *EP. FUND.*

Now that Augustine's account of his time as a Manichaean hearer has been examined, and more importantly, the testimony of Secundinus, Augustine's comments on Manichaean cosmogony need to be examined to see if the extent of his knowledge can be determined and whether or not it is possible to see if Augustine knew of the *Ep. fund.* in detail before he wrote *Contra ep. fund.*

What this will show is that although Augustine does tell us some facts about Manichaean cosmogony, it is not until 396 that he really found out or remembered the details when he obtains the *Ep. fund.*¹¹⁸ As Coyle recently stated, "Over the course of his entire literary career he only quotes from the Manichaean literary corpus infrequently, in each

¹¹⁵ Van Oort (1996), p. 42.

¹¹⁶ Van Oort (1996), p. 42.

¹¹⁷ Decret (1970), pp. 312-313 "Toutefois, l'évêque d'Hippone, qui tenait là un beau sujet pour embarrasser ses adversaires dans des controverses publiques, est tout aussi discret sur cette question que les polémistes de la secte." But Decret does not give a reason for why Augustine would be so discrete.

¹¹⁸ This agrees with Coyle (2001), p. 53.

instance from writings recently acquired.”¹¹⁹ He also lists the *Ep. fund.* which Augustine “rediscovers” and this rediscovery could have been due to his power as a bishop to confiscate books, as he did with Felix just two years later. People also sent heretical works to Augustine for him to comment on, as happened with the *Capitula* of Faustus.¹²⁰ It is even possible that someone sent Augustine a group of Manichaean writings with the work of Faustus, such as the *Ep. fund.* and the *Treasure*, all of which he spent the next two to four years using and refuting.

A comparison of all of his Manichaean cosmological statements from the time he began writing and publishing his works (386) until he finishes *Contra Secundinum* (399 or 404) will show that there is a leap in information regarding his cosmogonical details after he writes *Contra ep. fund.*¹²¹ An argument will be made from this that Augustine had learned a great deal of the Manichaean cosmogony from the Manichaean *Ep. fund.* and other works, but not from his personal experiences as a hearer.

The foundation of Manichaeism is the separation of the Light from the Dark in the beginning; the mixture of the two; and then the final separation (the Three Times and the Two Substances). Augustine probably knew of this, or at least the Beginning and the Middle when he was a Manichaean. From his comments in *C. Fort.* (discussed below), he probably knew a little of the End Time as well. But what he did not know are the intimate details of the cosmogony or if he did know of them, he did not understand their importance. Either way, he did not make use of them in his earlier writings.

Augustine knew of the *Ep. fund.* of Mani, the Apostle of Christ, when he was a Manichaean. Augustine himself says that “this letter was read to us miserable people in that

¹¹⁹ Coyle (2001), p. 50.

¹²⁰ *C. Faust.* 1.1 (CSEL 25,1/251.8-12) “Hic quoddam uolumen edidit aduersus rectam christianam fidem et catholicam ueritatem. Quod cum uenisset in manus nostras lectumque esset a fratribus, desiderauerunt et iure caritatis, per quam eis seruimus, flagitauerunt, ut ei responderemus” Someone also sent Augustine the Manichaean Adimantus’ work, as he states in *retr.* 1.22 (CCL 57/63.1-2) “Eodem tempore uenerunt in manus meas quaedam disputationes Adimanti...” See also A.-M. Bonnardière, “The Bible and Polemics,” in P. Bright (1999) based on A.-M. Bonnardière (ed.), *Saint Augustin et la Bible*, Bible de Tous les Temps, vol. 3 (Paris, 1986), p. 188 (all references are to the translated version) for another list of works that were sent to Augustine.

¹²¹ This is a logical endpoint since *C. Sec.* is Augustine’s last anti-Manichaean work.

time.”¹²² Despite this, Augustine made no mention of this work by name before writing *Contra ep. fund.*¹²³ This can be shown from the surviving fragments of the *Ep. fund.* found in Augustine’s writings: *C. Faust.*, *Nat. b.*, *C. Fel.*, *C. Sec.*, which were all written after.¹²⁴ He did not use this work before writing against it in 396, which is surprising since “it contains nearly everything that the Manichaeans believe.”¹²⁵ So why it is that Augustine does not mention this work by name in his earlier writings?

3.4.1 His Anti-Manichaean Works

In this examination of Augustine’s comments on Manichaean cosmogony, it will be helpful to discuss these comments, not as Decret has admirably done by categories,¹²⁶ but by examining Augustine’s comments on what he has to say about the Manichaean Three Times.

The first work in which Augustine specifically mentions Manichaean cosmogony is *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* (*Mor. I*), where he states “For you hold that there are two gods, one good and the other evil.”¹²⁷ This is the only reference to cosmogony in this work, although he does mention other aspects of the Manichaean religion.¹²⁸ A work that came very

¹²² *Contra ep. fund.* 5 (CSEL 25,1/197.8-10) “Ipsa enim nobis illo tempore miseris quando lecta est, inluminati dicebamus a uobis.”

¹²³ It does appear that he gave indirect quotes to it in his debate with Fortunatus. But as will be shown, Augustine does not know where these words were from. Or if he did, he gave no indication, which shows that he was not totally familiar with the *Ep. fund.* and did not realize how important it would become for him four years later.

¹²⁴ For the most recent list of fragments, see Stein (2002), especially pp. 123-129. See also Feldmann (1987); Decret, vol. 1 (Paris, 1978), p. 110-113; and Adam (1969), pp. 27-30.

¹²⁵ *Contra ep. fund.* 5 (CSEL 25,1/197.6-8) “...et potissimum illum consideremus librum, quem Fundamenti epistulam dicitis, ubi totum paene, quod creditis, continetur.”

¹²⁶ See F. Decret (1978), *passim*.

¹²⁷ *Mor. I* 10.16 (CSEL 90,7/19.6-7) “Duos enim deos, unum bonum, alterum malum esse perhibetis.” See also Decret (1978), p. 38. For the only in-depth study of this work, see J. K. Coyle (1978). Although this contains Augustine’s first comments on cosmogony, this does not mean that he had not mentioned them before. As C. P. Bammel notes in “Pauline Exegesis, Manichaeism and Philosophy in the Early Augustine,” in L.R. Wickham and C.P. Bammel (ed.), *Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity: Essays in Tribute to Christopher Stead* (Leiden 1993), there are only indirect references to the Manichaeans in his early works (*C. Acad.* 1.1.3, *B. uita* 1.4, *Ord.* 2.17.46, *Sol.* 1.2 and 1.4) (p. 16). I would also add *Quant.* 33.71 to this list of early works making reference (but not a direct reference) to the Manichaeans.

¹²⁸ F. Decret, vol. 1 (1978), p. 38 also lists *Mor. I* 17.30 as containing “Les dualisme, ses Principes et les Temps de son <histoire>” but I do not see this.

close after (if not during) this work was *De moribus Manichaeorum* (*Mor.* II).¹²⁹ As expected from the title, Augustine gives a much more detailed description of Manichaeism and it is one of the most detailed day to day descriptions of Manichaeism that is found in any other of his works. In terms of cosmogony, his main concern regarding the First Time is the nature of the Kingdom of Darkness and the animals that inhabit this region. This resembles comments made in the *Contra ep. fund.* But Augustine is not getting this description from the *Ep. fund.*¹³⁰ The *Ep. fund.* does mention these animals, and in the *Contra ep. fund.* he stated that the specific names of particular animals were listed in other works.¹³¹ Regardless, *Mor.* II gives many more details of the Second Time and these include his first mention of the abortions and the story of Adam and Eve. In *De Uera Religione* (*Uera rel.*), written in 389 and probably finished in 391, there is a fuller description of the Land of Light.¹³² This is followed by his debate with Fortunatus in 392.

A possible section of the *Ep. fund.* is referred to by Augustine in *C. Fort.*, although it is not a fragment of the letter but an allusion to the text.¹³³ Augustine appears to be quoting from memory, as shown by the use of *dicitis*, meaning the Manichaeans as a group. In the citations of the *Ep. fund.* as found in *Contra ep. fund.*, he never uses the plural to introduce a direct quote of Mani.¹³⁴ The use of the plural here in *C. Fort.* also fits in well with his statement that the *Ep. fund.* was read aloud to him.

¹²⁹ In very useful tables, F. Decret (1978), vol. 1, breaks down Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings. Column Ten refers to "Le sort de l'âme après la mort et le Temps Final." Under this column (in reference to *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum*) he lists for *Mor.* II, chapters 15.36, 17.55 and 17.57 (p. 38-9). These passages refer to "le sort de l'âme après la mort" and not to "le Temps Final."

¹³⁰ As I have already discussed in my paper titled "The State of Research on Augustine's Against the Fundamental Epistle", given in the 1998 conference on Manichaeism, The International Association for Manichaean Studies Subgroup, Macquarie University.

¹³¹ *Contra ep. fund.* 28 (CSEL 25,1/229.12-16) "Diuersa fuisse respondent et de aliis libris ita docent, quod tenebrae serpentes habuerunt; aquae natantes, sicut sunt pisces; uenti uolantes, sicut sunt aues; ignis quadrupedes, sicuti sunt equi, leones et cetera huiusmodi; fumus bipedes, sicuti sunt homines."

¹³² *Uera rel.* 49.96 (CCL 32/249.34ff).

¹³³ This is also independently noted by Stein (2002), p. 29.

¹³⁴ *Contra ep. fund.* 5 (197.8) (let us examine that book which you call the *Letter of the Foundation*) and 34 (238.6) (For where you say that those evils cannot be taken away from such natures...).

Augustine does not state where his information comes from and he does not seem to realize that this statement is from the *Ep. fund.* If he had known that this information was from the *Ep. fund.*, he would almost have certainly stated this, since after writing *Contra ep. fund.*, Augustine used and named the *Ep. fund.* in every single anti-Manichaean work. As will be discussed shortly, it is strange that Augustine did not continue on with his comments, especially with regard to the End Time.

This indicates that at the time of his debate with Fortunatus, Augustine did not have a copy of the *ep. Fund.* nor did he understand the importance of this letter until he was able to look at a copy of the entire work. *C. Fort.* is more interesting in terms of what it implies for the state of knowledge on Manichaeism in Augustine. Augustine, in using these words to Fortunatus, gave the “principles of their faith.”¹³⁵ It should also be pointed out that Fortunatus also did not reveal the source for Augustine’s words, either because he himself did not know, or more likely because Fortunatus was not debating with Augustine the principles of the Manichaean faith, but their *conversatio*:

Fortunatus said: Because I know that you have been in our midst, that is, have lived as an adherent among the Manichaeans, these are the principles of our faith. The matter now to be considered is our mode of living, the falsely alleged crimes for which we are maltreated. Therefore let the good men present hear from you whether these things with which we are charged and which we have thrown in our teeth are true or false. For from your instruction, and from your exposition and explanation, they will have been able to gain more correct information about our mode of life, if it shall have been set forth by you. Did you participate in our religious services?¹³⁶

¹³⁵ According to Fortunatus (CSEL 25,1/84.9-10).

¹³⁶ *C. Fort.* 1.1 (CSEL 25,1/84.7-15) “Quia te medium fuisse nostrum scio, id est inter Manichaeos administrasse, ista principalia sunt fidei nostrae. De conuersione hic agitur, de quibus falsis criminibus pulsamur. Ex te ergo praesentes audiant boni uiri, utrum sint uera, super quibus criminamur et adpetimur, an sint falsa. Etenim ex tua doctrina et ex tua expositione et ostensione poterunt uero uerius scire nostram conuersionem, si a te fuerit prodita. Interfuisti orationi?” Adapted English translation is taken from A. H. Newmann, “St. Augustin: Acts or Disputation against Fortunatus the Manichaean,” in P. Schaff (ed.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol. 4 (Edinburgh, 1887; reprint, Grand Rapids, 1996). All references are to the reprint edition.

Augustine seemed surprised at this since he stated that he had proposed their meeting to discuss their faith and not their *mores*. Besides, he remarks, only the elect can fully know the Manichaean *mores*.¹³⁷ Augustine, however, never discussed the End Time.

The next important piece of cosmogonical information that Augustine gives is found in *C. Adimantum*, written in 394.¹³⁸ This is the first time Augustine mentions anything about the End Time. He begins by discussing the problems that Adimantus had with Ex. 20.5, which contains the curse that God puts on people who reject Him down to the fourth generation and its supposed contradiction found in Mt. 5.45, which states that God makes the sun rise upon the evil and the good and Mt. 18.22, which states that Peter should forgive a brother who sins against him not seven times but seventy seven times. Augustine then remarks

However, if I should ask them whether God does not punish his enemies, without doubt they will be disturbed. For these Manichaeans say that God prepares an eternal prison for the race of darkness, which they say is hostile to God and this is not all -- they do not hesitate to say that He is going to punish his own members at the same time as He punishes that race.¹³⁹

He says nothing more on the End Time in this work, but a few notes on this work are in order. This is the first time that Augustine has mentioned this eternal prison (*aeternum carcerem*). It certainly has links with the horrible globe, to which during the End Time those souls who refused Mani's message would be attached, and which is mentioned in the *Ep. fund.* These connections within the texts of *C. Faust.* and *C. Fel.* are discussed by Decret, although not linked with *C. Adim.*¹⁴⁰ It seems fairly certain that this eternal prison is the horrible globe. But is this from the *Ep. fund.*? His statement in *C. Adim.* is given from

¹³⁷ *C. For.* 1.3 (CSEL 25, 1/84.24-85.15) "Ad aliud uocas, cum ego de fide proposuerim. De moribus autem uestris plene scire possunt, qui electi uestri sunt."

¹³⁸ *C. Adim.* (CSEL 25, 1/115-190).

¹³⁹ *C. Adim.* (CSEL 25, 1/127.12-16) "A quibus tamen si quaeram, utrum deus non puniat inimicos suos, sine dubio turbabuntur. Ipsi enim dicunt deum genti tenebrarum aeternum carcerem praeparare, quam dicunt esse inimicam deo et parum est. Sed eum etiam sua membra simul cum ipsa gente puniturum esse non dubitant dicere."

¹⁴⁰ Decret (1970), pp. 317-318.

memory (as shown by the use of the third person plural) and not from a text. Therefore it is unlikely that he is taking this information from the *Ep. fund.* As mentioned earlier, Augustine probably had some knowledge of this Third Time when he was a Manichaean hearer and this is what he was referring to.

The next work of Augustine to discuss Manichaean cosmogony is *Contra ep. fund.* This text was not finished and it contains only fragments of the description of the Beginning Time and some of the Middle. It is known that the *Ep. fund.* contained the whole Manichaean cosmogony, since both Felix and Augustine stated in *C. Fel.* that this letter contains the Beginning, the Middle and the End.¹⁴¹ The important thing to remember is that Augustine had in his hands the text with the full description of Manichaean cosmogony. This text was important for Augustine to now have, since, as mentioned, he named it in every anti-Manichaean text he subsequently writes.

The first time that he makes a detailed discussion of the Third Time is in *On Christian Combat (Agon.)* 4.4, which is not an anti-Manichaean text, but is a manual of the faith in which Augustine had written “for those not well-versed in the Latin tongue.”¹⁴² This is the third writing that Augustine had begun after becoming bishop, but the first following *Contra ep. fund.*¹⁴³ In it he states

Now, these wretched people are bold enough to affirm that the divine portion cannot be wholly purified, and that the uncleanable part serves as a bond by which the grave of wickedness can be bound and sealed. Consequently, the ill-fated part of God remains forever fastened to the prison of darkness, and, though sinless, it is forever fastened to the prison of darkness...that the Almighty God was compelled of necessity to yield a good and sinless portion of His substance to be overwhelmed by such great torments and defiled by such

¹⁴¹ *C. Fel.* 2.1 (CSEL 25,2/828.23-26) Fel: “Ista enim epistula Fundamenti est, quod et sanctitas tua bene scit, quod et ego dixi, quia ipsa continet initium, medium et finem”; and (CSEL 25,2/829.3-6) Aug: “Hoc obicitur primo sectae uestrae — siue initium hoc uoces, siue medium, siue finem, non ualde id curo; hoc tamen de hac epistula, quam fateris esse Manichaei, lectum esse non negas.”

¹⁴² *Retr.* 2.29. Although not an anti-Manichaean text per se, it certainly has anti-Manichaean features. See also Zunkeller, A., “Agone Christiano, de,” *AugLex*, 1:221-27.

¹⁴³ The first is *Diu. qu.*, then *Contra ep. fund.* and *Agon.* See *Retr.* II.3 (CCL 57/91.1).

great foulness; that He could not liberate all His substance; that He would consign what He could not liberate to endless servitude.¹⁴⁴

It cannot be coincidence that Augustine makes his first, detailed statement on the End Time in a work which follows *Contra ep. fund.* There are certainly similarities with this description and that found in *C. Adim.*, especially in terms of the eternal prison. But here the description is much more detailed and it is detailed because he had finished (or was in the process of completing) *Contra ep. fund.*, which contains this description. Augustine now begins to use what he had learned from the *Ep. fund.*

Another important text which shows that Augustine was using other Manichaean works for cosmogonical details is found in his work against the writing of the Manichaean Faustus, *C. Faust.*, a massive work which contains a large amount of cosmogonical information.¹⁴⁵ Here Augustine went from barely mentioning the framework of Manichaean cosmogony in the previous ten years to never stop talking about it. There are references to things that he had never mentioned before: the eight earths and ten heavens,¹⁴⁶ the Song of the Lovers,¹⁴⁷ and Atlas.¹⁴⁸ It is unlikely that Faustus would discuss these details, although it appears that the work of Faustus did contain some cosmogonical information.¹⁴⁹ Augustine now had the texts in front of him, giving him plenty of ammunition against the Manichaeans. This suggests that he was now mining the Manichaean texts, building his argument and then wielding this Manichaean material like a sword, with the End Time receiving particular

¹⁴⁴ *Agon.* 4.4 (CSEL 41,3/106.2-12) "Nunc uero infelices audent adhuc dicere nec totam posse purgari; et ipsam partem, quae purgari non potuerit, proficere ad uinculum ut inde inuoluatur et inligetur malitiae sepulcrum, et sic ibi semper sit pars ipsa dei misera, quae nihil peccauit et affigitur in aeternum carceri tenebrarum... quibus affirmant omnipotentem deum necessitate oppressum esse, ut partem suam bonam et innocentem tantis cladibus obruendam et tanta immunditia inquinandam daret et non tam liberare posset et quod liberare non potuerit, aeternis uinculis conligaret?"

¹⁴⁵ It also cannot be a coincidence that Augustine will use the phrase horrible globe, taken from the *Ep. fund.*, some twenty times in this work. See Decret (1970), p. 317.

¹⁴⁶ *C. Faust.* 32.19 (CSEL 25,1/781.1) "postremo unde scis octo esse terras et decem caelos..."

¹⁴⁷ *C. Faust.* 15.5 (CSEL 25,1/4).

¹⁴⁸ *C. Faust.* 15.5 (CSEL 25,1/6) "...Atlantem..."

¹⁴⁹ In *C. Faust.* 20.11 Augustine states that Faustus, having given a description of the Trinity, is giving only "the briefest manner possible to the lengthy stories of Manichaean invention." He also states in *C. Faust.* 24.2 that Faustus never mentioned the First Man in his *Capitula* for fear of someone knowing something about the story of this emanation.

attention. This shows that Augustine is learning more and more about Manichaean cosmogony over time, and learning specifically from Manichaean texts that he obtained years after he left the Manichaeans.

3.5 POSSIBLE PROBLEMS

After stating above that Augustine did not know very much about their cosmogonical details until after he had their texts (especially the *Ep. fund.*), one possible problem emerges. Augustine specifically states in chapter five of the *Contra ep. fund.* that the letter was read to him when he was a hearer.¹⁵⁰ Since this was the case (and there is no reason to doubt this), how could he not know the details of the Beginning, Middle, and especially the End? Did he not have the opportunity to discuss this in his earlier works?¹⁵¹ A good opportunity would have been with Fortunatus. In chapter one of *C. Fort.* Augustine gave some of the cosmogony to the audience that was listening to this debate. This cosmogony was probably from the *Ep. fund.*, although Augustine did not appear to know this. He mentioned the battle, the commingling of the Good and Evil, and the need for a liberator (possibly Jesus or more likely Mani) and then the need for this liberator to free them from servitude.¹⁵² He does not mention the Third Time. This text shows that he had the opportunity to mention the End Time, and especially the horrible globe (or even the *carcerem*) but did not. Decret also notes this absence.¹⁵³ To expose the Manichaean cosmogony in front of the public, especially the details of the End Time, would probably have led to the same results as it did with Felix six years later, who capitulated and became a Catholic because of Augustine's arguments

¹⁵⁰ *Contra ep. fund.* 5 (CSEL 25,1/197.9-10) "Ipsa enim nobis illo tempore miseris quando lecta est, inluminati dicebamus a uobis."

¹⁵¹ J. J. O'Meara, in "Research Techniques in Augustinian Studies," *AugStud* 1 (1970), p. 280-1, points out the dangers of assuming that just because Augustine did not mention something in an earlier writing he didn't know it. I think, however, that with the number of times that Augustine uses Manichaean cosmogony against them after writing *Contra ep. fund.*, Augustine did not know the details in this letter, despite hearing it.

¹⁵² *C. Fort.* 1.1 (CSEL 25,1/83.11-84.7).

¹⁵³ Decret (1970), p. 317 "En revanche, chose étonnante, cette question n'a pas été une seule fois effleurée dans la controverse publique avec Fortunatus et, quand l'évêque d'Hippone expose ses conceptions du *globus* devant Felix, c'est l'occasion pour le <docteur> manichéen de réfuter la déclaration de son adversaire qu'il juge erronée et tendancieuse."

primarily against the End Time.¹⁵⁴ There is a similar situation in *C. Faust.* 28.5, written a year or two after *Contra ep. fund.*, but the main difference is that Augustine *does* mention the Beginning Time, the Middle Time and then the End Time.¹⁵⁵

There are three possibilities for this absence of the End Time in Augustine's earlier writings. The first possibility is that he doesn't mention it because he chose not to discuss it. This certainly could be the case, except that once he mentions it, it becomes a powerful and repeated argument against the Manichaeans. Besides the *C. Ep. fund.*, we find the Third Time also discussed in *Confessions*,¹⁵⁶ *C. Faust.*, where it is used extensively throughout the work,¹⁵⁷ *Contra Fel.*,¹⁵⁸ *Nat. b.*,¹⁵⁹ *C. Sec.*¹⁶⁰ as well as in *Haer.*¹⁶¹ It cannot, however, be stated that Augustine had never mentioned Manichaean cosmogony before writing against the *Ep. fund.* since *Mor. II* and *C. Fort.* contains part of their cosmogony.

The second is that it is possible that the entire work was not read to the auditors, leaving out specific details about the End Time which were too secret to reveal to them or possibly too distressing, such as the fact that some light will be forever imprisoned in a horrible globe. All religions must have some sort of reward/punishment that will allow their adherents to have a reason to be a member.¹⁶² Likewise, most religions have contained within their theology a version of the End and Manichaeism is no different.¹⁶³ Therefore punishment

¹⁵⁴ *C. Fel.* II.7 (CSEL 25,2/835.9) and II.13 (CSEL 25,2/842.24).

¹⁵⁵ *C. Faust.* 28.5 (CSEL 25,1/743, especially 5-7) "Fabulae scilicet tuae habenti in capite bellum dei, in medio contaminationem dei, in fine damnationem dei."

¹⁵⁶ *Conf.* 13.30.45 (CCL 27/268.1-269.14).

¹⁵⁷ *C. Faust.* 2.5 (CSEL 25,1/258.29) "...damnari in aeternum confixas globo horrido tenebrarum." See also 2.6, 3.6, 4.2, 5.7, 11.3, 21.16, 22.22 and 22.98.

¹⁵⁸ *C. Fel.* II.7 (CSEL 25,2/835.9) and II.13 (CSEL 25,2/842.24).

¹⁵⁹ *Nat. b.* 42 (CSEL 25,2/876.20ff).

¹⁶⁰ *C. Sec.* 10 (CSEL 25,2/922.2ff).

¹⁶¹ *Haer.* 46.19 (CCL 46/319.198-320.204) "sed a nobis seiunctam atque seclusam substantiam istam mali, et finito isto saeculo post conflagrationem mundi in globo quodam, tamquam in carcere sempiterno, esse uicturam. Cui globo affirmant accessurum semper et adhaesurum quasi coopertorium atque tectorium ex animabus natura quidem bonis, sed tamen quae non potuerint a naturae quidem bonis, sed tamen non potuerint a naturae malae contagione mundari."

¹⁶² Decret (1970), p. 320.

¹⁶³ Decret (1970), p. 311 "L'idée d'un commencement et d'une fin du monde domine les grandes religions et le manichéisme apporte sa réponse quand il enseigne que le Temps Final viendra clore de drame cosmologique."

as found in the End Time of the *Ep. fund.* would have acted as a deterrent to bad behaviour so it seems likely that the whole letter was read out during the Bema Festival.

This leads to the third and most probable explanation: that Augustine had forgotten the details of the End Time and did not discuss it until he had a Manichaean text in his hand because he probably never paid attention to the section on the End Time, or if he did, he had forgotten it. This would not be the first work that Augustine had known and often forgotten. The prime example of his forgetting is his very first work, *de Pulchro et Apto*. His comments in the *Conf.* regarding this work are surprising: he claims that he cannot remember all of it, let alone how many books it actually contained.¹⁶⁴ So if he can forget the contents or the length of one of his own writings when he was a Manichaean, it would not be surprising that he could forget parts of a letter that had been read out to him at least twelve years before, especially if he had never paid it that much attention to it in the first place. This would explain why Augustine could not have known all of the details and explain his inability to discuss the End Time fully with Fortunatus.

3.6 SUMMARY

This chapter showed that in organizing the cosmogonical statements in terms of the Manichaean Three Times, a distinct pattern emerges. Over time, Augustine gives much more cosmogonical information starting with his *Contra. ep. fund.*, especially in regard to the End Time. After this, his details are specific and the source for these come from not only the *Ep. fund.* but from other writings that Augustine either obtained on his own or confiscated.¹⁶⁵ To say that Augustine had a detailed knowledge of Manichaean cosmogony is only true for him as the bishop of Hippo when he had obtained these texts and not Augustine the Manichaean hearer. He knew or remembered some of the details, but its importance to him as a

¹⁶⁴ *Conf.* 4.13.20 “puto duos aut tres: tu scis, deus, nam excidit mihi. Non enim habemus eos, sed aberraverunt a nobis nescio quo modo.”

¹⁶⁵ Sundermann (1992), p. 310 states regarding the Manichaean cosmogony “Unfortunately, unless the original source is mentioned by these authors it cannot be determined from which of Mani’s works they took their information.”

Manichaean must have been very slight. The distinction between what he knew earlier and what he learned later is an important one.¹⁶⁶

Augustine's life as a Manichaean was also re-created from two sources: his own writings and the letter of Secundinus which he sent to Augustine. This chapter has shown that when this is done, a different Augustine appears. By his own words he was not a good hearer, since he rejected the moral teaching he had received from the Manichaeans. The letter of Secundinus also is an important witness to Augustine's knowledge of Manichaeism in general. He stated that Augustine did not know all that much about his former religion and in fact, what Augustine had written about them were lies. He was also willing to teach Augustine about the reason for this battle and about the battle itself. It is clear that he believed Augustine was not telling the truth about the Manichaean religion and that Augustine certainly did not understand its concepts: Augustine did not understand what he had been writing when he was attacking the Manichaeans. Yet he continued to do so.

Augustine's repeated use of the *Ep. fund.* in works after *Contra ep. fund.* may show that it had a negative effect on the Manichaeans. Augustine used this work as a punishing rod against the Manichaeans in all of his anti-Manichaean works until they begin to fade from his diatribes after *Contra Secundinum* (even though his Manichaean past will haunt him until his death because other people will not let him forget that he was once a Manichaean). The best example of this can be found in *C. Fel.* The information that he obtained from the Manichaean writings, especially the *Ep. fund.*, probably played a major part in their downfall, at least in North Africa.

¹⁶⁶ See Coyle (2001), p. 56.

4 AUGUSTINE'S RESPONSE (1): USE OF SCRIPTURE

After examining the nature of the *Ep. fund.* and Augustine's history as a Manichaean, his attack against the *Ep. Fund.* will be dealt with in the next two chapters. Augustine had taken a two-pronged approach at attacking Mani's claims in the *Ep. fund.* The first is his limited use of scripture, which indicates that his primary method of arguing against them was not going to be the use of scriptural exegesis.¹ The second, and more important, line of attack is the use of his ascent teaching, by which he will show the Manichaeans and his other audience how to think about God in the correct, immaterial way (this will be dealt with in the next chapter).

It is fair to say that both lines of attack are interrelated and cannot be totally separated from each other without making it appear that Augustine is a Christian preacher on the one hand and a Neoplatonist on the other. It is not the intention here to imply that this is so. But if one examines the placement of his scriptural quotations, it will be seen that Augustine himself stops quoting the Bible in the middle of this work and begins to discuss the ascent, without a single allusion to scripture. Once he finishes his ascent teaching, then he fills out the details with scriptural citations, both direct and indirect. Therefore his response to the *Ep. fund.* is divided into two parts: the examination of his use of scripture (both the specific citations as well as what manuscripts he might have been using) and the examination of the ascent.

Augustine makes little use of direct scriptural citations in his argument against the *Ep. fund.* Despite this, what little he does use guides a number of his most important arguments. He directly quotes scripture eleven times from the New Testament (this includes two very large parts of Acts): John (4), Romans (2), Matthew (1), Acts (2), 1 Cor. (1) and II Tim. (1)

¹ This goes against J. Ries, in *Les Études Manichéennes: Des Controverses de la Réforme aux Découvertes du X^e Siècle* (Louvain, 1988), p. 131 who states "En 395, Augustin est sacré évêque à Hippone. La défense de la Bible sera une de ses préoccupations majeures durant les premières années de son épiscopat. Il lui faut une victoire décisive sur les manichéens. De 395 à 400, ses ouvrages exégétiques vont se suivre: *Contra epistulam manichaei* (396), *De doctrina christiana* (396)..." The *Contra ep. fund.* contains only sixteen direct scriptural citations (see below), so it is hard to see how this work can be described as an exegetical work or even as a defense of the bible.

and three times from the Old: Psalms (1), Isaiah (1) and Malachi (1). He also makes allusions to scripture twenty-three times, but because of the difficulty inherent in scriptural allusions (if he is quoting from memory or from a text), they will not be dealt with here.² There are two other citations that will be discussed and are not direct citations: John 14.16 and Luke 12.4. Augustine's version of John 14.16 has been given two explanations: the first is that Augustine is citing (from memory) from the *Diatessaron*; the second is that it is an independent reading. It will be shown that it is neither, but Augustine is simply misquoting that particular verse. Jerome also does the same. Augustine's wording of Luke 12.4 has also been the object of some discussion in that it is always confused with Mt. 10.28. But as will be shown, this confusion is unwarranted.

All of the direct citations are given both at the beginning and the end of the work with a noticeable absence in the middle (chapters 13-22; see Topical Outline), where Augustine begins to discuss the ascent of the soul. The largest section of direct biblical citations comes from the Acts, a work that the Manichaeans rejected.³ The prime reason for these long citations is to show the Manichaeans that Mani could not have been the Holy Spirit that Christ promised God would send. Augustine also used Acts in his debate with Felix just two years later. His allusions are also found near the direct citations, except for a cluster found in chapter twenty three, where Augustine discusses the allegorical body parts of God. They are then scattered through the last third of the work, starting again in chapter thirty one, and focus on the idea that all good things are ordered and come from God.

Because the *Contra ep. fund.* has never had a detailed study, it is also necessary to make a detailed textual examination of his scriptural citations. Coyle is correct when he states that any study of Augustine's use of scripture "must almost inevitably confront the student

² This number is variable since it is hard to guess at certain parts what books of scripture he may be referring to. A good example is found in chapter twenty-three where Augustine is discussing the body parts of God. There are a number of places in both the Old and the New Testament where these parts are mentioned and Augustine does not state which book or books he is referring to. Thus the allusions are, by nature, provisional.

³ See *Commentary* 198.28.

with the knotty problem of scriptural versions...”⁴ This is certainly true for the *Contra ep. fund.* Thus a large part of this chapter will be an examination of the texts themselves in order to determine what type(s) of biblical manuscripts Augustine might have been using. What will be shown is that the citations in *Contra ep. fund.* are very important to the study of Augustine and the bible. They reveal that Augustine was not using Jerome’s Vulgate (if it was even available to him at this time – see below) and might have been actively rejecting Jerome’s translations of John 1.9 and Rom. 8.3,⁵ which were known to Augustine by 396 through Jerome’s *Commentary on Galatians*. It will also be shown that Augustine’s text of Acts is an important witness to an African version of the text.⁶ Augustine also had a wide variety of different translations available for some of his books of the Bible, especially Isaiah, 1 Cor. and John and was not hesitant in using them.

4.1 JEROME, AUGUSTINE, AND THE VULGATE

A short digression is needed. In the tables that follow I use the Vulgate⁷ only as a standard by which Augustine’s citations can be compared. It is not to suggest that Augustine had a copy of the Vulgate, even where the citations match (and this only happens in the short citations, never the long). Jerome had finished his translation of the Gospels by 384.⁸ As will be shown, there is no evidence that Augustine had at the time he was writing *Contra ep. fund.* a copy of Jerome’s Vulgate Gospels because for the simple reason that there are no direct matches to the Vulgate.

There is correspondence between Jerome and Augustine and he had read some of Jerome’s works, but Augustine does not mention Jerome’s translation of the Gospels until 403

⁴ Coyle (1978), p. 154.

⁵ Rom. 8.3 does not occur in *Contra ep. fund.*, but it shows, along with John 1.9, that he was not using the same wording as Jerome). See the discussion on John 1.9 below.

⁶ This has been discussed before in some discussions of Acts (see below). But these studies assume that Augustine had access to Jerome’s Vulgate. What I will show is that this is not the case.

⁷ The name Vulgate was not given to the translations of Jerome until centuries after he had finished. See A.-M. La Bonnardière, “Did Augustine Use Jerome’s Vulgate?” in Bright (1999), p. 42. The edition of the Vulgate used is R. Weber, F. Fischer, H. I. Frede, H. F. D. Sparks and W. Thiele (ed.), *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (Stuttgart, 4th ed., 1994).

⁸ J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London, 1975), p. 88.

(see below).⁹ As Augustine stated in ep. 28 (written in 394/5, one or two years before writing *Contra ep. fund.*), he had read Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians*, which was finished in 388.¹⁰ Alypius, one of Augustine's friends and now bishop had recently been to Bethlehem and had met Jerome. His description to Augustine also included Jerome's scholarly pursuits.¹¹ Unfortunately Augustine did not describe these pursuits. Later in 397 or as late as 399 (regardless of the exact date, it was probably written after *Contra ep. fund.*) he wrote to Jerome again (ep. 40) and stated that he had also read Jerome's *Lives of Illustrious Men*.¹² It is not until ep. 71, written in 403, that Augustine mentions Jerome's translation of the Gospels.¹³ It is not known, however, when he had received a copy of this work. Milne believed that Augustine had a copy of Jerome's Vulgate at least by the time Augustine had written *C. Adim.* in 394.¹⁴ But evidence in the *Contra ep. fund.* suggests that this was not the case, or if it were, then Augustine had chosen to totally reject Jerome's translations since there are no matches.

⁹ For an excellent work on this correspondence, see C. White, *The Correspondence (394-419) Between Jerome and Augustine of Hippo*, Studies in Bible and Early Christianity vol. 23, (Lewiston, N.Y, 1990). See also Kelly (1975), pp. 217-220.

¹⁰ We also know, from ep. 27* that Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, had a copy of Jerome's *Homilies on Jeremiah*, two on the *Canticle of Canticles*, a small commentary on Matthew, probably no later than 392 (see ep. 27* section 1.2 in *FOTC, a New Translation: Letters*, vol VI (1*-29*), vol. 81). Jerome also sent him a small commentary on the tenth Psalm and *Hebrew Questions on Genesis*. Augustine, however, does not indicate that he knows these works.

¹¹ See the beginning of ep. 28: "Never has anyone been so well known to another by face, as the quiet joy and scholarly pursuit of your studies in the Lord are known to me...I owe this to brother Alypius, now a blessed bishop, but even then worthy of the episcopate." All translations from Augustine's letters are taken from W. Parsons (trans.), *Saint Augustine's Letters*, vol 1 (1-82), The Fathers of the Church, A New Translation, vol. 12, H. Dressler (ed.), (Washington, 1951).

¹² This letter does have a firm date. White (1990), p. 17 believes this letter to have been written in 399, while R. B. Eno, "Epistulae" in Fitzgerald (1999), p. 299 places it around 397, with a caution on the dating of Augustine's letters in general.

¹³ Ep. 71 "Therefore, we give no slight thanks to God for our work of translating the Gospel from the Greek, because there is scarcely ever objection made by anyone when we consult the Greek." See also Portalié (1960), p. 123, n. 135. On the use of the Vulgate after 400, see H. F. D. Sparks, "Jerome as Biblical Scholar," in P. R. Ackroyd, C. F. Evans (ed.), *Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 519. Sparks claims that Augustine does not show the slightest knowledge of Jerome's Vulgate for any other books of the New Testament and that he never appears to quote it beyond the Gospels. See also A.-M. La Bonnardière, "Did Augustine Use Jerome's Vulgate?" in Bright (1999), p. 43, who claims that Augustine had a knowledge of Jerome's translations, which occur in his mostly later works, such as *Ciu. Dei.* and *Questions on the Heptateuch (Qu.)*.

¹⁴ Milne (1926), pp. ix and xiii.

There is also a question of whether or not Jerome had made a new translation of the entire New Testament.¹⁵ He stated that he had (*Illustrious Men* 135; ep. 71.5, and 112.20), but this may be an exaggeration. When Jerome himself had written commentaries on Philemon, Galatians, Ephesians, and Titus (finished around 387), he ascribes his translations to other writers.¹⁶ If he had completed the entire New Testament, it is not clear why he would have used the translations of someone else and not his own. It is also possible that the Vulgate Acts is not from Jerome either, since there are stylistic differences.¹⁷ But what is important for our purposes is that even if Jerome had completed the entire New Testament, Augustine does not make use of it in the *Contra ep. fund.* Thus the Vulgate used in the following tables is for comparison only.

On the other hand, it is known that Jerome had translated some of the Old Testament directly from the Hebrew (as opposed to the Greek *Septuagint*), a task he began around 390.¹⁸ It was not until 405/6 that he had completed his goal. It is also unlikely that Augustine would have used a copy of the Old Testament Latin translation by Jerome. Alypius must have told Augustine that Jerome was making the translation from the Hebrew. Augustine then had written to Jerome (394/5) and wondered why he was translating from the Hebrew to Latin instead of a new translation from the Septuagint.¹⁹ Later in 403 (in ep. 71) Augustine had written again and still wished that Jerome would just translate the Old Testament from the Greek.²⁰ It is therefore very unlikely that Augustine would have been using a translation of

¹⁵ F. Cavallera, "Saint Jérôme et la Vulgate des Actes, des Épîtres, et de l'Apocalypse," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* (1920): 269-292; B. Metzger, "The Evidence of the Versions for the Text of the New Testament," in M. M. Parvis, A. P. Wikgren (ed.), *New Testament Manuscript Studies: The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus* (Chicago, 1950), pp. 56-61; and R. Gryson in his Preface to the first edition in R. Weber, et. al. (1994), p. xxix.

¹⁶ Kelly (1975), p. 88.

¹⁷ Kelly (1975), p. 88. On the question of Jerome and the rest of the New Testament, see also Metzger (1992), p. 76 and 252-3. He states that the commonly held view is that Jerome had translated the entire New Testament.

¹⁸ Kelly (1975), p. 159. See also Gryson (1994), p. xxix. He states that Jerome did not re-translate Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch and Maccabees.

¹⁹ Ep. 28.2.

²⁰ For the dates of the correspondence, see White (1990), p. 17-18.

the Old Testament of Jerome in 396 when he was writing *Contra ep. fund.*, even if one were available.²¹

4.2 POTENTIAL PITFALLS

Before beginning this discussion, it should be pointed out that there are some potential pitfalls in examining Augustine's biblical citations. Augustine did not have a standard Latin version of the Bible and both he and Jerome complain about the number of Latin translations.²² Therefore it is not the goal of this sub-chapter to determine exactly what manuscripts he might have been using when he was writing the *Contra ep. fund.* It is unlikely that this is even possible with this particular text, considering that some of citations are too small and the fact that in most of these citations he will use variants in other works.²³ If anything, it is clear that he does not use one particular biblical manuscript family. It is known, however, that the manuscripts that he used in his various writings can be linked with some European and (North) Italian manuscript families, as well as those designated as African.²⁴ But his citations have not been linked to any one particular manuscript family.²⁵ This will become abundantly clear once the few citations are examined.

Another problem is that Augustine hinted that one could change the text if it is compared with the original language.²⁶ This indicates that although he might have a manuscript in front of him, he could have taken liberty with it and corrected something that he

²¹ See also F. Van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop: Church and Society at the Dawn of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1961), p. 343.

²² Augustine, in *Doct. Chr.* 2.36 and Jerome, in *Praefatio in quatuor euangelia*.

²³ On these difficulties with Old Latin translations in general, see R. P. Casey, "The Patristic Evidence for the Text of the New Testament," in M. M. Parvis, A. P. Wikgren (ed.), *New Testament Manuscript Studies: The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus* (Chicago, 1950), p. 77: "The most confusing feature of the Old Latin is the amount of textual variation found among its witnesses." He gives examples from Ambrose which can easily be applied to Augustine as well.

²⁴ The terms European, North Italian and African will be used as found in P. Burton, *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language* (Oxford, 2000), p. 14. European manuscripts are comprised of the following: *a*, *a*², *b*, *c*, *ff*², *h*, *i*; North Italian, Codex Monacensis *q* and Codex Brixianus *f*; and the African, Codex Bobbiensis *k* and Codex Palatinus *e*. For descriptions of these manuscripts, see Burton (2000), p. 16-28.

²⁵ Burton (2000), p. 6. B. Harbert, in "Romans 5,12: The Old Latin and Vulgate in the Pelagian Controversy," *Studia Patristica* 22 (1989), p. 261 believes that Augustine had used an Old Latin version based on the Western Greek text, but he does not go into the details.

²⁶ *Doc. Chr.* 2.11. According to La Bonnardière (1999), p. 44, he is also still "manipulating" the texts as late as 419-420 when he was writing his *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* (*Qu.*). See also D. De Bruyne "Saint Augustin reviseur de la Bible," *MA* 2 (1931): 544-78.

disagreed with. He also states that there were Christians who knew Greek and made their own translations and that there were many manuscripts.²⁷ Augustine also is notorious for giving a citation in one text and then elsewhere providing a slightly different version of the same citation, within the same work.²⁸

Finally, another danger, and probably more important, is the use of the critical texts of Augustine's works that are available. It is known that Christian copyists tend to correct Augustine from the pre-Vulgate to the Vulgate text, or to harmonize the texts, even though the weight of manuscript evidence goes against this.²⁹ This is most clearly seen in a quotation from Mt. 23.29-36 in Augustine's *Contra aduersarium legis et prophetarum* (*C. adu. leg.*) and *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum* (*C. Iul. imp.*).³⁰ This citation did not occur in the text of the *Contra ep. fund.*: a quick glance shows that a majority of the scriptural citations (including those from the Gospels) are not the same as the Vulgate. It is possible that the relative obscurity of this text caused it to escape the continual change towards the Vulgate. Coyle finds the same for *Mor.* I.³¹ Nevertheless, this danger remains, and until a modern critical text is produced, these results must remain provisional.³²

The lack of direct citations in *Contra ep. fund.* also makes it difficult to determine what biblical manuscripts Augustine might have been using. *Codex Bobbiensis* (*k*), an important African manuscript, only contains Mark 8.8-11 and 14-16; Mark 8.19-15.9 and

²⁷ See also *S. Dom. mon.* 2.2.9 (CCL 35/100.217) as well as *C. Faust.* 11.6 (CSEL 25,1/321.27ff.).

²⁸ Coyle (1978), p. 157. For an excellent list of these changing texts, see C. H. Milne, *A Reconstruction of the Old-Latin Text or Texts of the Gospels used by Saint Augustine, with a Study of Their Character* (Cambridge, 1926), p. xviii-xxi. Milne notes that these changes are due to four reasons: Augustine is either moving from using the Old Latin towards using the Vulgate; he is reverting back to the Old Latin; he is arbitrary for some citations; and the fourth is the "mosaic" type, which can fit into multiple categories.

²⁹ See G. G. Willis, "Patristic Biblical Citations: The Importance of a Good Critical Text, Illustrated from St. Augustine," *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966), p. 577. Willis shows that there is assimilation to the Vulgate in *Mor.* I and II (p. 578), *Doc. Chr.*, *Util. cred.* as well as *Pecc. mer.* See also Coyle (1978), p. 172; O'Donnell (1992), vol. 1, p. lxvi; Metzger (1992, 3d edition), p. 197 and Burton (2000), p. 4.

³⁰ Harbert (1989), p. 262.

³¹ Coyle (1978), 172.

³² The most current critical edition of *Contra ep. fund.* is from 1891 (CSEL) and is slightly different from the previous edition found in Migne (1844-1864).

Matt. 1.1-3.10; Matt. 4.2-14 and Matt. 15.20-36.³³ Augustine does not use quotes from these particular places in *Contra ep. fund.*, therefore it will be impossible to gauge whether what used to be in *k* can be found in this text. Fortunately, the other African manuscript, *Codex Palatinus (e)* does contain material that can be compared to some of Augustine's citations of John.³⁴

4.3 THE TEXTS

In the following tables, the text of Augustine will be given, followed by any relevant texts from earlier Christian writers and finally, the text of the Vulgate. The texts will be examined in regard to their comparison between the Vulgate, the African manuscripts (*k* and *e*)³⁵ as well as any relevant comparisons to Cyprian or Ambrose's work. As mentioned, Augustine does not use the Vulgate for either the New or Old Testament. Nor do his citations of the Gospels seem to come from the African versions. This would point more towards a European or Northern Italian version.

How Augustine used these citations in the *Contra ep. fund.* and other works will be examined. This will be followed by a discussion of the texts themselves, when needed. Some of the texts are too short for any meaningful discussion. For Acts, because of the length of the citations, a discussion of their contents will come first, followed by the texts and any relevant discussion of specific citations. The order given below will be the order as found in *Contra ep. fund.*

Romans 11.36

³³ A. Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*, revised edition (London, 1913), p. 34. For a useful study of the text, see A. H. A. Bakker, *A Study of Codex Evang. Bobbiensis (k)* (Amsterdam, 1933).

³⁴ This codex contains John 1.1-18.12; John 18.25-21.25 as well as some of Matt., Mark and Luke. See Souter (1913), p. 35 for details on the Synoptic gospels. The standard edition for *e* is found in H. Vogels, *Evangelium Palatinum: Studien zur ältesten Geschichte der lateinischen Evangelienübersetzung* (Münster, 1926).

³⁵ The differences between the manuscripts will be discussed below.

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 1 (CSEL 25,1/193.4)	Cassiodorus <i>Expositio Psalmorum</i> 2	Cyprian <i>Quir.</i> 3.53 (CCL 3/17) ³⁶	Ambrose <i>Hex.</i> 1.5.19 (PL 14,131)	Vulgate
ex quo omnia per quem omnia in quo omnia	ex quo omnia per quem omnia in quo omnia	quoniam ex ipso et per ipsum et in ipso sunt omnia	quoniam ex ipso, et per ipsum, et in ipsum sunt omnia	quoniam ex ipso et per ipsum et in ipso omnia

This is the very first biblical citation found in the *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine's view of God and the whole reason why he is writing against the Manichaean cosmogony within the *Ep. fund.* can be contained all within this one important verse. God and Christ are the ultimate creators of everything and there is nothing that They have not created. This is the main point that Augustine will attempt to teach the Manichaeans: anything that exists comes from God. Therefore their Land of Darkness, with all of its creatures as described by the *Ep. fund.* cannot exist. A probable source for Augustine's ideas on this is Ambrose. In *Hex.* 1.4-1.5, given the same week that Augustine was baptized,³⁷ Ambrose used Rom. 11.36 to show that God was the ultimate creator of everything. Ambrose also raised the point, which will become fundamental later in Augustine's argument in *Contra ep. fund.*, that all matter was created from nothing (*ex nihilo*).

This particular phrase is one that Augustine uses again and again in his writings. O'Donnell states that this form is as early as *Quant.* 34.77, but *Sol.* I.1.2 is the earliest.³⁸ In *Duab. an.* 9 he uses it specifically to counter the Manichaeans. See also *Uera rel.* 55.113 and again in 55.113; *Agon.* 13.15 and *Trin.* 5.8, among others. For a list of Augustine's references to this quote, see Wiles and Du Roy.³⁹

The Text

³⁶ Most of the citations to Cyprian are found in Milne (1926) and the critical texts from CCL were added to this list. Milne only noted where Cyprian is found in a parallel passage in either *k* or *e*. He did not list the citations in Cyprian where the text matches Augustine, as I have done in this example. This complicates the issue slightly, since when this occurs, it will be difficult to determine whether Augustine is also following *k* or *e*.

³⁷ On the dating of this, see F. D. Dudden, *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1935), p. 713.

³⁸ J. J. O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1992), p. 19.

³⁹ J. W. Wiles, *A Scripture Index to the Works of St. Augustine in English Translation* (London 1995), p. 162 and O. J. B. du Roy, *L'intelligence de la foi en la trinité selon saint Augustin: Genèse de sa théologie trinitaire jusqu'en 391* (Paris, 1966), pp. 479-483.

This could be a conflation of Rom. 11:36 and 1 Cor. 7:6,⁴⁰ but it is unlikely. If it is a conflation, then Augustine uses the same phrase many times in his works, all worded exactly the same.⁴¹ Cassiodorus (485-580), writing his *Expositio psalmorum* from Constantinople, is the only other writer to have used this exact phrase.⁴² As shown, Augustine’s text does not resemble the text of the Vulgate, Cyprian or Ambrose and thus it appears that his manuscript had a common tie with that of Cassiodorus, or that Cassiodorus was influenced by Augustine’s writings. Either way, Augustine is the first to use this particular variation.

II Tim. 2.24-5

<i>Contra ep. fund. 1 (194.8)</i> ⁴³	Augustine <i>Ex. Gal.</i> 56	Cyprian <i>Quir.</i> 3.53 (CCL 3/141.20)	Ambrose <i>De Fide</i> 5	Vulgate
seruum autem domini non oportet litigare, sed mitem esse ad omnes, docibilem, patientem, in modestia corripientem diuersa sentientes	seruum autem domini litigare non oportet sed mitem esse ad omnes, docibilem, patientem, in modestia corripientem diuersa sentientes	seruum autem Dei non oportet litigare sed mitem esse ad omnes	seruum autem domini non oportet litigare, sed mansuetum esse ad omnes, docibilem, patientem, cum modestia docentem eos, qui resistunt.	seruum autem Domini non oportet litigare sed mansuetum esse ad omnes docibilem patientem cum modestia corripientem eos qui resistunt

This citation shows the way in which Augustine wanted to deal with the Manichaeans and the tone is unusually polite, considering his vociferousness shown in his previous works, especially *Mor. II* and his comments on the Manichaeans in *On Contenance (Cont.)*. It is possible that his elevation to bishop made him think differently about his role as the one who gently guides people on their journey to God. Unfortunately for his Manichaean audience, he

⁴⁰ Du Roy, (1966), pp. 479-85. See also O'Donnell, vol. 2 (1992) who agrees with du Roy.
⁴¹ As noted by Coyle (1978), p. 246, n. 945.
⁴² Psalm 2. On Cassiodorus, see T. G. Kardong, "Cassiodorus," in E. Ferguson (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, 2nd ed., (New York, 1998), pp. 219-220.
⁴³ This is also the form found in s. 88 and *C. litt. Pet.* 2.53.

did not remain so polite (see *Commentary* 193.6 for more details). His use of this citation also shows that Augustine was one of these servants of God.⁴⁴

Augustine also uses this citation in *S. Dom. mon.* 2.25.86, probably against the Manichaeans as well, since he had mentioned them just before in 2.24.79. Here too he gives this verse in order to show that if there is quarrelling and controversies, then it is not possible to be able to see with a pure eye what wisdom is unless there is gentleness. The Donatists, in *C. litt. Pet.* (written 400/3) and *ep.* 49.1 (written in 400 to the Donatist Honoratus) were also another group against which Augustine used this verse in the same way as he did with the Manichaeans.

The Text

Augustine uses this verse in many of his works, but he is not consistent -- even within the same work Augustine did not use the same form. For example, in *S. Dom. mon.* 2.8.28 he used the exact wording *seruum autem domini non oportet litigare*, but in 2.25.86 he used *litigare non oportet*, a form he seems to favour. See also his *Ex. Gal.* 56.7 (*litigare non oportet*); *C. litt. Pet.* 2.122 (400/403); *Cres.* 1.8 (dated to 405-6) (*litigare non oportet*); *ep.* 49.1; and *ep.* 53.3.7.⁴⁵ That he used different citations within the same work will also be shown in other citations discussed below.

The end of this verse (*diuersa sentientes*) is unusual and has only two direct matches to Augustine's text in the *Vetus Latina*: the *Concilium Carthagenensia* (CCL 149) and in the writings of Januarius, another North African from the Fifth Century.⁴⁶ This shows an African tendency for this verse, although the text is slightly different from that of Cyprian. Ambrose's text is more closely tied to the text of the Vulgate than that of Augustine.

⁴⁴ On these servants of God, see L. J. Van der Lof, "The Threefold Meaning of Servi Dei in the Writings of Saint Augustine," *AugStud* 12 (1981): 43-59.

⁴⁵ For the rest of Augustine's citations, see H. J. Frede (ed.), *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel*, vol. 25.1, *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos* (Freiburg, 1975-1982), pp. 744-745.

⁴⁶ See Frede, vol. 25.1 (1975-1982), p. 747.

Malachi 4.2, John 1.9 and Ambrose’s Hexameron

As will be mentioned in the *Commentary*,⁴⁷ the section from *Contra ep. fund.* 2⁴⁸ is reminiscent of Ambrose’s *Hexameron* 4.1.1-2 (*Hex.*). Ambrose had given these homilies on the days of creation during Easter 387, the same time that Augustine was being baptized by Ambrose. It is therefore likely that he would have heard these (see *Commentary* 194.7 for what Augustine might have heard from Ambrose) since there are a number of parallels. In the *Hex.* Ambrose discusses the eye of the mind, as Augustine does in *Contra ep. fund.* 2. In 4.1.2 Ambrose warns his listeners not to trust the physical sun, but to recognize who created it. Augustine does the same. Ambrose then asks his listeners to compare the sun to the Sun of Justice (*sol iustitiae*), found in Mal. 4.2 and he follows this with a citation from John 1.9. Augustine does the same, but Augustine uses Mal. first, and then John. The similarities show that Augustine was probably remembering his time with Ambrose and using that information in the *Contra ep. fund.* against the Manichaeans.

Mal. 4.2

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 2 (194.21)	Vulgate
ortus est mihi iustitiae sol	orietur uobis timentibus nomen meum sol iustitiae

Both this citation and John 1.9 come very close together in the *Contra ep. fund.* It is an example of Augustine using both the Old Testament as well as the New to show the Manichaeans that both works contain the same idea, which was a technique that Ambrose used as well (discussed above). Augustine also pairs the Old with the New Testament again in chapter thirty nine when he examines Isa. 45.7, Luke 12.4, and I Cor. 3.16-17 (see below).

Malachi was little utilized by Augustine, and when he did, it was primarily (but not exclusively) in his later writings such as *Ciu. Dei*. Its appearance in *Contra ep. fund.* was one of his earlier uses. This text, along with II Tim., allowed Augustine to show the Manichaeans that the prime source of knowledge about God must come through the assistance of this sun of

⁴⁷ See *Commentary* 194.17.

⁴⁸ CSEL 25,1/194.17-24.

justice, who is Jesus Christ. The sun of justice, a common theme in the Psalms,⁴⁹ was also a common theme in Augustine.⁵⁰ He had also used this text earlier in *S. Dom. mon.* 1.23.79, where he had stated that the spiritual sun only rises on those who are good and holy and cannot be seen by the physical eyes. In the *Contra ep. fund.* the difference between what is seen with the bodily eyes (and this goes also for the other senses) and what is seen by the interior eye of the mind played the most important part in the attempt at teaching the Manichaeans the proper way to think about God. That it comes very near the beginning shows that he is setting up the Manichaeans for their first great lesson of this work: what the eye sees cannot be what God truly is.

The Text

This verse is an example of an independent reading found in Augustine's works. The same wording of this citation can also be found in *S. Dom. mon.* 1.23.79, ep. 55.5, s. 26* (= s. 198),⁵¹ and these are the only three places where it occurs in medieval writers (Ambrose uses a different text from that of Augustine). Eugippius (d. 535), a southern Italian abbot, also has this wording (in PL 62, 756c), but he was using excerpts from the works of Augustine.⁵² His text of Mal. 4.2 is also very similar to that of Wisdom 5.6.⁵³

John 1.9

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 2 (194.22)	Jerome, <i>Commentary to Galatians</i> (PL 26, 351)	Vulgate	Cyprian <i>Quir.</i> 1.7 (CCL 3/12.1)	e ⁵⁴
erat lumen uerum, quod inluminat omnem	erat lux uera, quae illuminat omnem hominem	erat lux uera quae inluminat omnem hominem	fuit lumen uerum, quod inluminat omnem	lumen uerum quod inluminat omnem hominem

⁴⁹ See A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Biblia Augustiniana, Le Livre de la Sagesse* (Paris, 1970), p. 192, n. 146 for the full list.

⁵⁰ La Bonnardière (1970), p. 192, n. 145.

⁵¹ The use of the asterisk after a sermon or a letter of Augustine signifies that it is a recently discovered work. For his sermons, see F. Dolbeau, *Augustin d'Hippone, Vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique*, Etudes Augustiniennes, Antiquité, vol. 147 (1996).

⁵² See M. P. McHugh, "Eugippius," in *EEC*, pp. 398-399, with bibliography.

⁵³ La Bonnardière (1970), p. 191.

⁵⁴ Milne (1927), pp. 119-120.

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 2 (194.22)	Jerome, <i>Commentary to Galatians</i> (PL 26, 351)	Vulgate	Cyprian <i>Quir.</i> 1.7 (CCL 3/12.1)	e ⁵⁴
hominem uenientem in hunc mundum	uenientem in mundum	uenientem in mundum	hominem ueniens in hunc mundum	uenientem in hoc mundo

As mentioned above, this citation is paired with Mal. 4.2. Augustine uses it after telling the Manichaeans how difficult it is to purify the inner eye of the soul; in chapter three, he uses himself as an example to show that it was Christ, the most merciful doctor, who helped him to heal this inner eye.⁵⁵ For him, only Christ can be the one to enlighten mankind.⁵⁶ This is not the only time that he used this verse. A year or two later Augustine specifically used this verse against the Manichaean idea of two souls in the *Conf.* 8.10.22 and *C. Faust.* 19.22, where Augustine tells Faustus that he knows nothing of this light of the mind.⁵⁷

Augustine also ties this verse to Plotinus in *Ciu Dei.* 10.2 and here he shows that his source for this idea came mostly from the Neoplatonists and helped him to formulate his ideas of divine illumination.⁵⁸ He stated that the Platonists received the light of happiness from God and that this light is God. He also pointed out that Plotinus compared this immaterial light with material light, much like the way that he does with the Manichaeans here in the *Contra ep. fund.*

The Text

⁵⁵ *Contra ep. fund.* 3 (CSEL 25,1/195.5-6) "...qui me ad detergendam caliginem mentis tam tarde clementissimo medico uocanti blandientique subieci..."

⁵⁶ *Ench.* 103.

⁵⁷ *Conf.* 8.10.22 (CCL 27/127.1-13) and *C. Faust.* 19.22 (CSEL 25,1/520.20).

⁵⁸ R. Ferwerda, "Plotinus' Presence in Augustine," in J. den Boeft, J. van Oort (ed.), *Augustiniana Traiectina* (Paris, 1987), p. 111 states that this idea was taken from *Ennead* 4.6.41.3. See also V. J. Bourke, *Augustine's Love of Wisdom: An Introspective Philosophy* (Indiana, 1992), p. 18 and G. Tavard, "St. Augustine Between Mani and Christ," *The Patristic and Byzantine Review* 5 (1986), p. 199. H. Somers, in "Image de Dieu et illumination divine," *AugMag* 1 (Paris, 1954), p. 453, argues that there are three other sources for Augustine on his idea of illumination: "le livre de la Sagesse, saint Paul et les Pères de l'Église, en particulier saint Ambroise." See also R. A. Markus, "Reason and Illumination," in A. H. Armstrong (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1967), especially p. 365-368.

There are many problems associated with determining which manuscript family Augustine might have used for this verse. Milne saw in this passage a “notable case of persistence” in Augustine’s use of the phrase *lumen uerum quod*, even after (as he believed) he had Jerome’s Vulgate Gospels.⁵⁹ Augustine’s use of this citation is fairly consistent throughout a number of his earlier works, including, among others, *Gn. adu. Man.* 1.6; *Uera rel.* 73; *Fid. et symb.* 6 and as late as *C. Iul. imp.* 4. Augustine is far and away the one who used this wording the most.⁶⁰ The same wording is also found in such diverse writers as Cyprian (as noted above), Ambrose,⁶¹ Marius Victorinus⁶² and Gregory the Great.⁶³ Ambrose, like Augustine in *Trin.* 13.1, also used *lux uera quae* (it was the only time he had used this wording).⁶⁴ Cyprian is the only writer that does not use *lux uera quae*. Thus it is difficult to pin down the manuscript family of John that Augustine might have been using. Augustine seems to show a preference in his earlier works for the African style.

One last aspect that is important about this particular verse is that, as stated, Augustine had read Jerome’s *Commentary on Galatians* before or around 394/395, which is when Augustine had sent ep. 28. Augustine had also written a commentary on Galatians (*Ex. Gal.*) which was written in 394/5. It is possible that it was written in response to Jerome’s work, since Augustine had great difficulty with some of Jerome’s exegesis of Gal. 2.11-14.⁶⁵

John 1.9 occurs in Jerome’s *Commentary on Galatians*, but he uses *lux uera quae*. If Augustine had written *Ex. Gal.* in response to Jerome’s, then his use of translations different from Jerome may be a case of Augustine knowing the work of Jerome but refusing to use the same wording in his *Contra ep. fund.* This also occurs in Rom. 8.3 which both works share

⁵⁹ Milne (1926), p. xxii.

⁶⁰ In the sixty-six times that this particular wording appears up to and including the medieval writers, Augustine accounts for thirty-eight of these (Patrologia Latina database).

⁶¹ *Hex.* 1.9 and 4.1; *De fuga saeculi* 3.16

⁶² *Aduersus Arium*, Book 1A.4.

⁶³ *Moralia in Iob* 25.10.

⁶⁴ Ambrose, *Ex. evu. sec. lucam* 2 and *On the Holy Spirit* 1.14.

⁶⁵ See R. Cole-Turner, “Anti-Heretical Issues and the Debate over Galatians 2.11-14 in the Letters of St. Augustine to St. Jerome,” *AugStud* 11 (1980): 155-166 and White (1990), p. 4.

(but is not found in *Contra ep. fund*). Augustine has “...*Ut de peccato condemnaret peccatum*” while Jerome, in his commentary, has “*de peccato condemnauit peccatum in carne*.” The Vulgate has “*et de peccato damnauit peccatum in carne*.”

Milne believed that Augustine’s persistent use of biblical translations other than those of Jerome was due to Augustine refusing to use Jerome’s Vulgate Gospels. But Milne did not notice the parallel citations in Jerome’s work. Therefore it is more likely that in 396, Augustine was refusing to use Jerome’s *Commentary on Galatians* instead of the Vulgate.

John 14.16

Contra ep. fund. 6 (199.16)	Jerome, ep. 120 (PL 22, 996)	e ⁶⁶	Vulgate
et alium paracletum mittam uobis.	et alium paracletum mittam uobis	et alium aduocatum dabit uobis, ut sit uobiscum in aeternum	et alium paracletum dabit vobis

This is not a direct citation. Nevertheless it has been seen as slightly unusual, not in the way Augustine used it (he gave this passage to show when the Paraclete actually came, as opposed to when the Manichaeans believe He came) but in the manner of the text itself. There have been a two explanations for this variation in Augustine’s text. The first is that Augustine was remembering Tatian’s *Diatessaron*, something that might have been used in his Manichaean days.⁶⁷ Quispel believed that later Augustine also gave another version of this, quoted from memory, in *Trin.* 1.18 (et alium aduocatum dabit uobis, ut uobiscum sit in aeternum), which this time the text matches the African manuscript *e*.⁶⁸ The text of *Trin.* is

⁶⁶ Milne (1926), p. 145.

⁶⁷ G. Quispel in “Mani, the Apostle of Jesus Christ,” in J. Fontaine, C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (Paris, 1972), pp. 667-72, (repr. in G. Quispel, *Gnostic Studies*, II (Istanbul, 1975), pp. 230-37, especially p. 235). References are made to the reprint edition. On the use of the *Diatessaron* by the Manichaeans see G. Quispel, “Mani et la Tradition Évanélique des Judéo-Chrétiens,” *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 60 (1972), p. 145. He discusses this specific passage (p. 145). See also J. Van Oort, “Secundini Manichaei Epistula...” (2001), p. 166 and n. 19 and p. 173, who discusses the use of the *Diatessaron* by the Manichaean Secundinus. On the *Diatessaron* itself, see W. L. Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance and History in Scholarship* (Leiden, 1994).

⁶⁸ Quispel (1972a), p. 126, is mistaken when he states that this citation is from *k*, which does not contain the book of John. His conclusions, however, remain correct because *e* is considered African as well.

very close to the text of the Vulgate and undoubtedly comes from John 14.16. The second explanation, found in Milne, is that it is an independent reading, found neither in the Vulgate nor in the Old Latin.⁶⁹

While it is certainly possible that Augustine was remembering the Diatesseronic form of this passage, there is a problem with this theory: this particular form of John (*alium paracletum mittam uobis*) also appears in a work of Jerome.⁷⁰ It is unlikely, however, that Jerome was citing from the *Diatessaron*. Milne had also missed this citation in Jerome and his hypothesis that this is an independent reading also cannot stand. The simple answer is that it is likely to be a conflation of John 14.16 (*et ego rogabo Patrem, et alium Paraclitum dabit uobis ut maneat uobiscum in aeternum*) and John 15:26 (*cum autem venerit paracletus quem ego mittam vobis a Patre Spiritum veritatis...*), and both Jerome and Augustine were citing from memory and got the two citations from John mixed. O'Donnell hints that this is a possibility, but does not state it directly. He acknowledges that Augustine rarely uses the word *paracletum* for two reasons: the first is that “it did not appear in his NT translations (where ‘aduocatus’ is the accepted term), and second, to avoid a word complicated by Manichaeian claims and practice...”⁷¹ Thus if it is not in Augustine’s text, Augustine is not quoting directly from a manuscript, but from memory.

John 10.30

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 6 (199.21)	Vulgate	Cyprian
ego et pater unum sumus	ego et pater unum sumus	<i>De Unitate (Unit.)</i> 6 (CCL 3/254.1) ego et pater unum sumus

Augustine used this citation, like the citation above and like that of Acts given below, to show that Mani cannot legitimately call himself an apostle of Jesus Christ. He claimed that Paul did not write that he was an apostle of God the Father, when he could have because Jesus

⁶⁹ Milne (1926), p. 145.
⁷⁰ Ep. 120.
⁷¹ O'Donnell, vol. 3 (1992), p. 97.

and the Father are One. In the same way, if the Manichaeans believe that Mani was the Paraclete, why did he not write “Mani, an apostle of the Paraclete”? This text is also a favourite of Augustine’s since it is a proof-text used to establish the equality between God and Christ.⁷²

The Text

Because of its size, it would be dangerous to state very much about this citation since there would be little room for error in translating this in a different manner. It matches the text of the Vulgate as well as the text of Cyprian.

Acts

The citations from Acts are some of the most important in the *Contra ep. fund.*, more for their independent variations than their content.⁷³ Augustine included a large part of this text in order to show the Manichaeans when the Holy Spirit came. The Manichaeans believed that Mani was the Holy Spirit, or that the Holy Spirit came in Mani. Therefore the Manichaeans reject Acts.⁷⁴ It was necessary for Augustine to include large sections of Acts 1 and 2 to show that the Manichaeans were wrong. He also dealt with this issue in *C. Fel.*, and here too he gave citations from Acts.

As will be shown, there are also many differences between the text of Acts in Augustine and with the text of the Vulgate. Burkitt believed that Augustine, in the passages of Acts as found in *Contra ep. fund.* and *C. Fel.*, used an African text, but that the version of Acts as found in the *Contra ep. fund.* was from a much older manuscript tradition than that found in *C. Fel.*⁷⁵ Clark, who found that Augustine’s texts have similarities with that of

⁷² See Wiles (1995), p. 134 for a list of references.

⁷³ Clark (1933) notes that the text of *C. Fel.* is the more important of the two because Augustine expressly stated that he was using a codex, but in the *Contra ep. fund.* he did not state this. He also states twice that we can assume that the two texts are taken from the same source (p. 256 and 259). There are, however, some variations between the two, as will be shortly discussed.

⁷⁴ See *Commentary* 198.28 for a list of references where Augustine states that the Manichaeans did not accept Acts.

⁷⁵ Burkitt (1896), p. 71.

Cyprian, agreed with Burkitt.⁷⁶ But this is not so evident on a close examination of the texts. The text from *Contra ep. fund.* has more similarities with the text of Cyprian than that found in *C. Fel.*, but the text in *C. Fel.* still has its own peculiarities, different from *Contra ep. fund.*, Cyprian, the Vulgate. Augustine also had written *Ad catholicos fratres (Cath.)* in 402/405, which also contains a large section of Acts. Clark thought that this text had nothing to add to the authority of the text of Acts found in *Contra ep. fund.* and *C. Fel.* because he believed it had been revised, “probably from Jerome’s Vulgate.”⁷⁷ It will be shown that there is a tendency to agree with the Vulgate in some verses, but not all. Therefore it is important because it shows the process that Augustine had been going through in terms of deciding to use different texts or updating various verses to something similar to what the Vulgate Acts would become.

Because of the length of these citations, each and every line will not be examined. This has already been done by both Clark and Wordsworth.⁷⁸ I have chosen, however, to at least list the texts in order to show the differences and similarities between that of Augustine and the other writers who used Acts and the Vulgate, and comment on any peculiarities. Once again, the text of the Vulgate is shown only for comparison, since it is unlikely that Augustine would have had a copy even if Jerome had made a new translation of it.

Acts 1.1

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 9 (CSEL 25,1/203.12-13)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.4 (CSEL 25,2/804.6-8)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.27 (PL 43, 0409)	Vulgate
Primum quidem sermonem fecimus de omnibus, o Theophile, quae coepit Iesus facere et docere	Primum quidem sermonem feci de omnibus, o Theophile, quae coepit Iesus facere et docere	Primum quidem sermonem feci de omnibus, o Theophile, quae coepit Iesus facere et docere	Primum quidem sermonem feci de omnibus, o Theophile quae coepit Iesus facere et docere

⁷⁶ Clark (1933), p. 259. Cyprian’s text can be found in P. Corssen, *Der Cyprianische Text der Acta apostolorum* (Berlin, 1892) and J. H. Ropes, *The Texts of Acts* (London, 1926).

⁷⁷ Clark (1933), p. 256.

⁷⁸ Clark (1933), 2-9 and especially pp. 256-262; and I. Wordsworth, H. I. White (ed.), *Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine, Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronimi* (Oxonii, 1889-1954), pp. 35-44. The work of Wordsworth and White contains a more complete apparatus.

Clark makes no mention of this obvious difference found in the beginning of this citation (with the use of *fecimus*) while Wordsworth and White do.⁷⁹ The overwhelming manuscript tradition holds that *feci* was used, except in the earliest manuscript *P*.⁸⁰ Migne (PL 42) and Jolivet and Jourjon, who have relied on Migne for their translations of *Contra ep. fund.*, keep *fecimus*.⁸¹ Hence, this reading of Acts 1.1 only occurs in the *Contra ep. fund.* and is an independent reading. This will not be the only time that this occurs in the text of Acts as found in the *Contra ep. fund.*

Acts 1.2

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 9 (CSEL 25,1/203.13-15)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 4 (CSEL 25,2/804.8-10)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.27 (PL 43, 0409)	Pseudo-Vigilius <i>Contra Mariuadum</i> 1.3 (PL 62, 374)	Vulgate
in die, qua apostolos elegit per spiritum sanctum et praecepit praedicare euangelium.	in die, quo apostolos elegit per spiritum sanctum et praecepit praedicare euangelium:	usque in diem quo Apostolos elegit per Spiritus sanctum, mandans eis praedicare euangelium	In die qua apostolos elegit per spiritum sanctum praedicare euangelium	usque in diem qua cum praecipiens apostolis per Spiritus Sanctum, quos elegit adsumptus est

As shown, there are two serious differences between the texts of Augustine and the text of the Vulgate. The first is the additional text of *praecepit praedicare euangelium*. This is found in two other witnesses, Pseudo-Vigilius, writings based on a fifth-century North African bishop (445-480) as well as in the Latin codex *Gigas*.⁸² They do not contain the assumption of Jesus, which may be due to some Old Latin translators modifying the text,

⁷⁹ Wordsworth and White (1889-1954), p. 35. They only mention that it is found in Augustine.
⁸⁰ See CSEL 25,1/192 and 203, n. on line 12.
⁸¹ R. Jolivet, M. Jourjon, *Six Traités anti-Manichéens*, Œuvres de Saint Augustin, vol. 17 (Paris, 1961).
⁸² This codex is so named because it is one the largest manuscripts ever found and is important because it contains an Old Latin form of Acts; see B. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 3d ed., rev. and enl., (New York, 1992), p. 74. See also Clark (1933), p. 2 who recreates the underlying Greek text. Metzger (1971), p. 274-5, however, does not agree with the text of Acts found in Clark because Clark adopts the texts of Augustine, Vigilius and *Gigas* over other witnesses.

which was then used by Augustine and others.⁸³ The second major difference is that the texts that Augustine and Pseudo-Vigilius give begin Jesus' ministry on the day that Jesus chose his disciples. As Metzger has pointed out, it would seem incredible that Luke would have left out what Jesus had done before choosing the disciples, since Luke had talked about what Jesus had done before this.⁸⁴ Thus it is likely that Augustine was using a text that was based on a faulty Greek text. His reading in *Contra ep. fund.* and *C. Fel.* are, however, different from other readings. As shown, his *Cath.* is closer to the text of the Vulgate, but still shows some differences.

Acts 1.3

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> (CSEL 25,1/203.15-17).	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.4 (CSEL 25,2/804.10-12)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.27 (PL 43, 0410)	Psuedo-Vigilius <i>Contra Mariuadum</i> 1.3 (PL 62, 374)	Acts 1.3 Vulgate
quibus praebuit se uiuum post passionem [in multis argumentis dierum, uisus est eis <i>per</i> dies] quadraginta et docens de regno dei	quibus praebuit se uiuum post passionem in multis argumentis dierum uisus eis dies quadraginta et docens de regno dei	quibus et manifestauit se ipsum post passionem suam in multis signis per dies quadraginta apparens eis et disputans de regno dei	quibus etiam exhibuit se ipsum uiuum post passionem suam in multis argumentis apparens eis et docens de regno dei	quibus et praebuit se ipsum vivum post passionem suam in multis argumentis per dies quadraginta apparens eis et loquens de regno dei

There are a few things to note about Acts 1.3. The first is that Augustine's text in each of the works listed above are different from anything found elsewhere. The text of *Pseudo-Vigilius* is yet again different from the rest.

Acts 1.4-5

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> (CSEL 25,1/203.18-23)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.4 (CSEL 25,2/804.12-18)	<i>Cath.</i> 11 (PL 43, 0410)	Vulgate
quomodo conuersatus sit cum illis et praeceperit eis, ne discederent ab	et quomodo conuersatus est cum illis. Et praecepit eis, ne discederent ab	et cum conuersaretur cum eis, praecepit eis ne discederent ab Ierosolymis, sed	Et convescens praecepit eis ab Hierosolymis ne discederent, sed

⁸³ Metzger (1971), p. 276.

⁸⁴ Metzger (1971), p. 275.

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> (CSEL 25,1/203.18-23)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.4 (CSEL 25,2/804.12-18)	<i>Cath.</i> 11 (PL 43, 0410)	Vulgate
Hiersolymis, sed sustinerent pollicitationem patris, quam audistis, inquit, ex ore meo	Hiersolymis, sed sustinerent pollicitationem patris; quam audistis, inquit, ex ore meo	exspectarent promissionem eius, quam audistis, inquit, ex ore meo	expectarent promissionem Patris quam audistis per os meum
(5) quoniam Iohannes quidem baptizauit aqua, uos autem spiritu sancto incipietis baptizari: quem et accepturi estis non post multos dies istos usque ad pentecosten.	(5) quoniam Iohannes quidem baptizauit aqua, uos autem spiritu sancto incipietis baptizari, quem et accepturi estis non post multos istos dies usque ad pentecosten.	(5) quia Ioannes quidem baptizauit aqua, uos autem spiritu sancto baptizabimini, quem et accepturi estis non post multos hos dies	(5) quia Iohannes quidem baptizavit aqua, uos autem baptizabimini Spiritu Sancto non post multos hos dies.

Once again, Augustine's text of Acts 1.4 presents a different and independent reading in each of his three works. The texts of Acts 1.5 agree in *Contra ep. fund.* and *C. Fel.*, but not in *Cath.*, which is leaning closer to the text of the Vulgate. In Acts 1.6, *Contra ep. fund.* and *C. Fel.* are exactly the same, while once again *Cath.* is closer to the Vulgate. Here though it is also possible to explain the change in Augustine's text, especially with the use of *baptizibimini* from *baptizari*, which is found in his s. 71 (written between 393-405)⁸⁵, *Cres.* 2.14 (404/5) and *Cath.* (written in 411).

Sometime after 395 (on the dating of this letter, see below) Augustine had written a letter to Seleuciana (ep. 265) and in it, Augustine states that Acts 1.5 reads "*ioannes quidem baptizauit aqua, uos autem spiritu sancto baptizabimini, quem et accepturi estis non post multos dies, usque ad pentecosten.*" He then states that some codices (*aliqui autem codices*) contain "*uos autem spiritu sancto incipietis baptizari*" which matches *Contra ep. fund.* and *C. Fel.* But he claimed it did not matter because for him the meaning is the same.⁸⁶ Although he had stated this, it is clear that it must have meant something for him because he had listed

⁸⁵ For the dating of Augustine's sermons, see É Rebillard, "Sermones," in Fitzgerald (1999), pp. 773-792. Because of the appearance of *baptizibimini* in this sermon, I would date it later than that of *C. Fel.* (404).

⁸⁶ Ep. 265 "...sed siue dicatur baptizabimini siue dicatur incipietis baptizari, ad rem nihil interest."

baptizibimini first in ep. 265 and in his later writings this is what he preferred, as opposed to *Contra ep. fund.* and *C. Fel.* Thus it might also be possible to date ep. 265 later than *C. Fel.* (around 404).

Acts 1.6

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> (CSEL 25,1/203.24-204.1)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.4 (CSEL 25,2/804.18-20)	<i>Ep. Io.</i> 10.9 PL 35, 2061.	<i>Cath.</i> 11.27 (PL 43, 0410)	Acts 1.6 Vulgate
Illi quidem cum uenissent, interrogabant eum dicentes: domine, si hoc in tempore repraesentaberis, et quando regnum Israel.	Illi ergo conuenientes interrogabant eum dicentes: domine, si in hoc tempore <i>praesentabis</i> regnum Israhel?	domine, si in hoc tempore praesentaberis, et quando regnum israhel?	At illi quidem conuenientes interrogabant eum dicentes: Domine, si in tempore hoc restitues regnum Israel?	Igitur qui convenerant interrogabant eum dicentes: Domine, si in tempore hoc restitues regnum Israhel?

There is little to be said about this citation except that the text from *Contra ep. fund.* contains two independent readings: the first, *cum uenissent*, and *repraesentaberis*.⁸⁷ *Praesentabis* in *C. Fel.* is also an independent reading. Augustine also cited this verse in *epistulam Ioannis ad Parthos tractatus (Ep. Io.)* 10.9, written in 406-407, and gives yet another independent reading of *praesentaberis*. The text from *Cath.* is closer to the Vulgate than it is to his earlier writings, but still does not match.

Acts 1.7

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> (CSEL 25,1/204.1-3)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.4 (CSEL 25,2/804.20-22)	<i>Ep. Io.</i> 10.9 (PL 35, 2061)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.27 (PL 43, 0410-11)	Augustine ep. 197.1 (CSEL 57)	Cyprian, <i>Quir.</i> 3.89	Vulgate
Ille autem dixit: nemo potest cognoscere tempus, quod pater posuit in sua potestate;	Ille autem dixit: nemo potest cognoscere tempus, quod pater posuit in sua potestate;	non est uestrum scire tempus quod pater posuit in sua potestate	Quibus respondens dixit: non est uestrum scire tempora uel momenta, quae pater posuit in	nemo potest cognoscere tempora, quae pater posuit in sua potestate	nemo potest cognoscere tempus aut tempora quae pater posuit in sua potestate	Dixit autem eis: Non est uestrum nosse tempora uel momenta, quae pater

⁸⁷ Clark (1933), p. 3 and Wordsworth and White (1905), p. 37.

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> (CSEL 25,1/204.1-3)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.4 (CSEL 25,2/804.20-22)	<i>Ep. Io.</i> 10.9 (PL 35, 2061)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.27 (PL 43, 0410-11)	Augustine ep. 197.1 (CSEL 57)	Cyprian, <i>Quir.</i> 3.89	Vulgate
			sua potestate			posuit in sua potestate,

Part of this passage (*nemo potest cognoscere*) is another important citation in *Contra ep. fund.* In 419/20 Augustine received advice about changing the wording of this particular verse. Augustine had written to Hesychius, a priest in Jerusalem (ep. 197).⁸⁸ He included the text of Acts 1.7 which read *nemo potest cognoscere tempora, quae pater posuit in sua potestate*. Hesychius then wrote back to Augustine (ep. 198.2) and told him that the oldest books of the church do not contain the phrase *nemo potest*, but have *non est uestrum nosse tempora uel momenta, quae pater posuit in sua potestate*, which matches the text of the Vulgate.⁸⁹ To round out the correspondence, Augustine then wrote back and corrected himself (ep. 199.1) and used this new wording.⁹⁰ As shown in the table above, Augustine appears to be progressively coming closer to that of the text of the Vulgate. But Hesychius is not using the exact text of the Vulgate, as the next section will show.

Augustine and Cyprian are the only ones to use the phrase *nemo potest cognoscere* and shows a different reading from other witnesses. Metzger, however, claims that both Cyprian and Augustine are instead citing from Mk. 13.32 (*De die autem illo uel hora nemo scit neque angeli in caelo neque Filius nisi Pater*) instead of Acts 1.7, and that the text from those two was not a “a testimony for the existence of a similar reading in Acts.”⁹¹ He bases this by claiming that this particular reading is *only* found in ep. 199 of Augustine and of Cyprian.⁹² But he did not notice the citations in *Contra ep. fund.* and *C. Fel.* where it is clear that Augustine is citing from Acts and not Mark. Therefore, this particular citation from Acts

⁸⁸ See M. P. McHugh, “Hesychius of Jerusalem,” in *EEC*, p. 524. For ep. 197, see CSEL 57/231.14.

⁸⁹ Ep. 198 (CSEL 57/236.3) “Nemo potest cognoscere tempora, quae pater in sua posuit potestate, primum quia et in antiquissimis libris ecclesiarum non ita scriptum est ‘nemo potest,’ sed scriptum est: ‘Non est uestrum nosse tempora uel momenta, quae pater posuit in sua potestate,...’”

⁹⁰ See Wordsworth and White (1905), p. 37 and Metzger (1971), p. 281.

⁹¹ Metzger (1971), p. 281.

⁹² Metzger (1971), p. 281.

is an important one because it gives evidence of another reading of Acts, most likely African, that is not found in any other witness.

Acts 1.8

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> (CSEL 25,1/204.3-5)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.4 (CSEL 25,2/804.22-25)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.27 (PL 43, 0411)	Ep. 198 to Hesychius to Augustine	Ep. 199 Augustine to Hesychius	Acts 1.8 Vulgate
sed accipietis uirtutem spiritus sancti superuenientem in vos et eritis mihi testes apud Hierusalem et in tota Iudaea et Samaria et usque in totam terram.	sed accipietis uirtutem spiritus sancti superuenientem in uos et eritis mihi testes apud Hierosolymam et in tota Iudaea et Samaria et usque in totam terram	sed accipietis uirtutem spiritus sancti superuenientem in uos et eritis mihi testes in Ierusalem et in tota Iudaea et Samaria et usque in totam terram	Sed eritis mihi testes in Hierusalem et in Iudaeam et in Samariam et usque ad ultimum terrae	sed eritis mihi estes in Hierusalem et in Iudaeam et in Samariam et usque ad ultimum terrae	sed accipietis virtutem supervenientis Sancto Spiritu in vos et eritis mihi testes et in Hierusalem et in omni Iudaea et Samaria et usque ad ultimum terrae.

As mentioned above, in his reply to Augustine, Hesychius wrote back to Augustine with what he thought was the correct version for the text of Acts. He also gave part of Acts 1.8, which, while close to the Vulgate, is still not an exact match (see above). This text also matches that of Hesychius.

Augustine also used another version of Acts 1.8: *in omni iudaea et samaria et usque in fines terrae* (twenty one times) and another: *in omni iudaeam et samariam et usque ad terminos terrae* (only in *Contra Gaudentium* 1.20, written in 419).⁹³

Acts 2.1

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> (CSEL 25,1/204.9-11)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.5 (CSEL 25,2/806.15-16)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.29 (PL 43, 411)	Vulgate
in illo tempore, quo	tempore, quo	Et cum complerentur	Et cum compleretur

⁹³ As found in a search on CETEDOC.

subpletus est dies pentecostes, fuerunt omnes eadem animatione simul in unum	subpletus est dies pentecostes, fuerunt omnes simul in uno.	dies Pentecostes, erant omnes simul in unum	dies Pentecostes erant omnes pariter in eodem loco
--	---	---	--

In the *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine skipped *Acts* 1.9-13, which contains the choosing of the replacement for Judas. In *C. Fel.* 1.4 he read this in its entirety.⁹⁴ Augustine also referred to *Acts* 2.1-11 in *Agon.* 28.30, where he refuted the heretics (including the Manichaeans) who believed that the Holy Spirit came at some other time than as reported in *Acts*.⁹⁵ Here again there are also some independent readings in both *Contra ep. fund.* and *C. Fel.* (*tempore, quo subpletus est dies penecostes*). The endings in both, while different from each other, are also not found elsewhere.⁹⁶

Acts 2.2

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> (CSEL 25,1/204.11-13)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.5 (CSEL 25,2/806.16-18)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.29 (PL 43, 411)	Cyprian Quir. 3.101 (CCL 3/171.3)	Vulgate
et factus est subito de caelo sonus, quasi ferretur flatus uehemens, et inpleuit totum illum locum, in quo erant sedentes	et factus est subito de caelo sonus, quasi ferretur flatus uehemens, et inpleuit totam illam domum, in qua erant sedentes.	et factus est repente de caelo sonus, uelut decurrentis spiritus uehementis, et repleuit totam domum, ubi erant sedentes	Et factus est subito de caelo sonus, quasi ferretur flatus uehemens, et inpleuit totum locum illum, in quo erant sedentes	et factus est repente de caelo sonus tamquam aduenientis spiritus uehementis et repleuit totam domum, ubi erant sedentes.

The texts of Augustine are nearly the same. The biggest difference occurs with the text of *C. Fel.*, which has *totam illam domum*, as opposed to *Contra ep. fund.*'s *totum illum locum*. These texts differ from the Vulgate, with the text of *C. Fel.* slightly closer to the Vulgate. There are, however, many more differences than similarities and Augustine is still not using the Vulgate in either text. Cyprian also cites this passage, which is closer to that of Augustine, showing once again a more African-style text.

⁹⁴ *C. Fel.* 1.4 (CSEL 25,2/804.25-806.9).

⁹⁵ *Agon.* 28.30 (CSEL 41/130).

⁹⁶ See Wordsworth and White (1905), p. 41.

Acts 2.3-4

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 9 (CSEL 25,1/204.13-17)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.5 (CSEL 25,2/806.18-22)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.29 (PL 43, 411)	Cyprian <i>Quir.</i> 3.101 (CCL 3/171.3)	Vulgate
Et uisae sunt illis linguae diuisae quasi ignis, qui et insedit super unumquemque illorum	Et uisae sunt illis linguae diuisae quasi ignis, qui et insedit super unumquemque eorum	et uisae sunt illis distributae linguae uelut ignis, consedit autem super unumquemque eorum	Et uisae sunt illis linguae diuisae quasi ignis, qui et insedit in unumquemque illorum	Et apparuerunt illis dispertitae linguae tamquam ignis, seditique supra singulos eorum.
(4) et inpleti sunt omnes spiritu sancto et coeperunt loqui linguis, quomodo spiritus dabat eis pronuntiare	(4) et inpleti sunt omnes spiritu sancto et coeperunt loqui uariis linguis quomodo spiritus dabat eis pronuntiare.	(4) et repleti sunt omnes Spiritu sancto, et coeperunt loqui uariis linguis, prout Spiritus dabat pronuntiare illis.	(4) et inpleti sunt omnes Spiritu sancto	(4) et repleti sunt omnes Spiritu Sancto et coeperunt loqui aliis linguis prout Spiritus Sanctus dabat eloqui illis.

The two texts of Augustine's differ at the end of each verse and are still very different to that of the Vulgate. Once again, the text of Cyprian comes much closer to the *Contra ep. fund.* and *C. Fel.* than it does with the text of the Vulgate.

For Acts 2.5-7 there is very little to discuss. As can be seen, the texts of *Contra ep. fund.* and *C. Fel.* are slightly different. For sake of clarity, the text in *C. Fel.* is italicized where these differences occur from the *Contra ep. fund.*

Acts 2.5-7

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 9 (CSEL 25,1/204.17-24)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.5 (CSEL 25,2/806.22-29)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.29 (PL 43, 411)	Vulgate
Hiersolymis autem fuerunt habitantes Iudaei, homines ex omni natione, quae est sub caelo	Hierosolymis autem fuerunt habitatores Iudaei, homines ex omni natione, quae est sub caelo.	Erant autem inhabitantes in Ierusalem Iudaei uiri religiosi, ex omni gente quae est sub caelo.	Erant autem in Hierusalem habitantes Iudaei, uiri religiosi ex omni natione, quae sub caelo sunt
(6) Et cum facta esset uox, collecta est turba et confusa est, quoniam audiebat unusquisque suo sermone et suis linguis loquentes eos	(6) Et cum facta esset uox, collecta est turba et confusa (om. <i>est</i>), quoniam audiebat unusquisque suo sermone et suis linguis loquentes eos.	(6) Cumque facta esset haec uox, conuenit multitudo, ac mente confusa est, quia audiebat unusquisque eorum sua lingua loquentes	(6) facta autem hac uoce, conuenit multitudo et mente confusa est, quoniam audiebat unusquisque lingua sua illos loquentes.

<i>Contra ep. fund. 9</i> (CSEL 25,1/204.17-24)	<i>C. Fel. 1.5</i> (CSEL 25,2/806.22-29)	<i>Cath.11.29</i> (PL 43, 411)	Vulgate
		eos.	
(7) Stupebant autem et admirabantur ad inuicem dicentes: nonne omnes, qui loquuntur, natione sunt Galilaei?	(7) Stupebant autem et admirabantur ad inuicem dicentes: nonne omnes, qui loquuntur, natione sunt Galilaei?	(7) Stupebant autem et mirabantur ad inuicem dicentes: nonne omnes isti qui loquuntur, Galilaei sunt?	(7) Stupebant autem omnes et mirabantur dicentes: nonne omnes ecce isti qui loquuntur, Galilaei sunt?

Only a few comments are needed on these three verses. First, the use of *cum facta esset uox* in Acts 2.6 is found only in the works of Augustine. This is also the case with *ad inuicem* in 2.7. In Acts 2.7 there is also a variation with the use of *natione sunt*. This is only found in Augustine and in Quodvultdeus, a deacon and later bishop of Carthage (in 437) in his *Liber promissionum et praedictorum Dei* 2.3, although the beginning and end of this phrase does not match the text of Augustine (*nonne hi qui locuntur natione sunt Galilei?*). The difference found in Quodvultdeus shows that the text of Acts was still in a state of flux in North Africa.

Acts 2.8

<i>Contra ep. fund. 9</i> (CSEL 25,1/204.	<i>C. Fel. 1.5</i> (CSEL 25,2/806.29-30)	<i>Cath.11.29</i> (PL 43, 411)	Vulgate
Et quomodo agnoscimus in illis sermonem, in quo nati sumus?	Et quomodo agnoscimus in illis sermonem, in quo nati sumus?	Et quomodo nos audiemus unusquisque propriam linguam, in qua nati sumus?	Et quomodo nos audimus unusquisque lingua nostra, in qua nati sumus?

Acts 2.9-10

<i>Contra ep. fund. 9</i> (CSEL 25,1/204.25-205.3)	<i>C. Fel. 1.5</i> (CSEL 25,2/806.30-807.4)	<i>Cath.11.29</i> (PL 43, 411)	Tertullian <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> 7	Jerome Commentary on Isaiah (PL 24, 150B)	Vulgate
Parthi, Medi, Elamitae et qui inhabitant Mesopotamiam, Armeniam et Cappadociam, Pontum, Asiam	Parthi, Medi et Elamitae, et qui inhabitant Mesopotamiam, Iudaeam et Cappadociam, Pontum, Asiam,	Parthi, et Medi, et Elamitae, et qui inhabitant Mesopotamiam Iudaei, et Cappadociam, Pontum, et	Parthi et Medi et elamitae et qui habitant Mesopotamiam Armeniam Cappadociam,	<i>habitantes in Mesopotamia et Syria</i>	Parthi et Medi et Elamitae et qui habitant Mesopotamiam et Iudaeam et Cappadociam, Pontum et

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 9 (CSEL 25,1/204.25-205.3)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.5 (CSEL 25,2/806.30-807.4)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.29 (PL 43, 411)	Tertullian <i>Adversus Iudaeos</i> 7	Jerome Commentary on Isaiah (PL 24, 150B)	Vulgate
		Asiam,	et incolentes Pontum et Asiam		Asiam
(10) Phrygiam et Pamphyliam, Aegyptum et regiones Africae, quae est ad Cyrenen; et qui aduenerant Romani	(10) Phrygiam et Pamphyliam, Aegyptum et <i>partes Libyae</i> , quae est ad Cyrenem, et qui <i>aderant</i> Romani	(10) Phrygiamque et Pamphyliam, Aegyptum, et partes Lybiae quae sunt ad Cyrenen, et qui aduenerant Romani,	(10) Phrygiam et Pamphyliam, inmorantes Aegyptum et regiones Africae, quae est trans Cyrenen, inhabitantes Romani et incolae		(10) Frygia et Pamphyliam, Aegyptum partes Liby quae est cir Cyrenem, e aduenae Romani

There are two major differences between *Contra ep. fund.* and *C. Fel.* The first is with the use of *Armeniam* instead of *Iudaeam*, as found in *C. Fel.* and the Vulgate.⁹⁷ The second is with the use of *regiones Africae*. Tertullian, in his *Aduersus Iudaeos* 7, is the only other one to have used both *Armeniam* and *regiones africae*. Clark believed that the use of *Armeniam* by these two authors makes sense geographically, but he puts more weight on the text as found in *C. Fel.*, since it agrees with the Vulgate.⁹⁸ This part of Acts 2.9 has caused much scholarly debate.⁹⁹ Jerome also used a variation: *habitantes in Mesopotamia et Syria*, which does not match the text of the Vulgate. As shown, there is also one other similarity between the texts that Augustine and Tertullian use: the use of *qui inhabitant*. It should also be noted that there are two similarities between the text of *C. Fel.* and the Vulgate (but not a direct match): the use of *Iudaeum* and *partes Libyae*.

Acts 2.11

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 9 (CSEL 25,1/205.3-5)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.5 (CSEL 25,2/807.4-6)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.29 (PL 43, 411)	Vulgate
---	--	---------------------------------	---------

⁹⁷ See Clark (1933), p. 259 who calls this difference “the most important case.” He then states that this is found at Acts 2.8, but this must be a misprint since the text is found at 2.9.

⁹⁸ Clark (1933), p. 338.

⁹⁹ See Metzger (1971), p. 293.

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 9 (CSEL 25,1/205.3-5)	<i>C. Fel.</i> 1.5 (CSEL 25,2/807.4-6)	<i>Cath.</i> 11.29 (PL 43, 411)	Vulgate
et Iudaei incolae et Cretenses et Arabes audiebant loquentes illos suis linguis magnalia dei	Iudaeique et <i>proselyti</i> , Cretenses et Arabes audiebant loquentes illos suis linguis magnalia dei	Iudaeique et aduenae, Cretenses et Arabes audiebant loquentes illos suis linguis magnalia dei.	Iudaei quoque et proselyti, Cretes et Arabes, audiuius loquentes eos nostris linguis magnalia dei.

Again there is a difference between the texts of Augustine, with the text of *Contra ep. fund.* containing two independent differences: *et Iudaei* and *incolae*. Once again, *C. Fel.* is closer to the text of the Vulgate, but does not contain a direct match.

Acts 2.12-13

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 9 (CSEL 25,1/205.5-8)	<i>C. Fel.</i>	<i>Cath.</i> 11.29 (PL 43, 411)	Vulgate
Stupebant autem et haesitabant ob id quod factum est dicentes: quidnam hoc uult esse? Alii autem inridebant dicentes: hi musto omnes onerati sunt	Not in <i>C. Fel.</i>	Stupebant autem et haesitabant ad inuicem dicentes: quidnam uult hoc esse? Alii uero irridebant eos, dicentes: Quia musto repleti sunt isti.	Stupebant autem omnes et mirabantur ad inuicem dicentes: quidnam hoc uult esse? Alii autem inridentes dicebant quia musto pleni sunt isti.

The last line of this verse in *Contra ep. fund.*, *hi musto omnes onerati sunt* is an independent reading. It should be noted that Augustine did not read these last two lines of Acts to Felix. The text states that there were some who believed that those who had claimed they could understand all of the different languages were drunk on wine. It is likely that Augustine did not read out this section to Felix because the Manichaean could have stated that, yes, those who thought the Holy Spirit had come on that day were drunk. Thus the Holy Spirit must have come with Mani.

John 7.39

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 10 (205.19)	<i>e</i> ¹⁰⁰	Ambrose <i>On the Holy Spirit</i> , Intro. 2.7 (PL 16, 744)	Vulgate

¹⁰⁰ The text of *e* is found in Milne (1926), p. 134.

spiritus autem nondum erat datus, quia Iesus nondum erat clarificatus	nondum autem spiritus erat sanctus datus quia Iesus nondum erat clarificatus	Iesus nondum fuerat honorificatus	nondum enim erat spiritus quia Iesus nondum fuerat glorificatus.
---	--	--	---

This *clarificatio* is Christ's resurrection and ascension.¹⁰¹ Once again Augustine resorts to John in his discussion of the Holy Spirit and His coming, as he will do one more time in with John 20.22 below. In both cases, the Holy Spirit immediately came in the time of the original apostles and not two centuries later in Mani. Similar to *Contra ep. fund.*, Augustine, later in *Io. eu. tr.* 52.8, tied this to Acts 2.4-6 (the speaking in numerous languages). See also *En. Ps.* 45.8 for the same use of both verses.

The Text

Milne notes that Augustine's use of *nondum erat datus* was another place where Augustine was stubbornly refusing to use the Vulgate.¹⁰² Augustine is the only one to use this particular phrasing and is used from *Diu. qu.* to *C. Faust.* But as mentioned many times earlier, since there is no evidence in this work to suggest that Augustine knew of Jerome's Vulgate, Augustine's stubbornness cannot be a factor here. There are also many writers who used this particular phrase.¹⁰³

Augustine will also use *erat clarificatus* and *erat glorificatus* interchangeably. He had used *erat glorificatus* in *En. Ps.* 45.8 (written before *Contra ep. fund.*) and *erat clarificatus* in ep. 55.16 (dated to 401). Later in his *Io. eu. tr.* 32.2 he also used *erat glorificatus*.¹⁰⁴ These three can be found in the texts of Ambrose, *e* and the Vulgate, which makes it difficult to determine which manuscript family Augustine might have been using.

John 20.22

¹⁰¹ *Contra ep. fund.* 10 (CSEL 25,1/205.17-18).

¹⁰² Milne (1926), p. xxii.

¹⁰³ In a search of *CETEDOC* for *nondum erat datus*, there were 48 different occurrences, with Augustine accounting for 28 of these.

¹⁰⁴ *Io. eu. tr.* 32.2 (CCL 36/301.10).

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 10 (205.26)	Cyprian <i>Unit.</i> 4 (CCL 3/251.84)	Vulgate
accipite spiritum sanctum	accipite spiritum sanctum	accipite spiritum sanctum

This text matches the Vulgate, but like John 10.30 (above), it is unlikely that he took this from the Vulgate. There was probably little room for change in such a short text.

John 1.14

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 37 (242.19) ¹⁰⁵	Hilary <i>De Trinitate</i> 1.10; Jerome <i>Tractatum in psalmos series altera</i> 15 and Fulgentius <i>Dicta regis Trasamundi et contra ea responsionum liber</i>	Ambrose <i>Expositio psalmi</i> 18.32	<i>e</i> ¹⁰⁶	Vulgate
et uidimus gloriam eius tamquam unigeniti a patre, pleni gratia et ueritate	uidimus gloriam eius, gloriam tamquam unigeniti a Patre, plenum gratia et ueritate	uidimus gloriam eius, gloriam quasi unigeniti a patre, plenum gratia et ueritate	tamquam unici patris plenus gratia et ueritate plenus gratia et ueritate	et uidimus gloriam eius gloriam quasi unigeniti a patre plenum gratiae et veritatis

There is a long break in the *Contra ep. fund.* where Augustine did not give a single direct citation to scripture. This ends at chapter thirty seven, where he gives John 1.14. Previous to this Augustine was discussing the terms “born of God” and “created from nothing.” Christ is born of God, and what is born of God is God. In a very similar argument, Augustine uses this phrase in his argument with Secundinus, *C. Sec.* 5 (CSEL 25,2/911.18-19) to show, like that in *Contra ep. fund.*, that Christ has no brothers because he is consubstantial with the Father (see Romans 8.29, below).

¹⁰⁵ This also occurs in *Adnotationes in Iob* (*Adn. Iob*). 38; *Io. ev. tr.* 2.16 and 3.6, *En. Ps.* 18.2 (2nd en.), s. 133, s. 174, s. 256D, *Pec. mer.* 2.18.31, and *Spir. et litt.* 10.16

¹⁰⁶ Milne (1926), p. 121.

The Text

Augustine shows a marked preference for *pleni*, as opposed to *plenum* found in Ambrose and the text of the Vulgate. There are also similarities to the text found in Hilary (the bishop of Poitiers who died around 367), Jerome and Fulgentius. Augustine’s text has many similarities with all of these works and this is another case where the family of his manuscript cannot be determined.

Romans 8.29

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 37 (242.21)	Vulgate
ut sit ipse primogenitus in multis fratribus	ut sit ipse primogenitus in multis fratribus

As Augustine stated over and over again, Jesus Christ is the only begotten of God (he makes an allusion to Col. 1.18). Therefore any attempt to find a brother for Him is “ignorant and impious.”¹⁰⁷ This citation is paired with John 1.14 (above). In his letter to Secundinus, Augustine uses this phrase from Romans to show that Jesus had human brothers, not by the equality of substance, but by the adoption of Grace (quos ei pater ad fraternam societatem non aequalitate substantiae, sed adoptione gratiae generavit).¹⁰⁸ Here in the *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine stops discussing the issue of the brothers of Jesus and does not bring up the topic again until *C. Sec.*

The Text

Once again, this text matches that of the Vulgate, but since Augustine is not using the Vulgate, this is another verse that is too small to determine what type of manuscript family Augustine might have been using.

Ps. 72.28

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 38 (CSEL 25,1/244.8)	Ambrose, <i>De Cain et Abel</i> 1.2.5 (CSEL 32,1/341.20)	Vulgate
mihi autem inhaerere deo bonum est	mihi autem inhaerere deo bonum est	mihi autem adherere Deo bonum est

¹⁰⁷ *Contra ep. fund.* 37 (CSEL 25,1/242.15-16) “...inperite atque inpie...”

¹⁰⁸ *C. Sec.* 5 (CSEL 25,1/912.5-6).

As he writes in the *Contra ep. fund.*, in order for mankind to become and remain incorrupt, they must cling to God; to move away from God is a corruption. It is a favorite of Augustine's (there are at least twenty-three separate times he had used it¹⁰⁹) and this is nowhere more clear than in *Ciu. Dei*. In book ten he uses it four times.¹¹⁰ In 10.25 he states that this verse shows that the only true good is God and not material things. When the material things are released from humanity's grip, then one can cling to God. This is very similar to his argument found in *Contra ep. fund.*

The Text

It is fortunate that the text of the Psalms is much better preserved in the works of Augustine, since he wrote a verse-by-verse commentary on the entire work, the *Enarrationes in Psalmos* (*En. Ps.*).¹¹¹ The *En. Ps.* were a series of sermons given from 392 to around 417.

This text is slightly similar to that of the Vulgate, and in this case it matches the text of Ambrose. Like other texts in the *Contra ep. fund.*, Augustine is not consistent with his use of this citation. In *Mor. I* (written in 387/8) Augustine gives his first citation of this as "Mihi autem adhaerere deo bonum est"; two lines later *adhaerere* has become *inhaerere*.

Elsewhere in the same work there are allusions to the same verse, using *cohaerere* or simply *haerere*.¹¹² He also had used the same wording as the *Contra ep. fund.* in *Conf. 7.11.17*.¹¹³

The text is similar to the Vulgate, but as mentioned above, Augustine would not have been using Jerome's translations from the Hebrew to Latin.

Isa. 45.7

¹⁰⁹ Wiles (1995), pp. 39-40.

¹¹⁰ *Ciu. Dei* 10.3, 10.6, 10.18, 10.25. See also 12.9.

¹¹¹ For the critical text, see CCL 38-40. There are also three very useful studies on the *Psalms*: Fiedrowicz, who deals specifically with the *En. Ps.*, and Knauer and Weber, who studied the *Psalms* in general, but who make reference to Augustine. See M. Fiedrowicz, *Psalmus Vox Totius Christi: Studien zu Augustins 'Enarrationes in Psalmos'* (Friburg, 1997); G. N. Knauer, *Psalmenzitate in Augustins Konfessionen* (Göttingen, 1955, reprinted in his *Three Studies*, New York, 1987); R. Weber, *Le Psautier Romain et les autres anciens Psautiers latins* (Rome, 1953).

¹¹² Coyle (1978), p. 157, n. 646. See also O'Donnell (1992), vol. 2, pp. 446-447.

¹¹³ CCL 27/104.4.

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 39 (244.28)	Jerome <i>Commentary on Amos 1</i>	Tertullian <i>De fuga in Persecutione</i>	Vulgate
ego facio bona et condo mala	ego facio bona et condo mala	ego facio bona et condo mala	faciens pacem et creans malum

Augustine liked to show the Manichaeans and his Catholic audience that the two testaments contained the exact same message (cf. especially *C. Adim.* [CSEL 25,1/115-190]), and here is another example with the pairing of Isa. 45.7 and Luke 12.4 (below). This was not a common verse used by Augustine and at this time of his career he was just beginning to become comfortable with using Isaiah.¹¹⁴ He had made use of it, however, in *Mor.* II 7.9 where he stated that the Manichaeans were always complaining about this particular citation. The Manichaeans had difficulty believing that God could create evil things, as Isa. 45.7 clearly states. In *Contra ep. fund.*, Augustine did not discuss this particular problem that the Manichaeans had with Isa. 45.7, but he had addressed it in *Mor.* II. 7.9. Here he stated that “to create evil things” means that God creates “things which are falling off, and so tending to non-existence...” Souls that fall away from God are ranked, by God, to the lowest levels of existence, or as he implies with the use of Mt. 5.8 in the *Contra ep. fund.* (discussed below), only God can send these souls to hell.

The Text

Augustine’s text of Isaiah corresponds to the texts found in Jerome’s *Commentary on Amos 1* and Tertullian’s *De fuga in Persecutione*.¹¹⁵ Once again Augustine is not consistent in his text of this verse. This is also another example where he is aware of other differences found in Isaiah regarding this passage. In *Mor.* II. 7.9 (CSEL 90,7/13-16) Augustine states that this passage reads: “‘Ego facio bona et creo mala.’ Creare namque dicitur condere et ordinare. Itaque in plerisque exemplaribus sic scriptum est: ‘Ego facio bona et condo mala.’”

¹¹⁴ L. C. Ferrari, “Isaiah and the Early Augustine,” in B. Bruning, M. Lamberigts, J. Van Houtem (ed.), *Collectanea Augustiniana: Mélanges T. J. Van Bavel*, vol. 2 (Léuven, 1990), p. 748

¹¹⁵ See R. Gryson (ed.), *Vetus Latina: Die Reste Der Altlateinischen Bibel, Esaias*, vol. 12.2 (Freiburg, 1995), pp. 1070-1073 for the entire list of *Vetus Latina* citations for this passage.

Despite the variations, for him the meaning is still the same. Several years later than *Mor.* II, Augustine wrote in *C. Adim.* 27 (CSEL 25,1/186.13) “Ego sum deus, qui facio *pacem* et *constituo mala*”; and finally, in *C. adu. leg.* 1.23.48 and 1.23.49 (written 419/420)¹¹⁶ he writes “...*faciens bona et creans mala*” which is different yet again.

Luke 12.4

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 39 (CSEL 25,1/245.1-4) ¹¹⁷	Augustine’s <i>En. Ps.</i> 118.1; <i>Ciu. Dei</i> 1.12 ¹¹⁸ ; <i>Io. ev. tr.</i> 43.12 and <i>Cura mort.</i> 9.11 ¹¹⁹ ; <i>Gr. et lib. arb.</i> and <i>C. Iul. imp.</i> 6 ¹²⁰	Pseudo-Vigilius <i>Contra Uarimadum</i> 3.73	Jerome, <i>Commentary on Ephesians</i> 3	Vulgate
nolite timere eos, qui corpus occidunt et amplius non habent, quid faciant, sed eum timete, qui cum corpus occiderit, habet potestatem animam <i>mittere in gehennam</i>	nolite timere eos qui corpus occidunt, et postea non habent quid faciant; sed eum timete qui habet potestatem et corpus et animam <i>perdere in gehennam</i>	ne timeatis eos qui occidunt corpus, et post haec non habent amplius quid faciant: ostendam autem uobis quem timeatis	nolite timere eos qui possunt occidere corpus, et plus non habent quod uobis faciant, sed timete eum qui potest et animam et corpus occidere in gehennam	ne terreamini ab his qui occidunt corpus et post haec non habent amplius <i>quod faciant</i> , ostendam autem uobis quem timeatis, timete eum qui postquam occiderit habet potestatem <i>mittere in gehennam</i>

Augustine used this text (and the one above and below) to show that God both creates and destroys. Although the primary use of this citation is to show the Manichaeans this, it

¹¹⁶ On the distinct possibility that *C. adu. leg.* is an anti-Manichaean work, see J. K. Coyle, “Revisiting the Adversary in Augustine’s *Contra Aduersarium legis et prophetarum*,” *Studia Patristica* 38 (2001): 56-63.

¹¹⁷ Augustine paraphrases this in *Cura mort.* 2.3 “exhortans ne timeant eos, qui cum corpus occiderint, amplius non habent quid faciant.” He also used this in *En. Ps.* 68.3, with a slight difference at the end of the citation: “nolite timere eos qui corpus occidunt, et amplius non habent quid faciant; sed eum timete qui habet potestatem, et corpus et animam occidere in gehenna ignis.”

¹¹⁸ This text only contains “qui corpus occidunt, et postea non habent faciunt” (CCL 47/13.5-6).

¹¹⁹ This text only contains “nolite timere eos qui *occidunt corpus*, et postea non habent *quid faciant*” and *Cura mort.* 9.11 “nolite timere eos, qui corpus occidunt et postea non habent quid faciant.” The changes between *En. Ps.* 118 and the rest of the texts in this grouping are italicized.

¹²⁰ *Gr. et lib. arb.*: “nolite timere eos qui corpus occidunt, et postea non habent quid faciant” and *C. Iul. imp.* 6: “nolite timere eos qui corpus occidunt, et postea non habent quod faciant; sed eum timete, qui habet potestatem et corpus et animam perdere in gehennam.”

also serves as a warning to those who follow material objects or men (or a man, Mani) instead of God: only God can send the soul to hell. This, in effect, is the abandonment of the soul.¹²¹

The Text

This text is often mistaken for a conflation of Mt. 10.28 (et nolite timere eos qui occidunt corpus animam autem non possunt occidere sed potius eum timete qui potest et animam et corpus perdere in gehennam) and Luke 12.4.¹²² But the text of Mt. does not contain the important phrase *amplius/postea/post non habent quid/quod faciunt/faciant*, so there is no doubt that this comes from Luke 12.4. Augustine’s use of the text shows once again that he used different versions of it, sometimes within the same work (as with the case of *Cura mort.*). The use of *amplius*, as in *Contra ep. fund.* and one citation in *Cura mort.* seems to be the least-preferred choice in the works of Augustine. Both the writings of Augustine and the one citation from Jerome do not contain the phrase *ostendam autem uobis quem timeatis*, found in Pseudo-Vigilius and the Vulgate. It is unlikely that Augustine is citing from memory and possibly forgot part of the citation, since he used the same form many times. Therefore Augustine must have had a text which was different from what would be used in the Vulgate and which he continued to use throughout his writing career.

1 Cor. 3.17

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 39 (CSEL 25,1/245.6-8)	<i>Mend.</i> 18.38	<i>Lib. arb.</i> 3.40; s. 9, 161, 278	Vigilius, <i>Contra Uarimadum</i> 3.70	Cyprian <i>Quir.</i> 3.27 (CCL 3/122.5-6)	Vulgate
templum enim dei sanctum est, quod estis uos; quisquis templum dei	Quisquis templum dei corruperit, corrumpet illum deus; templum enim dei	si quis templum dei corruperit, corrumpit illum deus	si quis templum dei corruperit, corrumpit illum deus	Si qui templum Dei uiolauerit, uiolabit illum Deus.	si quis autem templum Dei uiolauerit disperdet illum Deus

¹²¹ He states this in *Ciu. Dei* 13.2.
¹²² Milne (1926), p. 32. See also the note on the *Contra ep. fund.* in CSEL 25,1/245, which lists this verse as Mt. 10.28 and Luke 12.4; PL 42, col. 204 and Jolivet and Jourjon (1961), p. 499. M. Boulding (trans.), in *Expositions of the Psalms 51-72*, in J. E. Rotelle (ed.), *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, vol 3.17 (New York, 2001), p. 368, lists this citation as Mt. 10.28.

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 39 (CSEL 25,1/245.6-8)	<i>Mend.</i> 18.38	<i>Lib. arb.</i> 3.40; s. 9, 161, 278	Vigilius, <i>Contra Uarimadum</i> 3.70	Cyprian <i>Quir.</i> 3.27 (CCL 3/122.5-6)	Vulgate
corruperit, corrupet illum deus	sanctum est, quod estis uos				templum enim Dei sanctum est quod estis uos

These last three verses (Isa. 45.7, Luke 12.4 and 1 Cor. 3.17) are all related, showing that God does corrupt those who do not follow his commands. The Manichaeans, as Augustine stated in the *Contra ep. fund.*, would not take this meaning literally, but they would try their best to make sure this does not mean that God is a corrupter, but hands them over to corruption. He approves of this explanation and remarks that he wished the Manichaeans would examine the Old Testament in this way as well. As shown above, this was also a favourite verse to use in his sermons.

The Text

Once again Augustine reminds us of the fact that there were many different copies of this work in Latin (*multi latini interpretes*). He claims that the Greek text clearly states (*apertissime scriptum est*) “Whoever corrupts the temple of God, God will corrupt him” and not “God will destroy (*disperdet*) him.”¹²³ But here Augustine also states that whether the text says *corrumpet* or *disperdet*, the meaning for him is still the same, but he prefers *corrumpet* because it is the more correct translation.¹²⁴

Mt. 5.8

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 42 (CSEL 25,1/248.1-2)	Ambrose <i>De Officiis ministrorum</i> 38.300 (PL 16, 80)	k ¹²⁵	Cyprian <i>Quir.</i> 3.78 (CCL 3/162.4-5)	Vulgate
--	---	------------------	---	---------

¹²³ *Contra ep. fund.* 39 (CSEL 25,1/245.16) “quisquis templum dei corruperit, corrupet illum deus.”

¹²⁴ *Contra ep. fund.* 39 (CSEL 25,1/245.10) “Quod uerbum metuentes multi latini interpretes noluerunt dicere ‘corrumpet,’ sed dixerunt ‘disperdet illum deus,’ et non deuiantes a re ipsa offensionem uocabuli deuitarunt.”

¹²⁵ Milne (1926), p. 4.

beati mundicordes, quoniam ipsi deum uidebunt	beati enim mundo corde, quia ipse etiam Deum uidebunt	baeti mundi corde quoniam ipsi Dominum uidebunt	Felices mundi corde, quoniam ipsi Deum uidebunt	beati mundo corde, quoniam ipsi Deum uidebunt.
--	--	--	--	---

Only the pure of heart will be able to see the Good and this is not seen with the eyes of the body. It is one of Augustine's favorite quotes from Matthew and he used it extensively throughout his writings.¹²⁶ Augustine has used this verse a few years earlier in *S. Dom. mon.* 1.2.8 (CCL 35/5.102-6.108) to make the same point:

Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. How foolish, therefore, are those who seek God with these outward eyes, since He is seen with the heart, as it is written elsewhere, '*And in sincerity of heart seek Him* (Wis. 1.1).' For that is a pure heart which is a sincere heart, and just as this light cannot be seen, except with pure eyes, so neither is God seen, unless that is pure by which He can be seen.¹²⁷

This verse is very important to his arguments in the *Contra ep. fund.* since it ties it together to the beginning of this work, where he had quoted both Mal. 4.2 and John 1.9:

Let those rage against you who know not the difficulty of curing the eye of the inner man that he may gaze upon his Sun,-not that sun which you worship, and which shines with the brilliance of a heavenly body in the eyes of carnal men and of beasts,-but that of which it is written through the prophet, "The Sun of righteousness has arisen upon me;" and of which it is said in the gospel, "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."¹²⁸

Augustine had spent a great deal of time in the *Contra ep. fund.* teaching the Manichaeans the correct way to think about God, by means of Jesus, who is the internal

¹²⁶ See Wiles (1995), p. 58.

¹²⁷ "*Beati mundo corde, quoniam ipsi Deum uidebunt.* Quam ergo stulti sunt qui deum istis exterioribus oculis quaerunt, cum corde uideatur, sicut alibi scriptum est: *Et in simplicitate cordis quaerite illum.* Hoc est enim mundum cor quod est simplex cor. Et quemadmodum lumen hoc uideri non potest nisi oculis mundis, ita nec deus uidetur, nisi mundum sit illud quo uideri potest." Translation, with modifications, is take from P. Schaff (ed.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol. 6 (Grand Rapids, reprint, 1996).

¹²⁸ *Contra ep. fund.* 2 (CSEL 25,1/194.16-24) "illi in uos saeuiant, qui nesciunt, cum quanta difficultate sanetur oculus interioris hominis, ut possit intueri solem suum – non istum, quem colitis caelesti corpore, oculis carnis et hominum et pecorum fulgentem atque radiantem, sed illum, de quo dictum est per prophetam: *ortus est mihi iustitiae sol*, et de quo dictum est in euangelio: *erat lumen uerum, quod inluminat omnem hominem uenientem in hunc mundum.*"

teacher. The Good (here Augustine is implying that the Good is God) cannot be thought of by thinking of it in material terms such as space and time¹²⁹ (which, for emphasis, he repeats again in chapter 42¹³⁰). Whoever cleanses the heart will be able to see that things such as justice, piousness and wisdom is something beyond the material and this will lead to the correct thinking about God.

The Text

The use of *beati mundicordes* is common in Augustine, but the overwhelming majority of ancient writers use *beati mundo corde*. Once again, Augustine is not consistent in his use of this quotation, even within the same work. As shown above, in the text of *S. Dom. mon.* 1.2.8 (CCL 35/5.102-6.108) he stated *Beati mundo corde, quoniam ipsi deum uidebunt* but in 2.22.76 he used *Beati ergo mundicordes, quia ipsi deum uidebunt*. In *C. Adim.* he also used both: *C. Adim.* 9 “*Beati enim mundicordes, quia ipsi Deum uidebunt*” and *C. Adim.* 28 “*Beati mundicordes, quoniam ipsi Deum uidebunt.*” Later in *Io. eu. tr.* 1.19, 3.18, 20.11 he used “*Beati mundo corde, quoniam ipse Deum uidebunt.*”

4.4 SUMMARY

4.4.1 His Use of Scripture

The lack of biblical citations against the Manichaeans is surprising. Although few in number, they are important in their theological weight. Augustine began his work with references to God as the ultimate creator of everything. To convince the Manichaeans of their errors, Augustine attempted to teach them about the interior teacher Christ, the Sun of Justice. Augustine’s use of Mal. 4.2 and that of John 1.9 also shows parallels to Ambrose’s *Hexameron*.

¹²⁹ *Contra ep. fund.* 42 (CSEL 25,1/247.24-25) “...festinemusque ad illud bonum quod nec locis grassatur nec tempore uoluitur et unde speciem formamque accipiunt omnes locales temporalesque naturae.”

¹³⁰ *Contra ep. fund.* 42 (CSEL 25,1/248.3-248.5) “Non enim eos oculos ad illud bonum cernendum praeparari oportet, quibus cernitur ista lux diffusa per locos, et non ubique integra, sed aliam partem hic habens et alibi aliam.”

Following this, he then tackled the issue of Mani as the apostle of Jesus Christ. Out of the small, total number of direct references, Acts takes precedence because of its claim of the coming of the Holy Spirit. Augustine had to give these texts (both in the *Contra ep. fund.* and in his debate with Felix), despite knowing that the Manichaeans rejected this work. This allowed him to undermine the authority of Mani for his Catholic audience by using the Catholic scripture against this charge.

All direct and indirect citations from scripture stop completely while Augustine taught the Manichaeans about the ascent and the nature of the soul, and thus of God. His direct citations do not start again until near the very end of the work (chapter thirty seven). There are, however, important allusions to scripture that begin in chapter twenty three. These focus primarily on the anthropomorphism found in his Catholic audience. He compares this to the idea that God is somehow wedged in by the Land of Darkness in the Manichaean story of the Two Natures. Other allusions deal with the order of things created by God.

The last cluster of biblical citations all revolve around the idea that God created all things good and in order to see this, the heart must be made pure. This directly ties in with his opening citations when he states that God created all things and that Christ is the only true internal teacher. Here he ends his citations and the *Contra ep. fund.* itself.

4.4.2 The Texts

An examination of the biblical citations in the *Contra ep. fund.* revealed two major results. The first is that Augustine was not using the text of the Vulgate in any of his citations. By the time he had written *Contra ep. fund.*, Augustine had read Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians*. Within this text of Jerome is one verse that is shared with the *Contra ep. fund.*, but contains a different wording. This is also the case with Rom. 8.3, found in both Jerome's and Augustine's *Commentary on Galatians*. Augustine had used different texts from that of Jerome, even though he knew of Jerome's work. This is not surprising considering that Augustine had written to Jerome in 394/5 to complain not only about

Jerome's translating method (translating from the Hebrew into Latin) but also about Jerome's exegetical ideas. His refusal to use Jerome's text adds more evidence to the controversy that Augustine and Jerome were having at this time. The second is that Augustine showed no hesitation in using different translations of verses, not only in works written years apart but also in the same work. As shown, this can be frustrating in terms of trying to determine which manuscript family Augustine might have been using for each verse, but some observations can be made.

It was shown that the text of Acts appeared to be more African, especially in the *Contra ep. fund.*¹³¹ This was proved by instances of close matches to texts which Cyprian used (Acts 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4). There are also similarities between Tertullian (Acts 2.9) and the text of *Contra ep. fund.* None of these are exact matches, showing that the texts were still in evolution. The differences between the texts of Acts in the *Contra ep. fund.*, *C. Fel.* (written about eight years later) and *Cath.* were also examined. Between these three was found a gradual movement towards the text which the Vulgate would become, with the text in *Contra ep. fund.* the most different from the Vulgate. At least two later changes in the text of Acts (1.7-8) were due to corrections sent to him by Hesychius.

The three longer citations of the Gospels used by Augustine (John 1.9, John 1.14, Mt. 5.8) do not resemble the text of the Vulgate thus in 396 Augustine either did not have a copy of Jerome's Gospels or he has them and refused to use them. These results also show that the biblical citations in *Contra ep. fund.* escaped being "vulgarized" by later editors since the text shows only a few direct matches with the Vulgate. Two texts (John 10.30, John 20.22) however, match both Cyprian and Ambrose. Since it has been shown that Augustine was not using Jerome's translations, it can be safely assumed that these verses were too short to allow very much variation between translators and remain similar over multiple manuscript families.

¹³¹ This has already been pointed out by P. Corsenn, *Der Cyprianische Text der Acta apostolorum* (Berlin, 1892), p. 17 as well as Clark (1933), p. 259.

Two of these citations are not of the African type either (John 1.14 and Mt. 5.8,), while John 7.39 has more affinity to the African than the Vulgate. Of the citations to Romans, one matches the Vulgate, the other does not. The one that does not (Rom. 11.36) also has parallels to Ambrose. The passage from 1 Cor. does not resemble either the Vulgate or the African texts, while II Tim. has more in common with African manuscripts than it does with the Vulgate.

The verse from John 14.16 in the *Contra ep. fund.* has also been the source of some discussion. A closer examination of the text, especially with a comparison with Jerome, shows that Augustine was not remembering this citation from the *Diatessaron* and his Manichaean days, but was probably citing the verse from memory and got it wrong. As stated, Jerome used the same wording of John 14.16 as Augustine and it was unlikely that he was using the *Diatessaron*. It was also shown that Augustine was also citing Luke 12.4 from memory and not a verse from Mt. 10.28.

If anything, this examination of the texts themselves has shown that Augustine was very willing to use multiple variations of scripture, sometimes within the same work. Augustine's discussion of 1 Cor. 3.17 in the *Contra ep. fund.* and of Isa. 45.7 in *Mor.* II shows that he is aware of other translations and it is likely that he owned or had access to these different texts. Here he indicated that although the texts differed, the meaning of the text was the same. This is probably the key reason why Augustine was not afraid to use different variations in nearly all of his biblical citations.

Now that Augustine's Biblical response has been examined, it will be important to look at the primary focus of his argument against the Manichaeans: the use of the Neoplatonically-inspired ascent of the soul.

5 AUGUSTINE'S RESPONSE (2): THE ASCENT

In the most important line of *Contra ep. fund.*, Augustine tells the Manichaeans that he will not join their religion unless they give him clear knowledge regarding the salvation of the soul.¹ All of Augustine's writings, in essence, regard the salvation of the soul and the understanding of God, whether he is directing his comments to the Manichaeans, the Donatists, or the Pagans (*Ciu. Dei*). He wrote in order to bring people into the Catholic faith, the only place where one will be able to find God. The *Contra ep. fund.* is no different. What is different, and relatively unnoticed about this work, is that he gives a very clear Neoplatonic pathway to God, using specific examples from the letter of Mani to counter the Manichaean belief in a separate God.²

This *Contra ep. fund.* is a didactic manual and the effort that Augustine spends on trying to teach the Manichaeans the correct way to understand materiality overshadows the other points in the work. In fact, every comment he makes about the soul, memory and God are all based on the foundation of correctly understanding the material world. This is not surprising considering the negative effect the materialism of the Manichaeans had on Augustine, which did not allow him to achieve a vision of God.³ This was the driving force behind all of his ascents. What is different about the *Contra ep. fund.* is the way he applies

¹ *Contra ep. fund.* 3 (CSEL 25,1/196.2-3) "...si non mihi de omnibus rebus ad salutem animae pertinentibus sine ulla caligine rationem perspicuam dederitis." He says the same thing in *Sol.* 1.2.7 and *Ord.* 2.18.47. As this chapter will show, Augustine is heavily dependent on the *Enneads* and his understanding of the soul is no different. On this see G. Verbeke, "Spiritualité et immortalité de l'âme chez Saint Augustin," *AugMag* 1 (Paris, 1954), p. 330: "Il est intéressant de noter que les trois idées fondamentales de saint Augustin concernant la nature de l'âme se retrouvent dans les écrits de Plotin; en concluons-nous immédiatement qu'il s'agit là d'un emprunt direct à ce philosophe? Ce serait aller trop vite en bosogne. Examinons d'abord ce que nous apprennent les textes des *Ennéades*..."

² R. Ferwerda in "Plotinus' Presence in Augustine," J. den Boeft, J. van Oort (ed.), *Augustiniana Traiectina* (Paris, 1987), p. 108, points out that "there is scarcely a reference to the *Enneads* in the ocean of scriptural quotations in those (the anti-Manichaean works) dialogues." As will be shown, this is not the case for the *Contra ep. fund.* Besides, Augustine rarely refers to the Platonists by name in the whole course of his writings, so it is not surprising not to find specific mention of the *Enneads* in his anti-Manichaean writings in particular. He is, however, correct to point out that Augustine did not mention this specifically because in his later works, Augustine disregarded the tools that originally helped him to understand the nature of the goodness of creation (p. 118). Ferwerda also recognizes that Plotinus was ever present in the thoughts of Augustine and had a positive effect on his thinking (p. 118).

³ Van Fleteren (1977), p. 19. For very similar arguments as found in *Contra ep. fund.*, see especially *Mor.* II where he addresses the issues of God being the creator of all good things and evil. These are discussed in the *Commentary*.

this ascent: he spends so much time detailing what materiality is because he has the Manichaean *Ep. Fund.* in front of him and can finally attack them using one of their own works.

The method by which he seeks to teach the Manichaeans (and the rest of his audience) to think in a spiritual manner is to begin with material things and ascend to God, step by step using the intellect in a “mental exercise.”⁴ At each step the listener must understand the previous stage in order to move forward and upward, from a definition of matter, to the nature of the soul, the memory and ultimately of the only immaterial God.⁵ This ascent, however, is not on a vertical scale in the sense of climbing a ladder, nor can it be taken without the help of God.⁶ It is an ascent of power, with God at the top.⁷ This is a fundamental cornerstone in Augustine’s quest for the knowledge of God⁸ and is a central motif in Augustine’s earlier writings.⁹

There are two ascents in the *Contra ep. fund.* The first is a mini-ascent, used to introduce the main topic of the work, which occurs in chapter two. In the second, Augustine begins with material objects, which is the usual place for him to begin.¹⁰ He then discusses the soul, the memory and its ability to change its stored images, and finally God. What is important to notice about this ascent teaching is that after reaching the top (which takes him

⁴ This phrase is used by R. J. O’Connell, *St. Augustine’s Confessions: The Odyssey of Soul* (Harvard, 1969), pp. 120-1 for Augustine’s use of his *Confessions* to “bring the reader to the self knowledge.” He also notes (p. 15) that Augustine was continually arguing that the Manichaeans were not thinking correctly about the “human condition” which is, according to him, little more than “a tissue of vain imaginings.” As will be shown, this is the primary focus of the *Contra ep. fund.* On this *exercitatio animi*, see also H.-I. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la Fin de la Culture Antique* (Paris, 1938), pp. 299-327.

⁵ All of Augustine’s philosophical writings lead to God. See V. J. Bourke, *Augustine’s Love of Wisdom: An Introspective Philosophy* (Indiana, 1992), p. 28.

⁶ Augustine’s view that the ascent cannot occur without the help of God differs from the ascent found in Plato. See J. C. Cooper, “The Basic Philosophical and Theological Notions of St. Augustine,” *AugStud* 15 (1984), p. 95 and 96. For Augustine, in his own words, see *Gn. adu. Man.* 1.3.6 and *Diu. qu.* 1.2.22.

⁷ See *Contra ep. fund.* 18 (CSEL 25,1/215.26) where Augustine is discussing the nature of the mind and its ability to judge things that are less powerful than it. He states “*Illud autem ipsum, quo ista iudicas, cernis esse supra ista, non loci altitudine, sed potentiae dignitate.*” See also Ch. Boyer, “The Notion of Nature in St. Augustine,” in K. Aland, and F. L. Cross, F. L. (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, vol. 2, *Papers Presented to the Second International Conference on Patristic Studies* (1957), p. 177.

⁸ Cooper (1984), p. 95.

⁹ F. Van. Fleteren (1977), p. 19.

¹⁰ Gilson (1960), p. 19.

four and a half chapters to detail¹¹), he departs from his general remarks on the ascent and moves the audience back down to the material world (he uses the verb *descendo* twice in this particular passage¹²).

The second is a large expansion and repetition of the first.¹³ Augustine attempts to teach the details of the ascent by using examples from Manichaean cosmogony taken directly from the *Ep. fund.* He does this because he believed that the Manichaeans were not capable of thinking about the material correctly, and thus also misunderstood immateriality and God. His discussion of materiality remains central to the rest of the work since it is the foundation from which one can understand everything else. Within this teaching includes the doctrine of *creatio de nihilo* and the goodness of all created things. If Augustine can convince the Manichaeans of this, they would be able to understand both the foolishness of Mani's fantasies and to be in a better position to think correctly about God.

The main reason for attacking the Manichaeans in this fashion is because Mani is guilty of using his imagination to manipulate what he receives from his senses to formulate his ideas and descriptions of the Land of Light and Darkness.¹⁴ The incorrect use of the imagination is, in a sense, worshipping the material as opposed to the creator of matter. He states:

Thus we see that these lies, which have added to the number of heretics, arose from the perception by carnal sense, only without care or discernment, of

¹¹ The middle of chapter fifteen, and sixteen through nineteen.

¹² *Contra ep. fund.* 20 (CSEL 25,1/217.1) "Uerumtamen cum carnalibus animis fortasse non sic agendum est, sed descendendum est potius ad eorum cogitationes, qui naturam incorpoream et spiritalem cogitando persequi uel non audent uel nondum ualent, ita ut nec ipsam cogitationem suam eadem cogitatione considerent et inueniant eam nullo locorum spatio de ipsis locorum spatiis indicantem. *Descendamus ergo ad eorum sensus...*" (emphasis mine).

¹³ Mourant (1969), p. 9: "Philosophers are fond of repeating themselves, and Augustine is no exception." Augustine also used repetition in his sermons. See also Van der Meer (1961), p. 132. For the use of repetition in primary school in antiquity, see H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, G. Lamb (trans.), (Paris, 1956; reprint, New York, 1964) p. 215 (all references to this work are to the 1964 edition).

¹⁴ The claim that the Manichaeans relied on their senses for their mythology is also found in the anti-Manichaean Muslim writers. See S. Stroumsa and G. G. Stroumsa in "Aspects of Anti-Manichaean Polemics in Late Antiquity and Under Early Islam," *HTR* 81:1 (1988), p. 46. See also p. 43. On the senses and Augustine, see Burt (1996), pp. 88-95;

visible objects in this world, and when thus conceived, were brought forth by fancy, and then presumptuously written and published.¹⁵

This is also stated at the end of *Contra ep. fund.*:

And as this vision is greatly hindered by those fancies which are originated by the carnal sense, and are retained and modified by the imagination, let us abhor this heresy which has been led by faith in its fancies...¹⁶

Augustine's duty as a bishop of the Catholic Church is to show them the correct way to understand God. His method of teaching this is not only repetition, but by formulating his language to help the Manichaeans, in a basic way, to learn about God Himself and the soul.

This chapter will focus primarily on the role of Augustine's ascent teaching, especially on the nature of materiality, since this is the base from which his anti-Manichaean arguments start in the *Contra ep. fund.* Other issues of the ascent, such as the soul and the memory, only play a role in the *Contra ep. fund.* in order to teach about the nature of materiality. We will first examine the teaching method which Augustine follows and then look at the issue of understanding immateriality in general. This will be followed by a short inspection of Augustine's previous ascent teachings and then of the ascent teaching in the *Contra ep. fund.* itself.

5.1 AUGUSTINE'S TEACHING METHOD AND THE RARITY OF UNDERSTANDING

As mentioned, within the *Contra ep. fund.* there are two ascent teachings, followed by an application of this teaching. These are a reflection of the teaching methods of Augustine by which he will tailor his language to whatever particular audience he is talking to. He gives the Manichaeans and his general audience the groundwork, then gives a generalized account

¹⁵ *Contra ep. fund.* 32 (CSEL 25,1/236.3-6) "Ita ostenduntur ista mendacia animaduersione rerum, quae uidentur in mundo, sed minus diligenti minusque sollerti carnali sensu concepta et phantasmatis parturita et temeritate edita atque conscripta haereticorum numerum auxisse."

¹⁶ *Contra ep. fund.* 43 (CSEL 25,1/248.11-248.14) "Cui aspectui quoniam multum sunt inimica phantasmata, quae de carnali sensu tracta imaginarie cogitatio nostra uersat et continet, detestemur istam haeresim, quae suorum phantasmatum fidem..."

of the ascent. He follows this with specifics, in laymen's terms, by which the Manichaeans can see from their own writing that the *Ep. fund.* is not the way to God.

To speak to the Manichaeans in this common, less technical way by giving them many examples is another way Augustine adapts his language and teaching to suit his audience.¹⁷ There are a number of places in *Contra ep. fund.* where he states that he will teach the Manichaeans in a way that they might understand. In chapter four he remarks that he could have discussed the pure wisdom as found in the Catholic church which few people have attained (and here he must be referring to the idea of immateriality),¹⁸ but he does not because not only the Manichaeans believe it is not found there but also that they would not have understood it. Later he remarks that he will not begin his discussion of the soul and the nature of God by going directly to a discussion of truth and wisdom which surpass the soul.¹⁹ This method of teaching is repeated again in chapter twenty, where he decides that what he had discussed so far might have been too rigorous for those who cannot think spiritually. It is at this point that the second ascent teaching starts.

By tailoring his language Augustine is making a genuine attempt to teach his audience how to think about the immateriality and thus the omnipresence of God. But this, as he had stated many times before, was a very difficult task. This spiritual understanding of God by the Neoplatonists was not something that very many people understood or indeed had known about.²⁰ Certainly when he was a Manichaean Augustine had little conception of immateriality and the omnipresence of God. This was also the case for the Catholic Church until the middle to late fourth century when it was beginning to appreciate the Neoplatonic

¹⁷ K.-L. E. Lee, *Augustine, Manichaeism, and the Good* (New York, 1999), p. 8. For other examples of this in Augustine's writing, see *Nat. b.* 15 and *Gen. adu. Man.* 1.1 where Augustine was specifically asked to write this treatise for those who could not grasp his other more-detailed arguments. For a very detailed study of Augustine's rhetorical abilities, see M. I. Barry, *St. Augustine, the Orator: A Study of the Rhetorical Qualities of St. Augustine's Sermones ad populum* (Washington, 1924).

¹⁸ *Contra ep. fund.* 4.

¹⁹ *Contra ep. fund.* 16.

²⁰ The language of the scriptures probably contributed most to the corporealism found in the early church. See D. L. Paulsen, "Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnesses," in *HTR* 83.2 (1990), p. 106.

texts,²¹ with Milan being an important area of scholarly activity.²² The introduction of these texts, at least in the Western, Latin-speaking empire, was due mainly to the translation of the Greek texts into Latin²³ by a few men such as Marius Victorinus, whose conversion to Christianity and translations had a marked influence on the conversion of Augustine.²⁴ It is from Plotinus that Augustine learned about the incorruptibility of God.²⁵ This influence was also due to other Neoplatonists, such as Manlius Theodorus, whom Augustine knew personally and knew that he was an admirer of Plotinus.²⁶

This group also included the spiritual father of Augustine, Ambrose. Ambrose may not have always been the most original in terms of his writings,²⁷ but what is important is that his information was passed down to Augustine, who was then able to come to understand the nature of immateriality and the omnipresence of God. These were by far the most important ideas that Augustine had gained from the Neoplatonists.²⁸ Because of this influence,

²¹ See Paulsen (1990): 105-116. However much this is true of the Latin west, the Greek east seemed to have come to an earlier understanding of this issue and like Augustine, Platonism also helped steer the east into understanding the incorporeality of God. See G. Stroumsa, "The Incorporeality of God: Context and Implications of Origen's Position," *Religion* 13 (1983): 345-358.

²² See Chapter 3 on the life of Augustine for greater detail. See also P. Courcelle, *Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources*, H. E. Wedeck (trans.) (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), p. 131-148 on the importance of the literature of the Greeks on those in Milan; and R. Teske, "The Aim of Augustine's Proof that God Truly Is," *International Philosophical Quarterly* (1986) p. 259, n. 19.

²³ Augustine himself had difficulties with reading Greek when he was younger (*Conf.* 1.13.20), but became adept and might have even preferred Greek to Latin in his later years. See Courcelle (1969), p. 153 and pp. 157-9. It should be noted that not all bishops were as bilingual as Ambrose. Augustine's predecessor in Hippo, the Greek Valerius, had trouble communicating to his flock in Latin and thus he had Augustine do a good part of the preaching; see Possidius, *Vita Sancta Augustini* 5.3 and Brown (1969), pp. 139-140.

²⁴ *Conf.* 8.2.3-5 (CCL 27/114.1-6) "Perrexi ergo ad Simplicianum... Narraui ei circuitus erroris mei. Ubi autem commemorauit legisse me quosdam libros Platoniorum, quos Victorinus quondam, rhetor urbis Romae, quem christianum defunctum esse audieram, in latinam linguam transtulisset..."

²⁵ *Conf.* 7.20.26 (CCL 27/109.1-8).

²⁶ *B. uita.* 1.4.

²⁷ See B. Ramsey (trans.), *Ambrose, The Early Church Fathers*, C. Harrison (ed.), (London, 1997), p. 52, who discusses Ambrose's *On the Holy Spirit*. Ambrose had borrowed heavily from other sources, of which Jerome takes note of in his preface to Didymus the Blind's work on the Holy Spirit. Here Jerome called Ambrose "an ugly crow ... adorned with other's plumage" (p. 52-53). But as Ramsey points out, the borrowing of ideas from Greek works introduced them to a new audience in the west who could not read the Greek original, especially Augustine (p. 54). See also B. McGinn, *The Presence of God: History of Western Christian Mysticism*, vol. 1, *The Foundation of Mysticism: Origins to the Fifth Century* (New York, 1994), pp 202-216, who discusses Ambrose's "borrowings" from the writings of Origen as well as J. C. M. Van Winden, "In the Beginning: Some Observations on the Patristic Interpretation of Genesis 1:1," *VigChr* 17 (1963), p. 106 who discusses the link between Ambrose and Basil. On Ambrose and Augustine, see also J. P. Burns, "Augustine on the Origin and Progress of Evil," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 16 (1988), p. 11.

²⁸ V. J. Bourke (1992), p. 22. See also Rist (1994), p. 95 and Stock (1996), p. 72. Augustine probably had also read *Ennead* 6.4-5, which is Plotinus' treatment of omnipresence. For this, see O'Connell (1968), pp. 53-55.

Augustine can be described as being a Christian Platonist;²⁹ it allowed Augustine to escape the materialism of the Manichaeans.³⁰

Augustine repeats over and over again how difficult it is to understand this idea. In *C. Acad.* 2.1.30 he admits that it is a very rare class of men who are capable of using reason to understand the nature of the soul and God.³¹ He also states that not even in the Catholic Church of his early days did all of the priests understand it. In his *B. uita* he wrote (to Manlius Theodorus):

“...For I noticed frequently in the sermons of our priests and *sometimes* (*aliquando*) in yours that, when speaking of God, no one should think of Him as something corporeal; nor yet of the soul, for of all things the soul is nearest to God” (emphasis mine).³²

This lack of understanding was also true for the Manichaeans as well. When Augustine was a Manichaean, he believed that everything that existed was material. This included God, who if not material, was at least material-like. This view -- the inability to understand immateriality -- was the greatest disappointment that Augustine had with the

²⁹ A. H. Armstrong, in “St. Augustine and Christian Platonism,” *Plotinian and Christian Studies* (London, 1979, reprint), p. 1, discusses the problems associated with naming Augustine a Christian Platonist. Platonism, like the term gnosticism (see M. A. Williams, *Rethinking “Gnosticism:” An Argument for Dismantling A Dubious Category* [Princeton, 1996]) is used and misused because there are many differences within this category. As Armstrong points out, with regard to the divinity of the soul, Augustine is in full accord with other Christian Platonists (p. 9); with regards to the body and the material universe, Augustine once again finds “a central position in the Christian Platonist tradition” (p. 14); and with regards to universal salvation by God, he remains outside the mainstream of pagan Platonists (p. 30). An earlier generation of scholars had questioned whether Augustine had really converted to being a Platonist instead of the Christian. For an overview of the literature on this topic, see J. J. O’Meara, “The Immaterial and the Material in Augustine’s Thought,” in J. Petruccione (ed.), *Nova & Vetera: Patristic Studies in Honor of Thomas Patrick Halton* (Washington, 1998), pp. 182-183.

³⁰ See among others, E. Peters, in “What Was God Doing Before He Created the Heavens and the Earth?” *Augustiniana* 34 (1984), p. 56 who points out that Neoplatonism was an important tool in Augustine’s attack against the Manichaeans.

³¹ *C. Acad.* 2.1.30 (CCL 29/124.1-4) “Ratio est mentis motio ea, quae discuntur, distinguendi et conectendi potens, qua duce uti ad deum intellegendum uel ipsam quae aut in nobis aut usque quaque est animam rarissimum omnino genus hominum potest non ob aliud.”

³² *B. uita* 1.4 (CCL 29/67.91-94) “Animaduerti enim et saepe in sacerdotis nostri et aliquando in sermonibus tuis, cum de deo cogitaretur, nihil omnino corporis esse cogitandum, neque cum de anima; nam id est est unum in rebus proximum deo.”

Manichaean religion once he had left.³³ This also explains the time Augustine will spend on the issue of materialism in the *Contra ep. fund.*

But the Manichaeans should not be wholly blamed for this misunderstanding. At the age of twenty, Augustine read Aristotle's *Ten Categories*.³⁴ He also stated that he understood this work without the help of anyone and understood it better than those who had help.³⁵ The *Ten Categories* contained a description, at least according to Augustine's understanding of the text, which stated that everything that existed was material. He believed that these *Categories* also included God, therefore God must be some type of material object.³⁶ As Chadwick notes, Plotinus believed that the information in the *Categories* was not applicable to God and it is unfortunate for Augustine that either he was not able to read it (because it had not been translated) or failed to do so (if it had been translated).³⁷ Therefore Augustine did not get all of his materialistic ideas regarding God from the Manichaeans.

5.2 THE ASCENT IN AUGUSTINE'S WRITINGS

The idea of an ascent is Platonic in origin and Augustine's language follows this.³⁸ It is found in Plotinus' *Enn.* 1.3, which is a possible source for Augustine. Plotinus states

We have established elsewhere, by many considerations, that our journey is to the Good, to the Primal-Principle...For all there are two stages of the path, as they are making upwards or have already gained the upper sphere. The first degree is the conversion from the lower life; the second -- held by those that have already made their way to the sphere of the Intelligibles...lasts until they

³³ *Conf.* 5.10.19 (CCL 27/68.39-43) "Et quoniam cum de deo meo cogitare uellem, cogitare nisi moles corporum non noueram -- neque enim udebatur mihi esse quidquam, quod tale non esset -- ea maxima et prope sola causa erat ineuitabilis erroris mei."

³⁴ Possibly like the *Enneads*, Victorinus might have made a translation of the *Ten Categories*. For a discussion of this see O'Donnell (1992), vol. 2, p. 265.

³⁵ *Conf.* 4.15.28.

³⁶ *Conf.* 4.16.29.

³⁷ *Enneads* 6.2.3 in Plotinus, *The Six Enneads* in MacKenna (Chicago, 1952), p. 270, as noted by H. Chadwick (trans.), *Saint Augustine: Confessions* (Oxford, 1991), p. 69, n. 34.

³⁸ See Plato's *Phaedrus* 246-249 on the ascent of the soul. See Gilson (1960), p. 257, n.39 and Van Fleteren (1973), p. 63: "Presumably, man gains the knowledge both of his end and of the moral precepts which prepare him for the ascent to God from authority. Involved in this passage is also the motif of fall and ascent. This theme is common in Augustine's works from the beginning and exists throughout ancient philosophy."

reach the extreme hold of the place, the Term attained when the topmost peak of the Intellectual realm is won.³⁹

Another example can be found in *Enn.* 1.6.8-9. Here Plotinus states that the journey to the Fatherland is not by the feet, but by the inner vision. This return can also be found in *Enn.* I.6.3-3, 5.8.11 and 6.9.7 for the return of the true self to the Intellect.⁴⁰ Plotinus is not the only possible source for Augustine.⁴¹ The ascent can also be found in Ambrose⁴² as well as in the writings of the Cappadocians.⁴³

This ascent is not a new feature of Augustine's thinking and there has been a large amount of scholarship on Augustine's own ascent⁴⁴ as well as his ascent language and teaching.⁴⁵ Unfortunately, the *Contra ep. fund.* is usually passed over in these discussions,⁴⁶ probably because the title of the work suggests that it is primarily an anti-Manichaean work.⁴⁷

³⁹ Plotinus, *The Six Enneads* in MacKenna (Chicago, 1952).

⁴⁰ These are noted by J. K. Coyle, *Augustine's De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae: A Study of the Work, its Composition and its Sources* (Fribourg, 1978), p. 119, n. 484. See also R. Ferwerda (1987), p. 116-117.

⁴¹ One must be careful when speaking of "sources" for Augustine. As R. Ferwerda (1987), p. 107 points out, it is difficult to state with much precision what works Augustine had read as well as influenced his thought, even in the case when Augustine states what he had read.

⁴² Ambrose also discusses the ascent of the soul, especially in his allegorical explanations of the Song of Songs. See F. B.. Asiedu, "The Song of Songs and the Ascent of the Soul: Ambrose, Augustine, and the Language of Mysticism," *VigChr* 55 (2001), especially pp. 301-306, where he discusses the use of the Song of Songs when baptizing new members of the church, and the possible influence this had on Augustine's ascent teaching (p. 301, n. 8).

⁴³ See J. Pelikan, *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism* (New Haven, 1993), pp. 60-75 for the discussion of the ascent as found in Macrina, Gregory of Nyssa and Basil. These are very similar statements to what is found in Augustine.

⁴⁴ *Conf.* 9.10.23-24. See the seminal study by P. Henry, *La Vision d'Ostie: sa place dans la vie et l'oeuvre de S. Augustin* (Paris, 1938). Henry shows the parallels between Augustine's ascent and that found in Plotinus' description of the soul and the higher realms. See also A. Mandouze, "L'extase d'Ostie: possibilités et limites de la méthode de parallèles textuels," *AugMag* 1 (1954), pp. 67-84; P. Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1950; 2nd edition, Paris, 1968), pp. 222-226 and plate XIV, fig. 1 which shows a Fourteenth century painting of this "extase d'Ostie," described on pp. 507-8. See also O'Donnell (1992), vol. 1, pp. xlix, xlvi and his related commentaries of Books Seven and Nine of the *Confessions*.

⁴⁵ For example, see Gilson (1960), pp. 3-10 and passim; V. J. Bourke, "Augustine of Hippo: The Approach of the Soul to God," in E. R. Elder (ed.), *The Spirituality of Western Christendom* (Kalamazoo, 1976), pp. 1-12; F. Van Fleteren, "Augustine's Ascent of the Soul in Book VII of the Confessions: A Reconsideration," *AugStud* 5 (1974): 29-72; F. Van Fleteren (1977): 19-23; P. M. Garvey, *St. Augustine: Christian or Neoplatonist, from his Retreat at Cassiciacum until his Ordination at Hippo* (Milwaukee, 1939), pp. 147-52; Teske (1986), pp. 253-268; F. Van Fleteren, "Ascent of the Soul," in Fitzgerald (1999), pp. 63-67 and C. Harrison, *Augustine: Christian Truth and Fractured Humanity* (Oxford, 2000), p. 14 and n. 43.

In his *Retr.*, Augustine recommended that his audience understand him by reading his works in chronological order.⁴⁸ One of the ideas that changes little in his earlier writings is his teaching on the ascent of the soul to God, although the method of teaching it will change slightly from work to work. The important works on the ascent written before the *Contra ep. fund.* are *Ord.*, *Imm. an.*, *Quant.*, *Uera rel.*, *Gn. adu. Man.*, and the second book of *Lib. arb.*⁴⁹ In studying these in chronological order, it will be shown that the *Contra ep. fund.* holds an important place in Augustine's discussion of matter.⁵⁰

It will be useful at this point to examine these ascent teachings in order to more fully understand his teaching in *Contra ep. fund.* The first example is found in *Quant.*, written in 387-388, probably the first work completed after his baptism.⁵¹ Out of all the earlier texts, this one is the most similar to the *Contra ep. fund.* in terms of the ascent. But before examining *Quant.*, there are two other important texts that need to be looked at first. These are *Ord.*, written in late 386 to early 387 and *Imm. an.*⁵² Both set the stage for his later investigations.

⁴⁶ See again V. J. Bourke (1976), pp. 1-12. Bourke begins his short study with *Quant.*, and then progresses to *Gn. adu. Man.*, *Uera rel.*, *S. Dom. mon.*, *Doc. Chr.*, *Conf.*, ep. 147, *Gn. litt.*, *Trin.*, *Gr. et pecc. or.*, *Ench.*, *Ciu. Dei.*, *Gr. et lib. arb.*, and finally, *Praed. sanct.* Although he states that he wishes to examine Augustine's writings chronologically (p. 1), he skips *Lib. arb.* and more importantly, *Contra ep. fund.* See also the Introductory Essay of A. H. Newman, in R. Stothert, A. H. Newman (trans.), *St. Augustine: The Writings Against the Manichaeans and Against the Donatists*, A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, vol. IV, P. S. Schaff (ed.), (Edinburgh, 1887; reprint, Grand Rapids, 1996. Page numbers refer to the reprint edition), p. 28-30. He discussed the influence of Neoplatonistic thought on Augustine, but failed to recognize the importance of the ascent in both Plotinus as well as in Augustine. Even Torchia (1999), p. 138-139, who gives an overview of the ascent in *Contra ep. fund.* did not discuss its Neoplatonic influence and importance.

⁴⁷ Augustine's anti-Manichaean material is probably the least studied of his works. This oversight of Augustine's anti-Manichaean material has been touched on by Coyle (1978), p. 3.

⁴⁸ *Retr.* prol. 3. This method is recommended by du Roy (1966), p. 16. There are, however, some pitfalls to this approach to Augustine. See O'Meara (1970): 277-84 and F. Van Fleteren, "Authority and Reason, Faith and Understanding in the Thought of St. Augustine," *AugStud* 4 (1973), pp. 33-34, who correctly note that one can use a later work to explain an earlier one.

⁴⁹ Van Fleteren (1976), p. 483, n. 32, mentions that the ascent in *Uera rel.* follows the "customary method found in Augustine's own experience in Milan and in many of the early writings" and lists *Conf.*, *Quant.*, *Mus.* and second book of *Lib. arb.*

⁵⁰ This can also be shown by examining L. Hölscher's (1986) discussion of Augustine and his ideas on matter. When his footnotes to Augustine's works are examined chronologically, they will show that the *Contra ep. fund.* is one of the earlier texts which have important details about the nature of matter (*Imm. an.* is another important text).

⁵¹ See V. J. Bourke, (1976), p. 3. On the dating of *Quant.*, see Coyle (1978), p. 75.

⁵² Fitzgerald (1999), p. xlvii.

In *Ord.* Augustine had stated that anyone who wished to understand and discuss the nature of the soul would first have to understand a large number of details before the inquiry into the soul is begun. He states:

...But, whoever is still a slave to his passions, or is keenly desirous of perishable goods, or even though he flee from these and live a virtuous life, yet if he does not know what pure nothing is, what formless matter is, what a lifeless informed being is, what a body is, what species in a body is, what place and time are, what in a place and at a time signify, what local motion is, what non-local motion is, what stable motion is, what eternity is, what it is to be either in a place nor nowhere, what is beyond time and forever, what it is to be nowhere and nowhere not to be, what it is to be never and never not to be -- anyone who does not know these matters, and yet wishes to question and dispute about even his own soul -- let alone investigating about the Most High God, who is better known by knowing what He is not -- such a one will fall into every possible error.⁵³

Ord. is an important text for a number of reasons. It is the first time that Augustine discussed the order that the soul should take in order to understand itself and therefore God. These, however, are not the stages that are usually discussed when the ascent of the soul is mentioned. Instead, these are pre-stages that need to be understood before examining the soul, which is the animator of the body by which it gives life.⁵⁴ In *Ord.* Augustine does not go into a thorough examination of these pre-stages, but they are important for two reasons: 1)

⁵³ *Ord.* 2.16.44. English translation is taken from R. P. Russell (trans.), "Divine Providence and the Problem of Evil," in *The Writings of Saint Augustine*, vol. 1, L. Schopp (ed.), The Fathers of The Church, A New Translation, vol. 5 (New York, 1948), p. 320. For the Latin, (CCL 29/131.6-18): "Quisquis autem uel adhuc seruus cupiditatum et inhians rebus pereuntibus uel iam ista fugiens casteque uiuens, nesciens tamen, quid sit nihil, quid informis materia, quid formatum exanime, quid corpus, quid species in corpore, quid locus, quid tempus, quid in loco, quid in tempore, quid motus secundum locum, quid motus non secundum locum, quid stabilis motus, quid sit aeuum, quid sit nec in loco esse nec nusquam, quid sit praeter tempus et semper, quid sit et nusquam esse et nusquam non esse et numquam esse et numquam non esse, quisquis ergo ista nesciens, non dico de summo illo deo, qui scitur melius nesciendo, sed de anima ipsa sua quaerere ac disputare uoluerit, tantum errabit, quantum errari plurimum potest."

⁵⁴ This can be found in *Quant.*, written a year or so later than *Ord.* See *Quant.* 33.70 (CSEL 89,1/218.5-11) "Haec igitur primo, quod cuius animaduertere facile est, corpus hoc terrenum atque mortale praesentia sua uiuificat, conligit in unum atque in uno tenet, diffluere atque contabescere non sinit, alimenta per membra aequaliter suis cuique redditus distribui facit, congruentiam eius modumque conseruat non tantum in pulchritudine, sed etiam in crescendo atque gignendo." This will become an important issue in the *Contra ep. fund.*

they set the pattern for Augustine in teaching the Manichaeans the ascent of the soul from material objects to God, especially in that most of these pre-stages involve understanding the nature of materiality. This is especially clear in the *Contra ep. fund.* where he deals with every single one of these issues. And 2) in understanding these first, the soul can then look at itself from within, and can see that the soul itself is either reason, or belongs to reason. Once this occurs, it will venture to see God.⁵⁵ Augustine is insistent that any inquiry into understanding the soul must follow the order that he had given above, or there should be no investigation at all.⁵⁶ Following the wrong order, one could be tricked, as he believed the Manichaeans were tricked by Mani, into thinking that material objects were all that existed.⁵⁷ The penalties for this occur not only here in this life but in the eternal life to come, as Augustine makes very clear throughout the *Contra ep. fund.*⁵⁸ Because of its importance, it is the obligation of the soul to fulfill this duty, or to at least make the attempt to understand this ascent.⁵⁹

The *Imm. an.* is the next important text because he begins to fill out the details of his pre-stages found in *Ord.* (above), especially in that it includes his first, highly condensed attempt at understanding the nature of matter. This really begins in chapter 7.12: any body has parts, all of which can be repeatedly cut, but which can never be cut down to where there is absolute nothingness⁶⁰; when a body becomes more deformed, it begins to lose its form⁶¹

⁵⁵ See *Ord.* 2.9.27: "Order is that which will lead us to God, if we hold to it during life; and unless we do hold to it during life, we shall not come to God" as well as *Ord.* 2.17.48 and 2.19.51 (CCL 29/135.46-48) "Cum autem se composuerit et ordinavit atque concinnam pulchramque reddiderit, audebit iam deum uidere atque ipsum fontem, unde manat omne uerum, ipsumque patrem ueritatis."

⁵⁶ *Ord.* 2.17.46 (CCL 29/132.48-54) "namque animam poenas hic pendere fatentur, cum inter eius et dei substantium nihil uelint omnino distare. Si autem istum mundum non factum dicamus, impium est atque ingratum credere, ne illud sequatur, quod deus eum non fabricarit—ergo de his atque huius modi rebus aut ordine illo eruditionis aut nullo modo quicquam requirendum est" (emphasis mine).

⁵⁷ See Rist (1994), p. 140.

⁵⁸ See especially *Contra ep. fund.* 1.

⁵⁹ This method of ascent is the rational way, as opposed to those who want to rely on their faith. See *Uera rel.* 24.45 (CCL 32/215.1) "Quamobrem ipsa quoque animae medicina, quae diuina prouidentia et ineffabili beneficentia geritur gradatim distincteque pulcherrima est. Tribuitur enim in auctoritatem atque rationem. Auctoritas fidem flagitat et rationi praeparat hominem. Ratio ad intellectum cognitionemque perducit."

⁶⁰ Augustine will also discuss this in the *Contra ep. fund.*, but in much greater detail than here in *Imm. an.*

⁶¹ For an overview of this term in Augustine and its relationship to Platonic forms, see G. O'Daly, *Augustine's Philosophy of Mind* (Berkeley, 1987), pp. 189-199.

(8.13); whatever created the body must be superior, incorporeal and unmovable (8.14); the mind can understand those things which are not corporeal (10.17); and finally, what created the mind is God (15.24). These are also issues that he deals with in *Contra ep. fund.*, although in much greater detail.

The next and most important text is Augustine's *Quant.* This text, which is in dialogue form with Evodius, a boyhood friend of Augustine, contains his first attempt at looking at the ascent of the soul.⁶²

Even though *Quant.* is not overtly anti-Manichaean, the Manichaeans are on Augustine's mind when he begins to discuss the ascent of the soul with Evodius. Just before discussing the ascent, he tells Evodius:

Wherefore, as far as I can, I warn you not to allow yourself to be swept along in your reading or discussion by the torrent of words that pour out of men who rely too much on the sense of the body, until you make straight and steady the steps that lead the soul up to God.⁶³

One of Augustine's main arguments against the Manichaeans in *Contra ep. fund.* and in other anti-Manichaean texts is that they have created their image and thought of God based on the senses, i.e., only in material terms. Although it is not absolutely clear who Augustine might have been referring to in the previous citation of *Quant.*, what is clear is that right in the middle of his discussion on the seven levels of the soul he is thinking of the Manichaeans. He tells Evodius:

For, no attention should be paid to that foolish superstition which some illiterate people cherish, a superstition that betrays closer affinity to a block of wood than do the very trees which it idolizes, namely, that the vine is pained when the

⁶² Bourke (1976), p. 3. Bourke is also correct to point out that although *Quant.* lists the seven stages, mankind's spiritual progress begins with the fourth step. J. J. O'Donnell, vol. 1 (1992), p. xlvii, n. 80, describes this work as "the fullest handbook of the ascent to come from Augustine's pen."

⁶³ *Quant.* 31.63 (CSEL 89,1/210.22-211.1) "Quapropter te, ut possum, etiam atque etiam moneo, ne temere aut in libros aut in disputationes loquacissimorum hominum nimiumque sensibus his corporeis credentium te praecipites, donec corrigas firmesque uestigia, quae usque ad ipsum deum animam ducunt." English translation is from *FOTC* vol. 2 (1947).

grape is plucked, and that such things not only feel pain when they are cut but even see and hear. Of this unholy error this is not the place to speak.⁶⁴

In *Quant.*, Augustine's description of the ascent comes at the end of this work. But before this, he begins to describe the nature of materiality, which begins in 3.4 with an account of width, length and height and continues into 6.10. His main point is to show Evodius that the soul cannot have material dimensions. After discussing the seven stages of ascent, he finishes by telling Evodius that he had given the answer to his questions in order that Evodius "seek out the solution by personal study rather than to furnish you with the answer."⁶⁵ This ascent has a number of similarities with that found in *Contra ep. fund.* (as shown in the *Commentary*).⁶⁶

But what is different is that the stages do not include a discussion of materiality as they do in the *Contra ep. fund.* It is true that he had briefly discussed some aspects of materiality in order to show that the soul does not have dimensions, but at this time he still had not begun to fill in the details of the pre-stages found in *Ord.*

Uera rel. is the next work which contains a number of ascents which are the main theme of this work.⁶⁷ This writing was one of the anti-Manichaean writings sent in 394 to Paulinus of Nola as part of the "pentateuch against the Manichaeans."⁶⁸ It is also another guide for teaching people to look within and then above themselves to understand God. Like *Quant.*, it has many parallels with *Contra ep. fund.* The main ascent starts in 24.52, which is an ascent based on reason. Augustine must also discuss the nature of materiality since the thrust of this ascent is to make sure that what the eye sees is not what the soul desires. Part of distinguishing between what the soul should love and not love is based on the idea of unity

⁶⁴ *Quant.* 33.71 (CSEL 89,1/218.18-219.1) "Non enim audienda est nescio quae impietas rusticana plane magisque lignea quam sunt ipsae arbores, quibus patrocinium praebet, quae dolere uitem, quando uua decerpitur, et non solum sentire ista, cum caeduntur, sed etiam uidere atque audire credit. De quo errore sacrilego alius est disserendi locus."

⁶⁵ *Quant.* 36.80.

⁶⁶ For the details of the ascent, see M. P. Garvey, *St. Augustine: Christian or Neoplatonist, From his Retreat at Cassiciacum until his Ordination at Hippo* (Milwaukee, 1939), pp. 146-160.

⁶⁷ F. Van Fleteren (1976), p. 476. As he points out, there are ten separate ascents in *Uera rel.* (p. 477 and n. 12).

⁶⁸ *Ep.* 25.

(31.60).⁶⁹ In material objects unity is missing because it is made of parts. Thus people should seek to see corporeal things and to know spiritual things. The reverse order is the prime hindrance keeping one away from God.

The next text is *Gn. adu. Man.*⁷⁰ Here Augustine describes seven stages of spiritual growth (1.25.43). Augustine uses this short ascent teaching as an allegory to the Seven Days of Creation (1.23.35-41). He says no more about the ascent or its importance for understanding God. This work, however, is important because Augustine first examines the beginning verses of Genesis which of course state how matter had come into being. There are many parallels in his arguments with *Contra ep. fund.*⁷¹ But again, like his previous ascents, Augustine does not spend time detailing the nature of materiality as he does in *Contra ep. fund.*

The *S. Dom. mon.* also contains an ascent. Bourke believes that there is a departure from the kind of ascent found in *Quant.* and the others. He states that in the *S. Dom. mon.* there is no longer found “a set of stages in the life of reason, (but) it is an advance toward spiritual peace in the affective order.”⁷² I disagree. Part of this disagreement comes from the fact that there is more than one ascent in this work; Bourke only focused on 1.4.2, which deals with the emotions, while just before that (1.3.10) is another that is very similar to that found in *Gn. adu. Man.* Regardless of this difference, what is important is that despite the two ascents near the beginning of the work, Augustine spends little time on them.

The last work before *Contra ep. fund.* which contains an ascent is in the second book of *Lib. arb.*, an anti-Manichaean work written sometime after Augustine had become a priest

⁶⁹ See Van Fleteren (1976), p. 489.

⁷⁰ Bourke (1976), p. 3.

⁷¹ For example, see 1.3.5 on the sun; 1.4.7 on the Manichaeans being deceived by their myths; and 1.16.25 on the beauty of all living things.

⁷² Bourke (1976), p. 5. For example, the seven steps he discusses are fear, meekness, sorrow, hunger, mercy, clean-heartedness and peace-making.

in 391.⁷³ This section contains more than just a proof of God's existence – the goal of this work is to teach the reader to understand God as an immaterial and eternal substance.⁷⁴ This is also the goal of his *Contra ep. fund.* The main thrust of book two is the teaching regarding the senses, the mind and reason, and ultimately God. This teaching in *Lib. arb.* is ultimately dependent on Plotinus' *Ennead* 6.4 and 6.5.⁷⁵

Augustine also spends time describing to Evodius the nature of the senses (2.3.9); the nature of the interior sense which perceives the data from the senses, which we also share with animals (2.4.10-2.5.11); followed by a discussion on reason and finally, God (2.5.11) who is above reason. Teske has correctly pointed out that Augustine could have ended the discussion by showing that mathematical proofs and truths regarding wisdom are immutable, and thus so is God who created these.⁷⁶ Instead, he immediately begins to discuss the senses again. The arguments that follow from this, on the goodness of material objects (see especially 2.16.41), are very much like what he does in *Contra ep. fund.* Book three of *Lib. arb.* continues in the same vein.

This survey of Augustine's ascents shows at least one important characteristic: most of these works can be considered to be anti-Manichaean (the exception is *Imm. an.*). The *S. Dom. mon.* should also be placed in this category, especially considering he ends this work with a number of anti-Manichaean comments.⁷⁷ The prime reason for giving these ascents is to show how someone can lift up the mind past material things to God. As he described in *Ord.*, one of the main details of this ascent must be the correct understanding of matter.

⁷³ Brown (1969), p. 74. Bourke (1976) does not discuss this ascent while Van Fleteren (1977, p. 21) believes that *Lib. arb.* II may contain a Neoplatonic ascent: "This ascent of the soul motif, though present in an analogous form in some later works (*Conf.* 10.6.9 and *En. Ps.* 41.7), breaks off abruptly with the *De uera religione*, with the possible exception of the ascent in Book II of *De libero arbitrio*."

⁷⁴ Teske (1986), p. 254 and p. 267. The second book of *Lib. arb.* (15-33) is usually seen either as another ascent of Augustine's or as a proof that God exists. But the thrust of Teske's article is to show that the goal of Augustine "is to lead the reader to conceive of God as a spiritual substance, immutable and eternal" (p. 254).

⁷⁵ Teske (1986), p. 263.

⁷⁶ Teske (1986), p. 263.

⁷⁷ See *S. Dom. mon.* 2.24.78- 2.25.82.

However, in these descriptions Augustine had yet to give a very detailed account. This is certainly not to say that he has not touched it at all. As shown from *Imm. an.*, *Quant.*, and *Uera rel.*, to understand what materiality is a step to understanding what the soul is.

However, these works deal primarily with what happens after, beginning with the soul.

Augustine's ascent in the *Contra ep. fund.* is different in two respects. The first is that he gives the best description of the ascent found in any of his works. It is clear and succinct because of the abundant use of examples. This ascent has gone relatively unnoticed. In fact, it has been stated that the ascent of the soul motif in the writings of Augustine "breaks off abruptly with *De uera religione*, with the possible exception of the ascent in Book II of the *De libero arbitrio*."⁷⁸ One reason why this was believed to be true is that Augustine, after a re-examination of Paul's works in 394-5, thought that this type of ascent was impossible.⁷⁹ But this cannot be the case since it is clearly found in *Contra ep. fund.*

The second difference is on the manner in which he spends most of his time discussing the nature of materiality. It is different because he had obtained the Manichaean *Ep. fund.*, a work which details Manichaean cosmogony. While his earlier ascent teachings dealt with the Manichaeans in general, he now had a specific text from which he could work. Upon reading the *Ep. fund.*, it was probably never more clear to Augustine that he had to deal with what materiality really is in order to prove to the Manichaeans how mistaken they were in believing Mani's account of the Land of Light and Darkness.

⁷⁸ Van Fleteren, (1977), p. 21. J. J. O'Donnell vol 1 (1992), p. xlix, states that all of Augustine's writings before the *Conf.* take "one of three forms: 'ascent', scriptural exegese, or anti-Manichaean polemic." But as he points out, these categories are not mutually exclusive (p. xlix, n. 97). This is true in the case of *Contra ep. fund.*, for here there is both an ascent teaching and anti-Manichaean polemic.

⁷⁹ Van Fleteren, (1977), p. 21. See also Landes Fredriksen (1982), p. xii, who believes that Augustine's emphasis against the Manichaeans turns less on philosophical arguments within two years of writing *Ex Rom. inch.* and *Exp. prop. Rom.* and more towards biblical exegesis. This timeframe is around the writing of *Contra ep. fund.* For similar comments, see also F. H. Russell, in " 'Only Something Good Can Be Evil': The Genesis of Augustine's Secular Ambivalence," *Theological Studies* 51 (1990), p. 706 and D. X. Burt, *Augustine's World: An Introduction to His Speculative Philosophy* (Lanham, Maryland, 1996), p. 61.

5.3 THE ASCENT IN THE *CONTRA EP. FUND.*

Two ascents can be found in *Contra ep. fund.* The first, near the beginning, contains a very abbreviated version and will serve as the foundation for the rest of the work. The second ascent starts in chapter sixteen through chapter twenty. The rest of the work deals directly with the application of his ascent teaching in which Augustine will take specific examples from the *Ep. fund.* The main goal of this ascent is to show the Manichaeans the correct way to think about God, by way of the correction idea of materiality. Therefore this section will examine his first and second ascent teaching and how he puts this teaching to use in the *Contra ep. fund.*

5.3.1 Ascent One

After his opening lines regarding just punishment in the *Contra ep. fund.*,⁸⁰ Augustine gives an abbreviated version of his ascent. He begins by telling his audience that it is very difficult to be able to overcome fleshly fantasies (*carnalia phantasmata*) of the mind without the mind being pious.⁸¹ In the next chapter Augustine will refer to these as illusory fantasies (*uanas imaginationes*).⁸² The use of these terms for the Manichaean cosmogony are interchangeable in Augustine's writings. For him, the whole of Manichaean cosmogony is nothing but a figment of imagination or a *inanis fabula*⁸³ which was due to their inability to understand things of an immaterial nature.

This is a common theme running through his anti-Manichaean works and especially in those which deal with the ascents. It was also common in other anti-Manichaean writers.⁸⁴

Therefore the first step in his ascent upwards will be to teach his audience the ability to know

⁸⁰ For an excellent overview of punishment in Augustine's writings, see D. X. Burt, *Friendship and Society: An Introduction to Augustine's Practical Philosophy* (Grand Rapids, 1999), pp. 187-199.

⁸¹ *Contra ep. fund.* 2 (CSEL 25,1/194.14-16) "illi in uos saeuiant, qui nesciunt, quam rarum et arduum sit carnalia phantasmata piae mentis serenitate superare..."

⁸² *Contra ep. fund.* 3 (CSEL 25,1/195.3).

⁸³ *Contra ep. fund.* 3 (CSEL 25,1/195.2).

⁸⁴ See G. G. Stroumsa, "Titus of Bostra and Alexander of Lycopolis: A Christian and a Platonic Refutation of Manichaean Dualism," in R. T. Wallis (ed.), *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, Studies in Neoplatonism: Ancient and Modern, vol. 6, (New York, 1992), pp. 337-349. See also J. C. Brunner "The Ontological Relation between Evil and Existents in Manichaean Texts and in Augustine's Interpretation of Manichaeism," in P. Morewedge (ed.), *Philosophies of Existence: Ancient and Medieval* (New York, 1982), p. 84 and n. 33 (p. 92) where he lists *Mor.* I 17.30 and *C. Faust.* 21.4.

what a material object is and the difference between this and something that can be manipulated in the memory.

It is also very difficult to be able to clear the mind of these illusory fantasies. While the Neoplatonists would have insisted that reason alone can do this, Augustine differs. It is impossible to do this without help from Christ, whom he describes (using Mal. 4.2 and John 1.9) as the true illuminator of the mind.⁸⁵ Once this step occurs, the soul will be able to follow the direction of Christ and mankind will be able to understand, if only a little, the nature of God (see table below).

Not only does Augustine describe these stages, in chapter three he also tells the audience what he had experienced in trying to escape these material fantasies. This section could be described as one of a few “first-confessions” before Augustine had written his *Conf.*⁸⁶ Part of Augustine’s appeal is that he tells his audience about his problems and then proceeds to show how he himself had solved them.⁸⁷ He also does this in order to spare others from falling into the same trap that he did.⁸⁸ This is the same with *Contra ep. fund.*, as the table below shows. The left side of the table shows his general comments in chapter two and on the right, his own solutions to the problems as he describes them in chapter three. The solutions set the framework for the rest of *Contra ep. fund.*

<i>Contra ep. fund. 2</i>	<i>Contra ep. fund. 3</i>
Let those rage against you who know not with what labor the truth is to be found and with what difficulty error is to be avoided.	For my part, I,-who, after much and long-continued bewilderment, attained at last, to the discovery of the simple truth, which is learned without being recorded in any fanciful legend
Let those rage against you who know not how rare and hard it is to overcome the fancies of the flesh by the serenity of a pious disposition. Let those rage against you who	who, unhappy that I was, barely succeeded, by God's help, in refuting the vain imaginations of my mind, gathered from theories and errors of various kinds; who so

⁸⁵ As shown in Chapter 4, Augustine uses the same two verses in the same way as Ambrose in his *Hex*.
⁸⁶ O'Donnell, vol. 1 (1992), p. li. O'Donnell also lists *B. uita* 1.4; *C. Acad.* 2.2, 3-6; *Util. cred.* 1.2, 8.20 and *Duab. an.* 9.1. It should be pointed out that four out of these five (*B. uita* being the exception) are all anti-Manichaean writings.
⁸⁷ Van Fleteren (1976), p. 477.
⁸⁸ J. M. Quinn, “Anti-Manichaean and Other Moral Precisions in Confessions 3.7.12-9.17,” *AugStud* 19 (1988), p. 165.

<i>Contra ep. fund. 2</i>	<i>Contra ep. fund. 3</i>
<p>know not the difficulty of curing the eye of the inner man that he may gaze upon his Sun,-not that sun which you worship, and which shines with the brilliance of a heavenly body in the eyes of carnal men and of beasts,-but that of which it is written through the prophet, "The Sun of righteousness has arisen upon me;" and of which it is said in the gospel, "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Let those rage against you who know not with what sighs and groans the least particle of the knowledge of God is obtained.</p>	<p>late sought the cure of my mental obscuraton, in compliance with the call and the tender persuasion of the all-merciful Physician; who long wept that the immutable and inviolable Existence would vouchsafe to convince me inwardly of Himself, in harmony with the testimony of the sacred books</p>
<p>And, last of all, let those rage against you who have never been led astray in the same way that they see that you are.</p>	<p>by whom, in fine, all those fictions which have such a firm hold on you, from your long familiarity with them, were diligently examined, and attentively heard, and too easily believed, and commended at every opportunity to the belief of others, and defended against opponents with determination and boldness,--I can on no account rage against you; for I must bear with you now as formerly I had to bear with myself, and I must be as patient towards you as my associates were with me, when I went madly and blindly astray in your beliefs.</p>

5.3.2 Ascent Two: Understanding Materiality

Augustine begins his second ascent after a detailed attack against the authority of Mani. Although important, since it allows Augustine to take Mani’s authority away and replace it with the Catholic Church, this will not be dealt with here.⁸⁹ Once he has shown that the Catholic Church has the correct authority, he lists his ascent teaching, which begins with a description of matter, followed by the soul, the memory and finally to God. After the ascent, he then begins a very detailed argument on the nature of matter which continues until the end of the work. Therefore the details of the ascent will be examined, followed by how he uses the ascent to teach the Manichaeans about the nature of matter.

⁸⁹ See *Commentary* for a detailed discussion of this.

The second ascent starts with Augustine copying out some of the *Ep. fund.*, beginning with the description of the Land of Darkness:

In one direction on the border of this bright and holy land there was a land of darkness deep and vast in extent, where abode fiery bodies, destructive races. Here was boundless darkness, flowing from the same source in immeasurable abundance, with the productions properly belonging to it.⁹⁰

This continues with a description of the five natures of the Land of Darkness which border on the Land of Light. Then, in what seems like an abrupt change of course, Augustine immediately begins talking about the materiality/immateriality question regarding God:

To speak of God as an aerial or even as an ethereal body is absurd in the view of all who, with a clear mind, possessing some measure of discernment, can perceive the nature of wisdom and truth as not extended or scattered in space, but as great, and imparting greatness without material size, nor confined more or less in any direction, but throughout co-extensive with the Father of all, nor having one thing here and another there, but everywhere perfect, everywhere present.⁹¹

Although it may seem abrupt, Augustine is beginning to discuss the main problem he had with the Manichaeans and their *Ep. fund.*: that their God is not the true God because the Manichaeans have included in their cosmology an area (the Land of Darkness) where God is not. The end result of this is that it inherently implies that God is material. For Augustine, the Catholic God is totally immaterial and cannot be broken up into parts, nor can He have size.⁹² God (as well as Christ and the Holy Spirit) is one, and is in his words, “ubique integram, ubique praesentem.” To teach the Manichaeans the correct understanding of God⁹³

⁹⁰ *Contra ep. fund.* 15 (CSEL 25,1/212.9-14).

⁹¹ *Contra ep. fund.* 15 (CSEL 25,1/212.23-213.2) “Si aerium vel etiam aetherium corpus diceret esse naturam dei, profecto inrideretur ab omnibus, qui sapientiae veritatisque naturam per nulla spatia locorum distentam atque diffusam sine ulla mole magnam et magnificam nec in parte minorem et in parte maiorem, sed per omnia aequalem summo patri, nec aliud habentem hic et aliud alibi, sed ubique integram, ubique praesentem qualicumque acie iam serenioris mentis intueri ualent.”

⁹² For a survey of Augustine’s ideas on the the nature of God, see S. Macdonald, “The Divine Nature,” in E. Stump, N. Kretzmann (2001), especially pp. 71-78.

⁹³ Portalié (1960), p. 91 notes “Even in his theology it is remarkable that Augustine always places the knowledge of God in the most prominent position...”

and to show that Mani was giving false information,⁹⁴ Augustine begins by teaching the nature of matter.⁹⁵

Material objects, created by God from nothing, are the cornerstones by which man begins to understand the soul and, with much effort, the nature of God.⁹⁶ Therefore it was important for Augustine to teach first of all regarding matter and its properties before moving upwards (or in Augustine's own words, upwards "in excellence of power rather than in height"⁹⁷) to the properties of the soul. Once it is understood that matter is divisible, then it will be easier to teach that because of these divisions, matter cannot be a perfect, indivisible one, as God is.⁹⁸

The discussion of matter includes two parts: the first is that never can two material objects be in the exact same place;⁹⁹ the second: bodies have three-dimensional space and therefore have the ability to be cut. That material objects have three dimensions also means that they have sides, which will become one of the most important issues in his anti-Manichaeism argument against the Land of Light/Land of Darkness.

5.3.2.1 Space: *Aliud habentem hic et aliud alibi*

Augustine frequently mentions the idea that matter must have one part here and another part there, especially in *Imm. an.*, one of his earliest discussions on the nature of

⁹⁴ Chapter 15 (CSEL 25,1/212.3-4) "Quid? Si non solum incerta, sed etiam falsa esse, quae dicit, deo et domino nostro mihi opitulante monstrauro." He mentions this a number of times in *Contra ep. fund.* to make this point clear. See also chapter twelve, thirty two and thirty five.

⁹⁵ *Contra ep. fund.* 16 (CSEL 25,1/213.4-6) "...cum ipsius animae natura, quae mutabilis inuenitur, nullo modo locorum spatia quadam mole sua occupet?" For an overview of the nature of matter, see Hölscher (1986), especially pp. 11-21. Hölscher's examination, while excellent, examines the nature of matter from an achronistic study of Augustine's writings. As noted above, it is sometimes possible for a later work of Augustine's to explain an earlier one, but my point here is to show that it is very important to study Augustine's progression of ideas, from his earlier works up to *Contra ep. fund.*

⁹⁶ This is why he begins this work by quoting Romans 11.36 "...ex quo omnia, per quem omnia, in quo omnia..." See Chapter 4 for a fuller discussion of this citation.

⁹⁷ *Contra ep. fund.* 18 (CSEL 25,1/215.27) "non loci altitudine, sed potentiae dignitate."

⁹⁸ He had stated this earlier in *Imm. an.* 3.3 (CSEL 89,1/104.6-13) "Omne autem, quod tempore mouet(ur) corpus, tametsi ad unum finem tendat, tamen nec simul potest omnia facere nec potest non plura facere; neque enim ualet, quauis ope agatur, aut perfecte unum esse, quod in partes secari potest, aut ullum est sine partibus corpus aut sine morarum interuallo tempus aut uero uel breuissima syllaba enuntietur, cuius non tunc finem audias, cum iam non audis initium" (emphasis mine).

⁹⁹ *Contra ep. fund.* 16 (CSEL 25,1/213.6-213.28). See also Hölscher (1986), p. 15.

matter.¹⁰⁰ This idea is intimately tied with the idea that materiality is composed of parts, each of which can be cut up indefinitely.¹⁰¹ In 387, the same year he had begun *Imm. an.*, Augustine had written a letter to Nebridius (*ep.* 3.2). This letter shows his struggles with trying to understand the nature of happiness and in the course of trying to understand this, he lists a number of things that he had been dwelling on. One of these was the fact that something material can be infinitely divided, which perplexed him.¹⁰² Unfortunately Augustine does not give an answer to this problem (as he will occasionally do when he asks himself a question). But this letter is useful in that he lays the platform for further work on the nature of the soul and all the related material that he later takes up in later works, including *Contra ep. fund.*¹⁰³

The fact that anything material has parts which can be endlessly cut into pieces assumes that material objects have dimension. There are a number of works in which Augustine describes these dimensions, which as shown above, also occurs in some of his earlier ascent teachings. This can also be found in some of his letters. For example, in 390 he wrote a letter to Caelestinus, asking him to send back to Augustine some anti-Manichaean works that were sent for Caelestinus' comments.¹⁰⁴ After inviting Caelestinus' comments on those writings, he immediately states that corporeal objects are subject to both time and space,

¹⁰⁰ This work was not one of Augustine's favorites and he found that when he had reread this work years later it was very complex and even he was having a hard time understanding what he had written (*Retr.* 1.5). Regardless, it is a very important work for understanding the problems that Augustine faced when he began to understand the nature of incorporeality. See *ep.* 3 (to Nebridius); *Imm. an.* 16.25 (CSEL 89,1/128.1-3) and *Commentary* 213.7 for other discussions on the idea of materiality and its parts.

¹⁰¹ See *Imm. an.* 7.12 (CSEL 89,1/113.22-114.2) "Omnis enim pars, quae remanet, corpus est, et quicquid hoc est, quantolibet spatio locum occupat. Neque id posset, nisi haberet partes, in quas identidem caederetur" and *Imm. an.* 16.25 (CSEL 89,1/128.1-3).

¹⁰² *Ep.* 3.2 (CSEL 34/7.10) "unum illud multum mouebat, quod infinite corpora searentur..." He also discusses this in *Uera rel.* 43.80 (CCL 32/240.14-20). In these early writings, Augustine stresses the idea the matter can be infinitely divided, but he does not mention this in *Contra ep. fund.* Despite its absence, it is still implied in this work. See also *Uera rel.* 43.80 (CCL 32/240.14-20) and *Commentary* 213.6.

¹⁰³ *Contra ep. fund.* 16 (CSEL 25,1/213.6) "Quidquid enim qualibet crassitudine est, non potest nisi minui per partes..." See also *Lib. arb.* II.8, which was written somewhere between 391 and 395.

¹⁰⁴ *Ep.* 18.

as opposed to the soul, which is only subject to time, and then God, who is not subject to either.¹⁰⁵

Others have mentioned this property of materiality and it is possible that Augustine got this definition from Plotinus, since it is also found in *Enn.* 4.7.1 which deals with the immortality of the soul. It is known that Augustine had read this particular *Ennead*.¹⁰⁶ Plotinus states that the body is divisible into shape and matter, and therefore it cannot be a unity.¹⁰⁷ He states this again in *Enn.* 4.7.5. Plotinus also dealt with this issue in *Ennead* 6.4.8, but from the perspective of the immaterial. As pointed out above, Augustine also knew this *Ennead*. Plotinus stated:

Extension is of body; what is not of body, but of the opposed order, must be kept free of extension; but where there is no extension there is no spatial distinction, nothing of the here and there which would end its freedom of presence. Since, then, partition goes with place -- each part occupying a place of its own -- how can the placeless be parted.

The *Contra ep. fund.* contains one of his clearest examples of this particular property of matter: in it he gives no less than five examples to try and get the audience to understand what he is trying to teach: that matter has parts.¹⁰⁸ He begins with what most people could understand: he first shows that a finger is less than a hand and that there are places on the hand for all the fingers. One finger cannot be in the same exact place as another finger. This is true for not only the finger but all moveable parts of the body (*in molibus corporum articulatis*). Later in *Ciu. Dei*, Augustine also applies the finger example to teach the same thing.¹⁰⁹ This is in opposition to something incorruptible wherein the totality of the incorruptible body is the same, thus it has no parts (the only incorruptible thing is God). In the *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine then moves on from human bodies to examples taken from the

¹⁰⁵ See Rist (1994), p. 96, n. 8, who lists *Diu. qu.* 83, *ep.* 137.2.4 and *Quant.* 4.6.

¹⁰⁶ See O'Connell (1968), pp. 135-145. O'Connell discusses the influence that this *Ennead* had on Augustine's *Imm. an.*, but not in regards to the materiality question.

¹⁰⁷ *Enn.* 4.7.1, in Plotinus, *The Six Enneads*, in MacKenna (Chicago, 1952), p. 191. All other references to the *Enneads* are from this edition.

¹⁰⁸ *Contra ep. fund.* 16 (CSEL 25,1/213.8-24).

¹⁰⁹ *Ciu. Dei* 11.10.

earth, liquids, air and finally light. All of these material objects can be divisible and therefore they are not wholly one, thus material objects can also not be in the exact same place as another part.

This topic of materiality is clearly something that Augustine had spent a great deal of time thinking about. Because it is frequently mentioned in his anti-Manichaeans works, it is also clear that it is a by-product of his years as a Manichaean believing in a material God. The teaching about matter will take up the bulk of all of his arguments in the *Contra ep. fund.* First, however, there are other steps upward in the ascent that must be discussed before examining his teaching on the nature of matter.

5.3.3 The Soul

The next stage in his second ascent teaching deals with the soul.¹¹⁰ As stated above, Augustine told the Manichaeans that he would become a Manichaean if they could give him clear knowledge of the salvation of the soul. This is a very important topic for Augustine since true religion (Catholicism) is “on the account of the soul alone,” something that he had stated a few years before to his Manichaean friend Honoratus:

Now I shall, if I may, go on with my task, and I shall endeavour, not meantime to explain the Catholic Faith, but to urge those who care for their souls to examine its great mysteries, and I shall show them that there is hope of divine fruit and of finding truth. No one doubts that he who seeks true religion either believes that the soul, which is to profit by religion, is immortal, or at least hopes to gain that belief from religion itself. All religion is on account of the soul alone or chiefly, therefore, true religion, if there is one, is instituted.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ On the soul in Augustine’s writings, see Portalié (1960), pp. 146-151; Hölscher (1986), passim; Rist (1994), pp. 92-104; and Burt (1996), pp. 55-60.

¹¹¹ *Util. cred.* 7.14 (CSEL 25,1/19.13-19) “Sed nunc quod institui peragam, si possum, et sic apud te agam, ut fidem catholicam non interim aperiam, sed ad scrutanda eius magna mysteria eis, quorum animae sibi curae sunt, spem diuini fructus et inueniendae ueritatis ostendam. Nemo dubitat eum, qui ueram religionem requirit, aut iam credere immortalem esse animam, cui prosit illa religio, aut etiam id ipsum in eadem religione uelle inuenire.” English translation is from J. H. S. Burleigh (trans.), *Augustine: Earlier Writings*, The Library of Christian Classics: Ichthus Edition (Philadelphia, 1953).

Earlier than this, he told Manlius Theodorus that the soul is the closest created thing to God.¹¹² Since the Manichaeans are unable, on all accounts, to give him this knowledge of the soul, Augustine then attempts to show the Manichaeans his own knowledge which begins after his discussion of the nature of materiality in *Contra. ep. fund.* He had already made reference to the soul at the beginning of chapter sixteen, when he stated that the soul, which is changeable,¹¹³ does not occupy an area of space concomitant with its own size. Here he refuses to begin his instruction on the nature wisdom and truth, which is higher than the soul and thus more difficult to understand.¹¹⁴ This refusal is in keeping with his teaching style of not starting at too high level for those who cannot yet understand. Instead, he will begin with an inferior aspect of the soul: the manner in which it keeps the body together and perceives the bodily senses.¹¹⁵ This aspect becomes important when he begins to discuss the living beings that Mani had described in the Land of Darkness (discussed below).

If matter or material objects are compared to the soul, it will become clear that since matter cannot be everywhere at once, and the soul, although changeable, is not contained in a specific place, the soul is found everywhere in the body. That it is found in all parts of the body, whole and at once, implies that it is omnipresent.¹¹⁶ To show this omnipresence, Augustine returns to his finger example from above. If the finger is touched, the soul does not perceive it through the whole body at the same time, but only in the touched finger, therefore the soul must be present in the whole body. Here he jumps ahead of himself slightly, since he has given no evidence that the soul is indeed throughout the body all at the same time. To

¹¹² *B. uita* 1.4 (CCL 29/67.91-94) "Animaduerti enim et saepe in sacerdotis nostri et aliquando in sermonibus tuis, cum de deo cogitaretur, nihil omnino corporis esse cogitandum, neque cum de anima; nam id est est unum in rebus proximum deo."

¹¹³ Here is also another instance where Augustine has repeated something from the beginning of the work. In chapter one he had already shown that the soul is indeed changeable because of the emotions.

¹¹⁴ *Contra ep. fund.* 16 (CSEL 25,1/213.3-4 and 213.25-26). Earlier he had made reference to this very combination of wisdom and truth, who is Christ (*Contra ep. fund.* 15 [CSEL 25,1/212.24]). See also *Commentary* 212.24.

¹¹⁵ *Contra ep. fund.* 16 (CSEL 25,1/213.26-27) "sed illa inferior, qua continet corpus et sentit in corpore..."

¹¹⁶ See Gilson (1960), p. 48, who discusses this idea as found in *ep.* 166.2.3 (n. 18, p. 273). See also Rist (1994), p. 96, who shows that this is one of Augustine's favorite examples to use and is taken from a Neoplatonic milieu (p. 95). See also Hölscher (1986), p. 40.

remedy this, he gives another, more detailed example. If the finger is touched at the same time the foot is touched, both places are sensed by the soul. It is in this way the soul can be determined to be throughout the whole body.¹¹⁷ The soul need not travel from one area to the next, sensing touch wherever it might occur -- it is omnipresent (*sufficiens exhibere se singulis locis simul totam*) and would be able to sense a touch in as many areas as could be touched. Because of this, the soul is not contained in an area of space, such as the body which can be divided into parts.¹¹⁸

This examination of the properties of the soul was by no means his first attempt.¹¹⁹ In *Imm. an.* (begun in 387), like *Contra. ep. fund.*, Augustine showed that material objects have parts (as discussed above) and that the soul is present in all body parts at all times. To show this, Augustine discusses the nature of pain, which is something that is felt in a specific part of the body, but is felt by the entire soul. If the foot hurts, the eye looks at it, the mouth says something about it and the hand reaches for it.¹²⁰ This shows that the soul is present not only in the whole body, but wholly in its parts as well and therefore the soul must be omnipresent within the body. He also discusses this again the following year, 388, in *Quant.* when he tells Evodius:

¹¹⁷ *Contra ep. fund.* 16 (CSEL 25,1/214.9-12) "Sed cum tota sentit in digito manus, si alius locus tangatur in pede, nec ibi desinit tota sentire. Atque ita in singulis distantibus locis tota simul adest, non unum deserens, ut in altero tota sit..."

¹¹⁸ *Contra ep. fund.* 16 (CSEL 25,1/214.12-15) "...ut aliam partem hic habeat et alibi aliam, sed sufficiens exhibere se singulis locis simul totam. Quoniam tota sentit in singulis satis ostendit se locorum spatiis non teneri."

¹¹⁹ For the most exhaustive study of the soul, see Hölscher (1986).

¹²⁰ *Imm. an.* 16.25 (CSEL 89,1/128.3-7) "Anima uero non modo uniuersae moli corporis sui, sed etiam unicuique particulae illius tota simul adest. Partis enim corporis passionem tota sentit, nec in toto tamen corpore. Cum enim quid dolet in pede, aduertitur oculus, lingua loquitur, admouetur manus."

Let us examine, therefore, if you wish, the force of that other argument of yours, namely, that the soul, which we would find to be without any material extension, feels the sensation of touch over the entire surface of the body.¹²¹

The soul cannot have width or length, because these are properties of bodies.¹²² For Augustine, this is the reason to flee totally from things of material nature, since they have nothing to do with the salvation of the soul; it was also a precept of the Christian belief.¹²³ Foreshadowing Augustine's arguments with the Manichaeans, he tried to teach Evodius about incorporeality by first teaching him about the nature of the soul.¹²⁴

Once again, Augustine may be indebted to Plotinus for such a view. Plotinus, in *Enn.* 4.7.1-3 deals with the immortality of the soul. In 4.7.5 he states "It is (the soul), as body cannot be, an 'all-everywhere,' a complete identity present at each and every point, the part all that the whole is." As mentioned above, it is known that Augustine had read this particular *Ennead*.

But despite the obvious importance of the soul in Augustine's theology, this aspect of the soul does not take center place in his explanation of the ascent found later in the *Contra ep. fund.* It is still important in that he uses this "inferior aspect" of holding the body together and perceiving things to demonstrate that the creatures in the Land of Darkness are all described as being alive, moving, growing. His point will be to prove (by means of his definition of a soul) that without the soul, life could not be and that this soul is also created by God. Because he is desperately trying to teach the Manichaeans the nature of materiality, it is

¹²¹ *Quant.* 21.35 (CSEL 89,1/174.13-15) "Quare uideamus, si placet, illud alterum argumentum tuum quale sit, quod per totum spatium corporis tactus sentitur ab anima, quam spatii nullius esse uolumus." English translations are taken from J. J. McMahon, "The Magnitude of the Soul (*De quantitate animae*)" in *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 4 (New York, 1947). Although important to understanding his theory of the soul, Augustine does not directly deal with sensation as such in his application of the ascent teaching. For one of many comments on this, see *Quant.* 23.41 (CSEL 89,1/182.3-4) where Augustine states sensation is an experience of the body that the soul is aware of. For his theory of sensation, see Hölscher (1986), pp. 91-103 and Burt (1996), pp. 89-95.

¹²² *Quant.* 3.4 (CSEL 89,1/135.4-8) "Atque illud superius dici non potest nec omnino intellegi de anima. Non enim ullo modo aut longa aut lata aut quasi ualida suspicanda est anima: corporea ista sunt, ut mihi uidetur, et de consuetudine corporum sic animam quaerimus."

¹²³ *Quant.* 3.4 (CSEL 89,1/135.8-13). Augustine will later change his view on this, by at least the time of *Ciu. Dei*. See Hölscher (1986), p. 29-30.

¹²⁴ *Quant.* 6.10 (CSEL 89,1/143.13-14) "Incorporeum est enim, quod te nunc intellegere cupio; Nam sola longitudo non nisi intellegi animo potest, in corpore inueniri non potest."

just one more step in the chain of understanding. He must now deal with another aspect of the soul which is more important, that of the memory.

5.3.4 From Memory To God

The next and very important step upwards that is discussed is that of memory, which is an aspect of the soul.¹²⁵ This section is not a full-scale examination of this important feature of Augustine's ascent teaching, since it has been the subject of many studies.¹²⁶ It is, however, a very important feature in his application of this teaching, since it is the memory and its ability to manipulate images that had caused so many problems for the Manichaeans.

Before specifically stating that this was the problem, Augustine describes first of all what the memory and its functions are: memory is something that both humans and animals share. He uses the image of a dog, barking and growling in its sleep, to show that this could not occur without a memory of things the dog had seen.¹²⁷ But Augustine's important point here is to show that the memory is capable of containing images that are much larger than the body itself.¹²⁸ It also cannot be contained but instead it contains images of material things which can be chopped up into pieces, without itself being chopped up. If they could understand that, then it could be seen that this ability shows that the memory is able to think of material things, while at the same time it is not able to be divided as something material. This shows that it is higher in power than these material objects.

¹²⁵ Bourke (1992), p. 142.

¹²⁶ For example, see K. Winkler, "La Théorie augustinienne de la mémoire à son point de départ," *AugMag* 1 (Paris, 1954), pp. 511-19; R. A. Markus, "Reason and Illumination," in A. H. Armstrong (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1967); J. A. Maurant, *St. Augustine on Memory* (Villanova, 1979); A. Solignac, "Memoria dans la tradition augustinienne," *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* vol. 10 (1980), pp. 995-99; G. O'Daly, *Augustine's Philosophy of Mind* (Berkeley, 1987) and R. J. Teske, "Augustine's Philosophy of Memory," in E. Stump, N. Kretzmann (ed.), (2001), pp. 148-158.

¹²⁷ As pointed out by Markus (1967), p. 370, the memory of the past is one of two 'roots' in Augustine's theory of memory: "the ordinary, common-sense conception of memory as the mind's ability to preserve and to recall past experience, and the Platonic conception as revised by him to free it from reference to the past." See also Hölscher (1986), pp. 45-57.

¹²⁸ *Contra ep. fund.* 17 (CSEL 25,1/214.25).

There is, however, a dangerous aspect of memory: its ability to manipulate images received from the senses, which may then be believed to be real things.¹²⁹ This was one of Augustine's greatest complaints about Epicurus and more importantly, the Manichaeans:

It shows that the countless worlds of Epicurus, in which his fancy roamed without restraint, are due to the same power of imagination, and, not to multiply examples, that we get from the same source that land of light, with its boundless extent, and the five dens of the race of darkness, with their inmates, in which the fancies of Manichaeus have dared to usurp for themselves the name of truth.¹³⁰

What Mani had usurped was the role of God by creating from his imagination the Land of Light and the Land of Darkness. In doing so, he had given order to all things in these lands, including the Darkness which was supposed to be totally evil and chaotic (discussed below). When the mind manipulates these images, the images then become *phantasmata*, something that is not real. These become dangerous when they are mistaken for real things, and this is the main thrust of his argument for three-quarters of this work: Mani has taken from the imagination his description of the Land of Darkness and the Land of Light and everything found in both, including God. He therefore has misunderstood (or lied about) the very nature of matter.

So, he asks the Manichaeans, if the mind or soul is found to be above material objects in terms of its power, and yet it is still changeable (which he had mentioned at the beginning and repeats in chapter nineteen), then what must be thought about God? The whole reason for the ascent is to show, step by step, how to correctly think about God. He began by proving that material things take up space and can be cut into pieces. He then proves that the soul is not able to be cut and therefore is immaterial. The soul or mind can still change by a number

¹²⁹ *Contra ep. fund.* 18 (CSEL 25,1/215.13).

¹³⁰ *Contra ep. fund.* 18 (CSEL 25,1/215.15-19) "Ex eadem uenire facilitate innumerabiles mundos, in quibus Epicuri cogitatio innumerabiliter peregrinata est, et, *ne multa consector*, ex eadem uenire facilitate istam terram lucis per spatia infinita diffusam et quinque antra gentis tenebrarum cum habitatoribus suis, in quibus Manichaei phantasmata ueritatis sibi nomen ausa sunt usurpare" (emphasis mine).

of different emotions.¹³¹ The memory is able to store innumerable material objects of whatever size without being contained by them and can also judge them. In this way he proved that the soul and memory are greater in power than material objects. But the soul was created by God, who must still be greater in power than the soul because He created it. If the soul is immaterial yet changeable, then God must be immaterial and unchangeable.¹³²

Augustine could have completed his ascent teaching here and left it at its pinnacle in hopes that the Manichaeans would understand it. But Augustine was first and foremost a teacher. He knew personally that thinking in a spiritual manner took great effort. So after describing God, he immediately attacks the descriptions of God in the *Ep. fund.* where God is limited to one area but extended outward in infinite space. This implies that God was a material object who would then have innumerable parts.¹³³ His goal now was to describe the nature of materiality, using all of the ingredients found in the ascent of the soul by taking apart the *Ep. fund.*, piece by piece.

5.3.5 Matter: Its Application in the *Ep. fund.*

At the end of the description of the ascent Augustine lowers the audience back to the material world, where he now gives concrete examples from the *Ep. fund.* to use what he had just taught. This is really an expansion of his second description of the ascent. He intertwines the issues of the soul, memory and God into one long argument against Mani's description of the Land of Light and Darkness, but concentrates mostly on the issue of materiality: from where it comes and what is its true nature. In order to do this he tackles three major themes throughout the work: the border between the two lands; *creatio de nihilo* by God; and the issue of corruption. Augustine believes that if he can get the Manichaeans and his other

¹³¹ He discussed this at the beginning of *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine had also discussed this previously. See *Imm. an.* 5.7.

¹³² As shown above, this is Augustine's standard proof on the immateriality of God.

¹³³ *Contra ep. fund.* 15 (CSEL 25,1/216.12-21) "Qui tamen, si, ut Manichaeorum phantasmata perstrepunt, locorum ex una parte determinato, ex aliis inmenso spatio tenderetur, quantaelibet in eo particulae et innumerabilia frusta alia maiora, alia minora pro cogitantis arbitrio metirentur, ut bipedalis in eo uerbi gratia pars octo partibus minor esset quam decempedalis. Id enim necesse est contingat omnibus naturis, quae per talia spatia diffusae ubique totae esse non possunt, quod in ipsa anima non inuenitur et ab eis, qui haec considerare non ualent, deformiter de illa et turpiter creditur."

audience to understand what matter is, then they would be able to leave Mani and join the Catholics.

5.3.5.1 The Border Issue and materiality

In his descent from God, Augustine immediately attacks the border between the two lands.¹³⁴ This border example is not used in his other writings before *Contra ep. fund.*, probably because he had not seen such a description of it until he had the copy of the *Ep. fund.* in his hand.¹³⁵ But when Augustine read this, it must have been clear to him that this was something that he could use to his advantage since it takes up a large part of his arguments in this work. He uses it to show not only that this implies that God is a material object, but also that since this border must be straight, there is a great good in the Land of Darkness.

In chapter fifteen, Mani's idea that there is a side to the Land of Light sets off this chain reaction of thoughts on the ascent to God. Augustine begins again in chapter twenty (and continues until the beginning of chapter twenty eight) where he states:

But perhaps, instead of thus addressing carnal minds, we should rather descend to the views of those who either dare not or are as yet unfit to turn from the consideration of material things to the study of an immaterial and spiritual nature, and who thus are unable to reflect upon their own power of reflection, so as to see how it forms a judgment of material extension without itself possessing it. Let us descend then to these material ideas, and let us ask in what direction, and on what border of the shining and sacred territory, to use the

¹³⁴ This begins in *Contra ep. fund.* 20.

¹³⁵ *Mor.* II is a good example of this. There are many similar arguments found there, but he does not discuss the border.

expressions of Manichaeus, was the region of darkness? For he speaks of one direction and border, without saying which, whether the right or the left.¹³⁶

Since it was the issue of the sides of the Land of Light and Darkness that started

Augustine on his ascent teaching, it is not surprising that he would then spend so much time on this issue now, especially since it is the cornerstone to his materiality argument. The first issue is “side”: if there is one side, then this implies that there are other sides as well, especially if on one side was the Land of Darkness. As shown above, his definition of matter included the idea that all material objects are spatial and therefore have sides. The *Ep. Fund.* did not contain a detailed account of the border or the shape of the Land of Light, but there were some Manichaeans who could give a description of it: they claimed that there are no sides to the land of Light because everything above the border was infinite.¹³⁷ This, however, was not an acceptable answer because even though God was infinite, just having one side was enough to show that He is bounded by one edge, and therefore it must be material.

That the Land of Darkness was material was never a question for the Manichaeans and because of this, Augustine does not discuss this.¹³⁸ Since this Land was material, how can the Land of Light, being immaterial, be joined to the Land of Darkness? Augustine begins to show his exasperation at what he thinks is common sense – only something material can be joined with something material.¹³⁹ Instead of discussing this further, he moves to the shape of

¹³⁶ *Contra ep. fund.* 20 (CSEL 25,1/216.22-217.5) “Uerumtamen cum carnalibus animis fortasse non sic agendum est, sed *descendendum* est potius ad eorum cogitationes, qui naturam incorpoream et spiritalem cogitando persequi uel non audent uel nondum ualent, ita ut nec ipsam cogitationem suam eadem cogitatione considerent et inueniant eam nullo locorum spatio de ipsis locorum spatiis indicantem. *Descendamus* ergo ad eorum sensus et quaeramus ab eis, ‘iuxta quam partem aut iuxta quod latus,’ sicut Manichaeus dicit, ‘inlustris illius ac sanctae terrae’ erat tenebrarum terra. Dicit enim: ‘iuxta unam partem ac latus,’ nec dicit, quam partem uel quod latus, dextrum an sinistrum” (emphasis mine). Later in Chapter 40 (CSEL 25,1/245.25-25) he will also give an example to the Manichaeans, so that they might understand his point easier. He does this “ut, cum tardis tardius ambulemus.”

¹³⁷ For a discussion of this in the works of Augustine as well as others, see B. Bennett, “Iuxta Unum Latus Erat Terra Tenebrarum: The Division of Primordial Space in Anti-Manichaean Writers’ Descriptions of the Manichaean Cosmogony,” in Mirecki and BeDuhn (2001), p. 74-78. He believes that the source of this information is the Mani’s *Living Gospel*. See also *Commentary* 212.9.

¹³⁸ See *Commentary* 218.2.

¹³⁹ *Contra ep. fund.* 21 (CSEL 25,1/218.12) “duas terras sibi lateribus non posse coniungi, nisi utrumque sit corpus.”

the two lands and the description he gives is once again not found in the *Ep. fund.*, but was discussed between him and some Manichaeans at some point in the past. He states:

Accordingly they make it boundless in depth and in length; but upwards, above it, they maintain that there is an infinity of empty space. And lest this region should appear to be a fraction equal in amount to half of that representing the region of light, they narrow it also on two sides. As if, to give the simplest illustration, a piece of bread were made into four squares, three white and one black; then suppose the three white pieces joined as one, and conceive them as infinite upwards and downwards, and backwards in all directions: this represents the Manichaean region of light. Then conceive the black square infinite downwards and backwards, but with infinite emptiness above it: this is their region of darkness. But these are secrets which they disclose to very eager and anxious inquirers.¹⁴⁰

For the Manichaeans, this was proof that the Land of Light is larger than the Land of Darkness, but for Augustine, it was another example of the materialism of the Land of Light, because not only does it have a border, but it also has a shape. Since it has a border, Augustine can think of three options for its shape: it must be either twisted, curved, or straight.¹⁴¹ In his usual method, Augustine will give a large number of hypothetical examples for each of these options: if the border is twisted, then there are gaps between the two borders, and the dangers in the Land of Darkness would fall through infinity and never harm anyone. If the Land of Darkness were curved either inward towards or outward from the Land of Light, then the Land of Light receives the Land of Darkness in a “shameful way.”¹⁴²

This then leads into a discussion for the first time in this work (but not the last) on beauty. The Land of Light, being perfect, must have a straight border, because there is nothing more perfect, beautiful and harmonious in a material object than a straight line.¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰ *Contra ep. fund.* 21 (CSEL 25,1/218.18-219.6).

¹⁴¹ *Contra ep. fund.* 26 (CSEL 25,1/225.4-6).

¹⁴² *Contra ep. fund.* 26 (CSEL 25,1/225.20-24) “Si autem curuo latere adiungebatur, terra quoque lucis curuo eam sinu deformiter recipiebat. Aut si introrsus ista quasi specie theatri curua erat, curuam terrae luminis partem tali sinu receptam non minus deformi copulatione amplectebatur.”

¹⁴³ Augustine had also discussed the beauty of a straight line with Evodius in *Quant.* 10.16; see *Commentary* 226.5.

Since it must have this (because Mani has described the Land of Light as perfection), then the Land of Darkness must also share this straight border. Augustine's point is to show that what Mani has declared was absolute evil contains something of utmost beauty.

To teach them what beauty is,¹⁴⁴ he takes this straight-lined border and has the audience imagine that someone could make it crooked.¹⁴⁵ In doing so, its beauty and harmony are taken away when the form of the line is changed. This does not mean that it is losing its substance or nature,¹⁴⁶ but that the form (*species*) is changing. This form is one of the key components in the substance or nature of a material object, the other two being measure and order (*modus, ordo*).¹⁴⁷ Thus substance is not taken away when something changes, but a corruption or an evil occurs in one of these three.¹⁴⁸ This is something that he returns to at the end of *Contra ep. fund.* and is repeated in *Nat. b.*¹⁴⁹

For Augustine, this is then the proof that a substance is not an evil. This straight line is beautiful because its form is pleasing, but when it is made crooked, the form changes and beauty is taken away. The example of this line is then paralleled with that of the soul: when a person living a pious and just life changes his will to live a less pious life, this will is made crooked and therefore that person will not be as happy as before. When this occurs in the will

¹⁴⁴ See Burt (1996), p. 62: "Finally, the goodness of the material world in general and the human body in particular can be argued from the beauty that is found there."

¹⁴⁵ This will not be the only time that Augustine asks that his audience take an active part in thinking about these things. He will do the very same thing at the end of the work (chapter forty) when we will ask people to think about what existence and non-existence is.

¹⁴⁶ These two terms, along with essence, are used interchangeably by Augustine. See *Mor. II.2.2* "Uos autem asseritis quendam naturam atque substantiam malum esse. Accedit etiam illud, quod contra naturam quicquid est, utique naturae aduersatur et eam perimere nititur. Tendit ergo id quod est facere, ut non sit. Nam et ipsa natura nihil est aliud quam id quod intelligitur in suo genere aliquid esse. Itaque ut nos iam nouo nomine ab eo quod est esse, uocamus essentiam, quam plerumque etiam substantiam nominamus ita ueteres qui haec nomina non habebant, pro essentia et substantia naturam uocabant." See also *Lib. arb.* 3.13.36 "Omnis autem natura aut corruptibilis est aut incorruptibilis. Omnis ergo natura bona est. Naturam uoco quae et substantia dici solet; omnis igitur substantia aut deus aut ex deo, quia omne bonum aut deus aut ex deo."

¹⁴⁷ Gilson (1960), p. 144.

¹⁴⁸ See also *Mor. II.5.7* where he states "But corruption exists not by itself, but in some substance which it corrupts; for corruption itself is not a substance." See also *Nat. b.* 4 (CSEL 25,2/857.3-8) "Proinde cum quaeritur, unde sit malum, prius quaerendum est, quid sit malum. Quod nihil aliud est quam corruptio uel modi uel speciei uel ordinis naturalis."

¹⁴⁹ Coyle, in his article on this work correctly wonders why Augustine had written *Nat. b.* at all, considering that it is mostly repetitions of statements found in *Lib. arb.*, *Mor. II* and here in the *Contra ep. fund.* See "Natura boni" in Fitzgerald (1999), p. 581.

or the mind, once again, substance is not taken away.¹⁵⁰ Therefore Mani had given this beautiful, straight border to his absolutely evil Land of Darkness. The key is that this border, which can be twisted or curved into something less good, must have had a good in it to allow it to become less good. But in declaring that everything in the Land of Darkness was absolutely evil, he has separated this perfectly straight, beautiful border from God, the author of all good things.¹⁵¹

From here Augustine takes a slight detour from the border to discuss both the “body” of God and the nature of the Land of Light. Once again both of these are intimately related to his entire argument on materiality. He begins by stating that the Manichaeans did not believe that God could have been in human form. There are many places in Augustine’s earlier writings where he states the Manichaeans had made fun of the Catholics for believing that God had a body.¹⁵² Augustine admits that there are still some Catholics who are yet unable to think in a spiritual manner and thus think about God as having a body. This was acceptable to him because they were in the Catholic Church and little by little he hopes that they will learn the correct way to think about Him. But when they think of Him in this manner, it is the best possible body. This is still better than the Manichaeans, who as shown above, believed that God was penetrated by the Land of Darkness, which in his words, was most repugnant and repulsive.¹⁵³

He then tackles the natures that might be found in the Kingdom of Light, which leads to his teaching on *creatio de nihilo*. His argument runs: Is God and his Kingdoms and the Blessed Earth of the same nature? If they were three, then Mani should have never stated that there were only two natures, but four. Are God and the kingdoms one nature and the land another? If so, then Mani should have declared three natures. If, as Mani had stated, there

¹⁵⁰ *Contra ep. fund.* 27.

¹⁵¹ *Contra ep. fund.* 27 (CSEL 25,1/227.25).

¹⁵² See *Mor.* I.10.17, *Gn. adu. Man.* I.17.27 and *Conf.* 5.10.19. Despite this they did not solve the ultimate problem of immateriality. See *Conf.* 5.10.19. It took Ambrose to convince him that the Catholic Church did not teach this. *Conf.* 5.14.24 and 6.3.4. See also Teske (1986), 255-256.

¹⁵³ *Contra ep. fund.* 25 (CSEL 25,1/224.19) “foedissime atque turpissime...”

were two because the Land of Darkness was separate from the rest, then does the Land of Light belong to Him because it is nearby? But if that were true, the Land of Darkness is nearby as well and He should belong to Him as well. If that is not the case, then did God generate it? If He did, then it would be the same nature as God and, back to square one, God would have been penetrated by the Land of Darkness. The only possibility left for the Manichaeans is that the Land of Light is created by God from nothing.¹⁵⁴

This ends his discussion of the border.

5.3.5.2 God, *Creatio de nihilo* and Goodness

The last major topic that Augustine discusses in relation to materiality is its creation by God from nothing (*creatio de nihilo*) and he uses the *Ep. fund.* to explain this. It is a very important issue in *Contra ep. fund.* and in his other anti-Manichaean writings.¹⁵⁵ Within it lies the explanation for the goodness in all material objects as well as the existence of corruption (as he had begun to discuss with the border). Once again, his purpose is to show that Mani was using his imagination when he created the two lands and to teach the Manichaeans the correct way to think about matter.

Creatio de nihilo by God is the basic tenet of materiality for Augustine.¹⁵⁶ He had already shown the Manichaeans that the Land of Light which God resided in must have been created by Him from nothing, otherwise He would have been penetrated from below by the

¹⁵⁴ This is found in *Contra ep. fund.* 25, with a summary in chapter 26. Augustine must have found this a very powerful argument to use against the Manichaeans since he repeats it in his debate with Felix. Although the *Ep. fund.* does not answer Augustine's question whether the Land is of the same substance as God, Felix tells Augustine that the two are of the same: Felix: And the one who generated and all the things which he generated and the place where he put them are all equal. Aug: Therefore they are one substance? Felix: They are one. Aug: What is God the Father, is also his sons and that land? Fel: All are one. *C. Fel.* 1.18 (CSEL 25,2/9-15) "Felix: Et qui generavit et quos generavit et ubi positi sunt, omnia aequalia sunt. Aug dixit: Unius ergo substantiae sunt? Fel. dixit: Unius. Aug. dixit: Hoc quod est deus pater, hoc sunt filii ipsius, hoc et terra illa? Fel. dixit: Hoc unum sunt omnes." Translations from *C. Fel.* are my own. Ephraim also has this exact argument in his *Panarion*, Book 5.14,12-13 found in F. Williams (tr.), *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Book I (Sects 1-46), II-III (Sects 47-80, De Fide)*, I-II, (Nag Hammadi Studies 35; Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 36), (Leiden, 1987-1994).

¹⁵⁵ Torchia (1999), p. xiii states "This understanding of creation in the most absolute, uncompromising terms is central to Augustine's refutation of Manichaeism." See also P. W. Van Der Horst and J. Mansfeld (1974), pp. 19-23 for Alexander's idea that matter was created by God.

¹⁵⁶ *Contra ep. fund.* 24 (CSEL 25,1/223.10-11) "Quodsi non de aliena substantia fecit terram lucis, restat, ut eam de nihilo fecerit." See also *Lib. arb.* 1.2.5 (CCL 29/213.30) "Ex quo fit ut de nihilo creauerit omnia" and *Commentary* 223.10 for more detail.

Land of Darkness. That God is the author of all good things (which he states a total of six times in this work alone¹⁵⁷) is a phrase that holds the key to understanding the entire ascent. He states:

If, then, you are now convinced that God is able to create some good thing out of nothing, come into the Catholic Church, and learn that all the natures which God has created and founded in their order of excellence from the highest to the lowest are good, and some better than others; and that they were made of nothing, though God, their Maker, made use of His own wisdom as an instrument, so to speak, to give being to what was not, and that as far as it had being it might be good, and that the limitation of its being might show that it was not begotten by God, but made out of nothing.¹⁵⁸

Within this paragraph is the outline for the rest of the work: God orders all things; these are all made from nothing; and the reason that things fall or change from their original goodness is due not to an independent evil, but is because they are made from nothing. Since God created all things from nothing, and God must be all good, He would create things in a good order, from the highest thing below Himself (the soul) to the lowest (matter).¹⁵⁹ The Manichaeans must accept this concept, or they will never be able to leave Manichaeism.¹⁶⁰ Exposing the contents of the Land of Darkness was a good way for Augustine to demonstrate this. He does this, and in a very long and exhaustive examination,¹⁶¹ proves that what Mani had thought was evil was actually something that was good. This is because Mani divided the

¹⁵⁷ See Chapter 29 (2x), 31, 33, 34 and 38. See also (among others) *Quant.* 33.76 and *Mor.* I 2.3.

¹⁵⁸ *Contra ep. fund.* 25 (CSEL 25,1/223.12-223.20) "Quare si uobis iam persuadetur posse aliquid boni omnipotentem deum de nihilo facere, uenite in catholicam et discite omnes naturas, quas fecit et condidit deus, excellentiae gradibus ordinatas a summis usque ad infimas, omnes bonas, sed alias aliis esse potiores, easque factas esse de nihilo, cum deus artifex per sapientiam suam potentialiter, ut ita dicam, operaretur, ut posset esse, quod non erat, et in quantum esset, bonum esset; in quantum autem deficeret, se non de deo genitum, sed ab ipso de nihilo factum ostenderet."

¹⁵⁹ *Contra ep. fund.* 25 (CSEL 25,1/ 224.2-7) "Quodsi magnum aliquod bonum, quod tamen illo ipso esset inferius, deus ex nihilo facere potuit, potuit etiam, quia bonus est et nulli bono inuidet, facere alterum bonum, quod illo priore esset inferius. Potuit et tertium, cui secundum praeponeretur, et deinde usque ad infimum bonum naturarum factarum ordinem ducere..."

¹⁶⁰ *Contra ep. fund.* 25 (CSEL 25,1/224.10-11).

¹⁶¹ Even Augustine admitted that to give all of these examples was tedious. Here he states "Longum est persequi cetera..." (chapter thirty three [CSEL 25,1/237.11]). See also chapter thirty four (line 238.21) and chapter thirty five (line 240.1) and well as *Nat. b.* 14 and *Mor.* II.8.13.

contents into certain areas and then gave them number, quality, form and life. But these can only come from God.¹⁶²

Instead of detailing all of Augustine’s examples (he spends chapters twenty-eight through thirty-three going through each of these five kingdoms), it will be enough to show his point with a summary of all the good things which Augustine found in the Land of Darkness:¹⁶³

Good	Corruption
beauty, distinction, order, peace, unity of forms, symmetry of limbs, healthful atmosphere, the control and guidance of the soul, the submission of the body	destruction, blindness, muddy turbulence, the horrible vehemence, the corruptibility, the savagery of the princes

By putting good things in the Land of Darkness, Mani had lied in stating that there was only absolute evil there and had alienated these from God, who is the only one who can give good things. This alienation occurred because Mani had believed that any evil had to be absolutely evil and totally separated from any good that it really has. Although undoubtedly Mani thought he was doing good by explaining the nature of evil in the world, but what he actually was doing was mixing up good and evil things and believed that the evil was absolute evil.

To prove that all things are good, he showed them numerous examples of objects that Mani had described and then asked them to take something away from it. For example, take away the muddiness of water, and only pure water will remain. But if the harmony of the parts were taken away, absolutely nothing will remain.¹⁶⁴ Thus, the taking away by

¹⁶² *Contra ep. fund.* 29 (CSEL 25,1/229.17-20) “Quis igitur ista ordinavit? Quis distribuit atque distinxit? Quis numerum, qualitatem, formas, uitam dedit? Haec enim omnia per se ipsa bona sunt nec inuenitur, unde cuique naturae nisi ab omnium bonorum deo auctore tribuantur.”

¹⁶³ *Contra ep. fund.* 33. This was also earlier discussed in *Mor.* II.9.18.

¹⁶⁴ Later in chapter thirty five he states that when things are corrupted, they are deprived of some good (CSEL 251/240.22-23) “...eo ipso bono minuuntur quo incorrupta erant.” Augustine did not use his phrase *priuantur bono* in the *Contra ep. fund.* as he did earlier in *Mor.* 2.5.7, *Lib. arb.* 3.13.36 and later in *Conf.* 7.12.18 (where he uses both terms in the same sentence) and *Nat. b.* 3 and 23 (see O’Donnell, vol. 2 [1992], p. 449).

corruption leaves something better, but in the removal of a good, no nature will exist.¹⁶⁵ This shows that evil cannot be a nature, but is against nature.¹⁶⁶ This also shows that an object cannot be thought of without something good. Augustine continues giving examples in this manner for the entire Land of Darkness.

Although we do not know the effect that this text had on the Manichaeans, it is clear from the *Ep. fund.* that Augustine tried to prove to the Manichaeans that the evil that Mani believed was the ultimate evil was actually something that was very good. It was not the highest good, but good nonetheless. From here he makes his last push to make the Manichaeans understand the correct way to think about matter. As shown above, everything that God had created was good. He must now prove to them that what is evil is a corruption of the good, in order to substitute Mani's false teachings with the correct ones found in the Catholic Church. Once again he gives a large number of examples.¹⁶⁷

Different evils may, indeed, be called by different names; but that which is the evil of all things in which any evil is perceptible is corruption. So the corruption of an educated mind is ignorance; the corruption of a prudent mind is imprudence; the corruption of a just mind, injustice; the corruption of a brave mind, cowardice; the corruption of a calm, peaceful mind, cupidity, fear, sorrow, pride. Again, in a living body, the corruption of health is pain and disease; the corruption of strength is exhaustion; the corruption of rest is toil. Again, in any corporeal thing, the corruption of beauty is ugliness; the corruption of straightness is crookedness; the corruption of order is confusion; the corruption of entireness is dismemberance, or fracture, or diminution.¹⁶⁸

All natures are good because they have form and order. Take this good totally away and you have nothing. This corruption only harms something that has good in it in the first

¹⁶⁵ For a similar argument, see *Lib. arb.* 3.13 "Every nature that can become less good is good, and every nature becomes less good when it is corrupted. For either corruption does it no harm, in which case it is not being corrupted, or else it diminishes its goodness to some extent and thus makes it less good... Therefore we must say that every nature is good insofar as it is a nature."

¹⁶⁶ *Contra ep. fund.* 33. On Augustine's denial of the existence of evil, see O'Donnell, vol 2 (1992), pp. 448-449.

¹⁶⁷ Although used elsewhere throughout various writings, Augustine never used such detailed examples or repeated them as many times as he does here until he wrote *Nat. b.* in 404.

¹⁶⁸ *Contra ep. fund.* 35.

place. If corruption is steadily increasing, it is steadily taking away the good that some object has inherently.¹⁶⁹ This is why the things in the Land of Darkness must be good because they too can be corrupted. He also proves this at the end of the work by asking his audience to think about what existence and non-existence really is by imagining a body of an animal sitting on either side of these two categories.¹⁷⁰ If the animal is growing, then it must be tending towards existence; if it becomes sick, then it must be tending towards non-existence. Corruption is not from God, but exists because matter was made from nothing.

Augustine ends this work by showing why it is important to understand what matter is. Matter exists because God has given everything its own order in the scale from the lowest created material thing up to the soul. Corruption exists because it is part of God's order. He gives two examples to show that the coming and going of things should be thought of as something beautiful and natural. Our speech consists not only of the sounds that are made, but also because of the silence that exists between the making of the sounds.¹⁷¹ This is also the case with material objects: everything must die, but there is a beauty in both the coming (tending towards existence) and going of these things (tending towards non-existence), which

if our sense and memory could rightly take in the order and proportions of this beauty, it would so please us, that we should not dare to give the name of corruptions to those imperfections which give rise to the distinction. And when distress comes to us through their peculiar beauty, by the loss of beloved temporal things passing away, we both pay the penalty of our sins, and are exhorted to set our affection on eternal things.¹⁷²

If the Manichaeans could think in the correct manner about matter, they would also be able to think about God in the correct manner. But as he has pointed out a number of times, Mani had misled his followers by wanting them to believe that what is really good in his

¹⁶⁹ This is not the first time that he has dealt with corruption. For a very similar argument, see *Mor.* II.6.8 and especially II.9.14-15 where he deals with all of the creatures in the Land of Darkness.

¹⁷⁰ *Contra ep. fund.* 40.

¹⁷¹ This is one of Augustine's favourite examples. See also *Gn. adu. Man.* 1.21.32 and *Commentary* 247.6.

¹⁷² *Contra ep. fund.* 41 (CSEL 25,1/247.12-17) "Cuius pulchritudinis ordinem et modos si posset capere sensus noster atque memoria, ita nobis placeret, ut defectus, quibus distinguitur, nec corruptiones uocare auderemus. Quod autem in eius pulchritudinis parte laboramus, cum nos fluentia deserunt temporalia, quae diligimus, et peccatorum poenas luimus et sempiterna diligere commonemur."

description of the Land of Darkness is evil. This could only be shown once he had spent time teaching them what matter was in the first place.

5.4 SUMMARY

Augustine, at the time that he had written *Contra ep. fund.*, was still comfortable using Neoplatonic ideas to teach his audience how to understand the soul and God. From his Manichaean days he had believed that God was some type of fine, material body that was present throughout the world. The belief that everything which existed, including God, was a body had a long history. The West had really no conception of immateriality until people like Ambrose, Simplicius and all those in Milan who were reading and trying to understand the Neoplatonic writings of Plotinus. Augustine was fortunate enough to be in the right place and the right time. This was not an easy thing to understand, as he had stated over and over. These writings set him aflame for the desire to truly understand God and once this understanding came, he realized how much the Manichaeans had wasted years of his life on their materialistic ideas.

Their materialistic ideas came to the forefront of his thought when he came upon a copy of the *Ep. fund.*, a writing that he had heard when he was a Manichaean. Although not the first time he tackled the issue of the ascent of the soul to God, Augustine now had a specific writing to address with which to combat the ideas of Mani directly. Most of his arguments center on the first stage of the ascent -- that of understanding materiality. What it is and what it means to the knowledge of God takes up a large part of this work. For the Manichaeans, matter comes from the Land of Darkness, and thus is seen to be evil. This is an impossibility to Augustine since everything that is created is created by God and therefore is good. To show the Manichaeans how this is so, he begins to take apart the *Ep. fund.* in order to prove that what Mani thought was evil in the Land of Darkness was really good. The main focus of his attack was the border between the two lands; this was also something new in his

arguments. Once this was shown, he teaches them about *creatio de nihilo* in order to show where evil things come from and finally, what corruption is.

Augustine's Neoplatonic learning plays a fundamental role in his arguments with the Manichaeans. This ascent in *Contra ep. fund.* is generally ignored, but it has been shown that it is one of his most important because of the way that he applies this ascent to a Manichaean work. It is also one of his best studies on the nature of materiality. Augustine knew firsthand that without a correct understanding of matter, everything else would be misunderstood. By giving so many examples and counter-examples from the *Ep. fund.*, he had hoped to not only destroy the teaching of Mani but also hoped that the Manichaeans would come to the Catholic Church.

6 CONCLUSIONS

Augustine's *Contra ep. fund.* is an important text in the mass of his writings. The text is often overlooked because it appears from the title that it is wholly an anti-Manichaean work and thus would contain nothing of use except to the Manichaean scholar. It is certainly the case that it is important for the study of Manichaeism since it contains a letter from the hand of Mani which is one of the primary sources for Manichaean cosmogony. But I believe what is even more important is Augustine's response to the letter. Here he makes a detailed argument, using a Neoplatonically-inspired ascent, to show the Manichaeans the correct way to think about the nature of materiality and therefore God. Since the *Contra ep. fund.* is essentially two works in one, this dissertation was also divided into two, plus a commentary (which follows the *Conclusions*).

The *Ep. Fund.* is one of the important primary sources of Manichaean cosmogony. Unfortunately the fragments are only preserved in the works of Augustine and Evodius, none of which contain the complete text. The absence of a whole text has led to a varied discussion on what the *Ep. fund.* might be. The examination of the various possibilities showed that it is in all probability just what the title suggests: it is a genuine epistle of Mani's which later, by the time of Augustine, had gained more importance. This is shown by its reading during the Bema Festival. It was also speculated that this work might have even become a work of canonical status by the eleventh century (as found in the Arabic sources), if we may take the title "*The Foundation and the Dawn of Truth*" as being the *Ep. fund.* under another name. These results, however, have shown what it cannot be: it is not the *Living Gospel*, the *Picture Book* or the text to the *Picture Book*, nor is it the *Precepts for the Hearers and the Elect*.

What kind of Manichaean he was and how much Augustine knew of Manichaean cosmogony both as a hearer as well as later as a Catholic was then examined, using the *Ep. fund.* and the Manichaean idea of the Third Time to help distinguish what he had learned when he was a Manichaean and what he had learned later as a Catholic bishop. This is an

important issue since there are two main positions taken by scholars: Augustine was either a knowledgeable Manichaean hearer and was an expert in Manichaeism; or Augustine was certainly knowledgeable, but he was not an expert. Even though he is an important witness, the results showed that he knew some things about Manichaeism, but because of his status as a hearer he could not have been an expert (he himself even admitted to Honoratus that he wasn't even a good hearer). After examining his comments on Manichaean cosmogony, it appears that Augustine had learned more of Manichaean cosmogony after he had left the religion, especially regarding the Manichaean idea of the End Time. He did not mention the Third Time until *C. Adim.*, but it was only after he had the *Ep. fund.* that he really began to mention the Third Time. This chapter revealed how important it is to deeply examine his comments in order to determine not only what he knew as a Manichaean hearer, but also what he had learned after he had left them.

Augustine's investigation into the *Ep. fund.* was then examined. He makes a two pronged attack, which, as stated, cannot be seen as two separate attacks. He does not use a single citation from the Bible when he is discussing the ascent (from chapter thirteen through twenty two). Thus his use of biblical citations was examined separately from the rest of his Neoplatonic attack on Manichaean cosmogony. The majority of the few direct citations he uses (only fourteen) are from the Gospel of John, at least in terms of the number of non-consecutive citations from a single book. Most of these are used against the idea that Mani was an apostle of Jesus. Here too he will quote a very large section from Acts 1 and 2 to show exactly, from scripture, when the Holy Spirit was sent in order to show the Manichaeans that Mani cannot be this Holy Spirit. The most important use of direct citations are Rom. 11.36, Mal. 4.2 and John 1.9, and at the very beginning of chapter one and two and then Mt. 5.8 at the end. These citations all deal with a common theme that is found throughout the *Contra ep. fund.*: God created all things good and to understand this, the soul must be

cleansed and must have help from Christ. He also uses some allusions to biblical material, found scattered throughout the work, except for chapters thirteen through twenty two.

Another aspect (and probably more important than how he used the texts) looked at was the texts themselves. Augustine and Jerome made it clear that there were many different Latin translations of scripture. Augustine's use of many variations, sometimes in the same work, showed that he was also guilty of creating his own. It was shown that Augustine did not use the Vulgate for his work in the *Contra ep. fund.* There are a few direct textual matches, but since there is overwhelming proof that the rest did not come from any possible work of Jerome's, these show more of a common manuscript family which was shared around the Mediterranean. If anything, the evidence showed that Augustine rejected the translations of Jerome, especially when parallel texts could be found between Augustine's *Contra ep. fund.*, his *Ex. Gal.* and Jerome's *Commentary on Galatians*. This must have also been the case with any of Jerome's Old Testament translations since Augustine disagreed with Jerome for translating from the Hebrew into Latin instead of using the Greek Septuagint.

It was also found that, in general, Augustine's texts are more African than anything else, especially in his citations from Acts. This is even more the case when they are compared to Cyprian's, where the text from *Contra ep. fund.* is more similar to Cyprian than with the text of Acts found in *C. Fel.* Most of Augustine's writings were very popular and underwent a "vulgarizing" process when they were translated, but the *Contra ep. fund.* escaped this. The results also show that Augustine did not use one particular manuscript family for his scriptural citations. This is sometimes frustrating for the modern scholar when trying to peel away the layers of what he might have been using. But he did not have a standard Latin bible to use, thus he either used whatever translation he felt was the best or possible altered the texts when he felt they needed it. The examination of his scriptural citations show this point very well.

The last chapter dealt with the primary argument against the Manichaeans: Mani used his imagination to create the Land of Light and the Land of Darkness and thereby

misunderstood the nature of materiality. To counter this, Augustine uses a Neoplatonically-inspired ascent teaching, a technique that he had used before, especially in *Quant.* and *Uera rel.* There are two ascents in the *Contra ep. fund.* The first is a mini-ascent which outlines the rest of the work. The second is a full scale ascent, beginning with the nature of matter, the soul, the memory and finally God. He focuses mainly on the nature of materiality, which is the foundation on which the rest of his ascent will build. From his discussions of the materiality of the Land of Darkness, Augustine showed the Manichaeans that God created matter *de nihilo*, and not from the pre-existing matter as found in Mani's Land of Darkness. Thus he struck at the major point of Manichaean religion: the division between the Land of Light and the Darkness.

This mix of the Neoplatonic ascent and the Christian idea of *creatio de nihilo* had a profound effect on Augustine. It would be difficult to guess how important the Neoplatonic ideas would have been to him if he had not been a Manichaean first. The materialistic notions of God, as found in the Manichaean teachings, spurred him on to understand God the way that Simplicius and Ambrose had understood Him. There can be no doubt that Augustine was highly influenced, albeit in a negative way, by the Manichaeans. This is especially clear in *Contra ep. fund.* That they had wasted at least nine years of his life with their materialistic ideas was his greatest regret of spending that time with them and he spared no effort in showing his frustration with them at that wasted time. But he also used his frustration to show, by way of the *Ep. fund.*, his clearest teaching yet of how the Manichaeans could escape the illusions of Mani and hopefully to come into the Catholic fold.

Augustine's anti-Manichaean writings are all very important in understanding the history of his thought. But because they are often overlooked, either because they are thought to contain interest only to Manichaean scholars or because they are thought to be primarily polemical, important issues are overlooked. Augustine's use of the Neoplatonic ascent in the

Contra ep. fund. is one such example. It has been thought that he stopped using these ascents sometime soon after he had become a priest and, ironically, when he had begun to focus on the Manichaeans. But the existence of the ascent in *Contra ep. fund.* has shown this is not the case. His anti-Manichaean works are not just polemical and deserve to be studied since they clearly contributed significantly to the development of his theological thought. It is true that these Manichaeans were a constant source of annoyance in his life, but they also proved to be the motivating factor for him to reach further than he might have if he had never joined them in the first place.

7 COMMENTARY

All abbreviations follow A. D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, 1999), pp. xxxv-xlii. I have chosen to use *Contra ep. fund.* instead of *C. ep. Man.* to make the distinction between this work and the Manichaean *Epistula Fundamenti* (*Ep. fund.*) clearer. I have also chosen to separate the *Mor. Eccl.* and *Mor. Man.* into *Mor. I* and *Mor. II*, instead of just using *Mor.*, in accordance with Coyle (1978, 77) “...and we have to avoid thinking of *Mor. I-II* as a single work, written all together within a short time-period in unchanging circumstances.” The Latin is taken from CSEL 25,1. The numbers refer to the page in CSEL, followed by the line number.

Chapter One

193.2 **contra Epistulam quam uocant Fundamenti** Augustine seems to be using sarcasm with his use of *uocant*. He uses this phrase again in 217.14. For the Manichaeans, this letter contains the principles of their faith (*C. Fort.* I.1 [CSEL 25,1/84.9-10]), but for Augustine, it is anything but. This is also the first time that Augustine had specifically used the title of this work; see also *Commentary* 197.6. Although the surviving fragments of this letter are found in the writings of Augustine and his pupil and later bishop of Uzalis, Evodius (*C. Manich.* in CSEL 25,2/951-975) there is another mention of a writing, possibly called the *Foundation* found in the *Kephalaia of the Wisdom of My Lord Mani* (Giversen 1986, p.212, lines 12-14; and see plate 325,5 and 13). Gardner (2001, 103) reconstructs these fragmentary lines as: “Take my great Gospel, [my letter of] foundation; and the letter that I have [sealed; together] with my tunic.” See Chapter Two of the dissertation for more details. As mentioned there, it is improbable that this *Gospel* is the *Foundation*. It does show, however, the existence of a *Foundation* outside of Augustine and Evodius (assuming they are the same work). There is also evidence that this letter might have survived in the source that Al Nadim had access to when he wrote his *Fihrist*, Chapter Nine (Dodge, 1970, 799). Here there are two possible options: *The Two Sources* and *The Letter of Futtuq, a Long One*, which is similar to a title of

Mani's as given by Julian in *C. Iul. imp.* 5.25 (PL 45/1462) "Dicit etiam Manichaeus ad Patricium..." Despite the importance of this letter for Augustine, there is very little mention made of it outside of Augustine's writings. See Chapter Two of the dissertation for a more detailed discussion.

193.4 **omnipotentem** It is important for Augustine to begin this work calling God the "one true omnipotent God," since he is omnipotent and therefore has made everything, and has made it all good. The use of this adjective for God is very common in Augustine's works and as a whole, he makes use of it more than any other late Latin antique writer (he uses it sixty three times in all of his writings), followed by Gregory the Great (twenty times), Ambrose (fourteen times) and Marius Victorinus (seven times) (CETEDOC). His use of this is no doubt in response to his belief that the Manichaean God was not omnipotent. Arguing against the idea is a constant theme in his anti-Manichaean works. See *C. Fort.* I.1 (CSEL 25,1/83.11), *Agon.* 4.4 (CSEL 41/105.4). One of his earliest and clearest statements on the omnipotence of God is found in *Lib. arb.* I.2.5 (CCL 29/213.23-30) "Optime namque de deo existimare uerissimum est pietatis exordium nec quisquam de illo optime existimat, qui non eum omnipotentem atque ex nulla particula commutabilem credit, bonorum etiam omnium creatorem..." See also Cooper (1984, 102) for the six definitions on Augustine's idea of God. He is: immutable, creative, the source of truth, eternal, all Good, and provident.

193.5 **rogaui et rogo** Augustine is the only Latin writer to use this exact phrase (CETEDOC). The use of the perfect as well as the present shows that this was an issue that Augustine had dealt with not only in *Contra ep. fund.*, but in his earlier writings. See also *Util. cred.* 1 (CSEL 25,1/4.2); *ep.* 166 (CSEL 44/545.7); *ep.* 217 (CSEL 57/403.4).

193.6 **haeresi uestra** Augustine on many occasions refers to the Manichaean religion as a heresy: *Mor.* II 2.2 (CSEL 90,7/89.5), 8.11 (CSEL 90,7/96.14-19) and especially *Gn. adu. Man.* II 25.38 (CSEL 91/163.13) where he uses 1 Cor. 11.19 against them: "Nam oportet, inquit, etiam haereses esse, ut probati manifest fiant inter uos." In the same paragraph

Augustine defines a heresy: all heretics deceive with the promise of knowledge and belittle those who believe. See also *Haer.* 46 (CCL 46) for his description.

193.6 **uos fortasse imprudentius quam malitiosius adhaesistis** This is a curious statement coming from a man who probably played a pivotal role in ridding North Africa of its Manichaean Christians. Augustine's whole Manichaean argument is for the sole purpose of bringing them into the Catholic fold, and his tone here is pastoral. He genuinely seems to want to help the Manichaeans and his role as a bishop/priest is never forgotten. Gibb and Montgomery (1927, xxxii-xxxiii), in their introduction to the *Conf.*, believe that Augustine's gentleness in dealing with the Manichaeans was rare in theological controversies and was due to the fact that he himself had been a Manichaean. The same tone can be found in *Conf.* 9.4.8-11 where Augustine seems to be directing his comments to a Manichaean audience (Kotzé, 2001, 125). I would not, however, go so far as Burns (1988, 22) who states that Augustine was "generally sympathetic to the Manichees because of their inability to perceive the true nature of evil." As will be shown, his pastoral tone will not remain for very long. He also says something similar to the Manichaeans in *C. Fel.* II.7 (CSEL 25,2/834.24-26) when he implies they are confused: "Ut enim purgetur inde, dicitis -- quod audire nefas est, sed ad uos confundendos et forte saluandos, tacere non possumus."

193.7 **det mihi** Asking for God's help is a very common beginning in Augustine's works. The first occurrence is found in *C. Acad.* 2.1.19-28 (CCL 29/18.17-26) "in primis diuinum auxilium omni deuotione atque pietate implorandum est." See also *C. Faust.* 1.1 (CSEL 25,1/251.12). O'Donnell (1992, vol. I, 13) examines the phrase "da mihi" and finds that Augustine uses this when only God can give what Augustine is looking for (1992, vol. I, 14). Asking God's help was a well known literary device from Plato's *Tim.* 27c4 through the Neoplatonic authors (Van der Horst [1974, 59, n. 218]).

193.8 **uestra correctione...** *Correctio*, like *emendatio* is part of Augustine's vocabulary of coercion—but unlike *cohercitio*, these words imply a corrective and positive treatment (Brown, 1972, 275).

193.10 **per suos servos** Augustine uses this term to signify a select group of Christians, as opposed to his use of this phrase in his earlier writings whereby it signified all Christians (Van der Lof, 1981, 47). He is also undoubtedly referring to himself as one of these servants: see *Conf.* 3.10.18 (CCL 27/37.1-2) “Haec ego nesciens inridebam illos sanctos servos et prophetas tuos.” See also *Commentary* 194.8 for the use of *servum domini*. For an excellent survey of the *servus dei*, see Brown (1969, 132-137) as well as Van der Lof (1981, 43-59). For the ascetical connotations of this phrase, see Lawless (1987, 13, 45, 55).

193.11 **Emendandos** For a similar statement given by Augustine just before writing *Contra ep. fund.*, see *Lib. arb.* 3.23.68 (CCL 29/315.39-43).

193.13 **uindicatur** This is a very important concept in *Contra ep. fund.* Punishment is something that is given in accordance with the order of things and for Augustine there are two kinds of evil, sin (or the deliberate choice to move away from God) and punishment, given by God justly to those who do move away (Babcock, 1988, 31). In *Gn. adu. Man.* 2.9.12 (CSEL 91/133.35-37) Augustine states that by punishment, the soul “will learn by experience the difference between the good which it abandoned and the evil into which it has fallen.”

193.15 **sed ad medicinam ualere credendum est** Augustine, as a bishop, is always looking for the healing of his listeners. In most cases the mention of *medicina* is tied with the idea of Christ being the physician and this *medicina* cures the “sickness” of not being able to see things in a spiritual way. It is a common phrase in Augustine's writings: see *Mor.* I 30.62 (CSEL 90,7/65.14-66.4) and *Agon.* 11.12 “O medicinam!” (CSEL 41/116.10). For Christ the Physician, see *Commentary* 195.6. On this term see also Coyle (1999, 135-58). Cicero had a similar idea; he believed that philosophy is the medicine to be applied to sick souls (*Tusc. Disp.* 4.27) and for Augustine's knowledge of the *Tusc. Disp.*, see Hagendahl (1967, vol. 2,

510-516), who states that Augustine uses Cicero's quotes all throughout his writings (510-511); see also Colish (1983, 44). On Augustine's use of the classical authors, see Courcelle (1969, 149-223) and O'Donnell (1980, 144-175), who looks at when Augustine used these authors.

193.16 **...sicut ignis et uenenum et morbus et cetera huiusmodi** The compiled list shows how the justice of God works, regardless of whether these seem to be punishments/rewards to humans. In *C. Acad.* 3.6.13.13 (CCL 29/42.11) Augustine argues that corporeal things are really the source of humankind's problems: "Sunt enim istae imagines, quae consuetudine rerum coproralium per istos, quibus ad necessaria huius uitae utimur, sensus nos, etiam cum ueritas tenetur et quasi habetur in manibus." Although he does not say it directly in this work, Augustine makes it clear that punishments would not occur if humankind did not love the things that can be lost. He states this clearly in *Lib. arb.* 1.15.33 (CCL 29/234.79-81) "Uides ergo etiam illud, quod poena non esset, siue quae per iniuriam siue quae per talem uindictam infertur hominibus, si eas res quae inuito auferri possunt non amarent."

194.3 **summa dei iustitia** The punishment of the wicked is part of the order of things. Sin occurs when mankind violates this order. In *Ord.* 2.7 (CCL 29/118.39-45) Augustine gives the definition of this justice of God: "...memini te dixisse hanc esse iustitiam dei, qua separat inter bonos et malos et sua cuique tribuit. Nam est, quantum sentio, manifestior iustitiae definitio; itaque respondeas uelim, utrum tibi uideatur aliquando deum non fuisse iustum." He repeats this again in *Uera rel.* 48.93 (CCL 32/248.1-5). It is possible that Augustine received this idea through his Neoplatonic readings, especially *Ennead* 4.3.16 (MacKenna, 150) which states "The punishment justly overtaking the wicked must therefore be ascribed to the kosmic (*sic*) order which leads all in accordance with the right."

194.6 **contentione et aemulatione** See Rom. 13.13. This is part of the text that Augustine cites which caused him to have his conversion experience (see *Conf.* 8.12.29). On the

importance of this citation, see Lawless (1987, 21-23) who points out the frequent complaints of quarrels and jealousy in Augustine's church.

Chapter Two

Augustine's comments here are reminiscent of what he will say in *Conf.* 4.1.1 "Let the proud laugh at me, and those who have not yet been savingly cast down and stricken by thee, O my God." Portalié (1960, 23-24) believes this chapter shows the paternal side of Augustine, but I think Augustine is rather pointing out his own personal difficulties in getting back on the right track to God.

194.13 **uerum** The search for the truth had been a constant effort for Augustine throughout his life, and this truth is not only the idea of the true, but also the Truth, the person of Christ.

He earlier talks about his desire for truth in *C. Acad.* 3.20.43 "ita enim iam sum affectus, ut quid sit uerum, non credendo solum, sed etiam intelligendo apprehendere impatienter desiderem..." The real truth can only come from the Catholic church. See also *Uera rel.*

10.20 (CCL 32/200.38-42) "Quae uera esse perspexeris tene et ecclesiae catholicae tribue, quae falsa respue et mihi qui homo sum ignosce, quae dubia crede, donec aut respuenda esse aut uera esse aut semper credenda esse uel ratio doceat uel praecipiat auctoritas." On the nature of truth in Augustine, see Allen (Cambridge, Mass, 1993) and Johnson (1972, 25-53).

194.15 **qui nesciunt, quam rarum et arduum** Augustine makes it very clear throughout the ten years of writing up to *Contra ep. fund.* that it is extremely difficult and rare for people to understand and overcome the fantasies that the mind creates. See *C. Acad.* 2.1.1 (CCL 29/18.6-13) for his earliest statement on this issue and also *ep.* 1 (CSEL 34/1.9-11) where he discusses how difficult it is to understand the Platonic idea of the immateriality of the soul. Augustine's division between the few who can understand this and the majority who cannot resembles the beliefs of the Academics as well (Foley, 1999, 66).

194.16 **carnalia phantasmata** The misuse of corporeal things which leads to many problems for humankind is another common idea that runs throughout Augustine's writings.

See (among many) *Mor.* I.21.38 (CSEL 90,7/42.19-43.2, 43.8-44.1) where Augustine talks about the formation of the imagination which is caused by material objects. The Manichaeans, according to Augustine, were plagued by their carnal fantasies which were the result of looking at things carnally, instead of spiritually. See also *Gn. adu. Man.* II.7.8 (CSEL 91/127.7-9). But looking at things in a spiritual manner was not an easy task, as seen above. Augustine later admits that it was these fleshly fantasies that were holding him back from discovering the true nature of God: *Conf.* 6.3.4 (CCL 27/76.41).

On the three uses of *phantasmata* in Augustine's writings, O'Donnell (1992, vol. II, 181) singles out the *Contra ep. fund.* The first use is that the Manichaeans believed the body of Jesus was an illusion; the second was that the Manichaean God was of their own imagination and the third, "particularly in *Contra ep. fund.*, he applied the term broadly to Manichaean doctrines: 18.20, 19.21, 32.35, 36.41, 43.49." Augustine is also deeply indebted to the Platonists who taught him that God was immaterial. See Chapter Five for more details.

The following section (194.17-24) is reminiscent of Ambrose's *Hexameron* (*Hex.*). Ambrose gave these homilies on the days of creation during Easter 387, the same time that Augustine was being baptized by Ambrose and therefore it is likely that he would have heard these homilies (see *Commentary* 194.7 for what Augustine might have heard from Ambrose). In *Hex.* 4.1.1 (PL 14/187) Ambrose tells his listeners "Sol incipit, emunda oculos mentis, o homo, animique interiores obtutus..." Augustine mentions the eye of the interior man in 194.17. In 4.1.2 Ambrose then discusses the physical sun and warns his listeners not to put "trust in the sun" but use it to recognize its Author. Augustine does the same in 194.18. Ambrose then asks his listeners to compare the sun to the Sun of Justice (*sol iustitiae*), found in Mal. 4.2, which Augustine uses in 194.21. Ambrose soon follows this with a quote from John 1.9. Augustine's order of these verses is reversed. But there are enough similarities to show that Augustine might have been remembering the homilies of Ambrose and using this

same information against the Manichaeans. See Chapter Four on Augustine's use of scripture.

194.17 **oculus interioris hominis** The parallel between seeing with the physical eye and the eye of the mind is a common thought in Augustine's writings (Teske 1986, 267 n. 39). It is through this interior eye that mankind can understand God and he mentions this phrase thirteen times in all (CETEDOC). He states this in *Conf.* 3.6.11 (CCL 27/33.57-58) "Tu autem eras interior intimo meo et superior summo meo." Through this introspection it is possible to find the existence of God, although not His nature (Rist, 1994, 88-9). There are a number of possible sources for this idea in the writings of Augustine. Ambrose is one, since he uses this phrase six times. For example, see Ambrose's *Expositio euangelii secundum Lucam* 7 (CCL 14/242. 855) "sapientia in capite, actus in manibus; oculi enim sapientis in capite eius, quia ille uere sapit cuius animus in christo est et cuius interior oculus erigitur ad superna. Et ideo sapientis oculi eius in capite ipsius, stulti autem in calcaneo" and *de Isaac* 3.8 (PL 14/506). See also his *On Mysteries* 8.44 (PL 16/403) "Nunc illud consideremus, ne quis forte uisibilia uideas (quoniam quae sunt inuisibilia, non uidentur, nec possunt humanis oculis comprehendi)." It is also found in the writings of Paulinus of Nola (*ep.* 41 in CSEL 29/358.4), another friend of Ambrose and Augustine. There are two other possibilities, the writings of Paul and that of Plotinus, especially *Enn.* 5.8. Augustine has probably adapted both of these sources (O'Connell, 1963a, 133-135 and Russell, 1981, 162). See also Mandouze (1968, 476-8) on the works of Ambrose that Augustine might have read. He lists *de Iacob*, *Uita beata*, and the *Hexameron*; and Courcelle (1968, 93-139). And in an excellent survey of this idea in Augustine, see Portalié (1960, 109).

194.18 **solem suum--non istum, quem colitis caelesti corpore, oculis carneis** The so-called worship of the sun was a contentious issue for Augustine. Brown (1969, 56) believes that the Manichaean "might appear to worship the Sun, like a pagan. A pagan however, would have felt himself far below the Sun. A Manichee would have seen in the sun nothing

less than the visible brilliance of a part of himself.” Harnack (1911, 574) and before him Beausobre (1739, 583-613 and 703) also believe that the Manichaeans did not worship the sun or the moon, as noted by Coyle (1978, 356). However, the Manichaean texts themselves show much ambiguity on this matter (Coyle 1978, 355-359). There are many references in Augustine for “evidence” of this sun worship, the most important of which are *B. uita* 1.4 (CCL 29/66.81-85), *Mor.* II.8.13 (CSEL 90,7/99.15-16); *S. Dom. mon.* 1.23.79 (CCL 35/88.1921-89.1935); *Conf.* 3.6.10 (CCL 27/31.14-32.24); and *C. Faust.* 16.10 (CSEL 25,1/448.26-449.9). Augustine is not the only one to accuse the Manichaeans of sun worship. Pope Leo in Letter 15.4 (in Schipper and Van Oort [2000, 58-59]) states that the Manichaeans fast mournfully on Sunday in order to worship the sun. See also Leo’s *s.* 34,4 (CCL 138) and *s.* 42, 5 (CCL 138A).

Faustus the Manichaean bishop admits (in *C. Faust.* 14.1 [CSEL 25,1/403.10-14]) and *C. Faust.* 20.1 [CSEL 25,1/535.23-536.8]) that they do homage to the divine luminary. In fact, in *C. Faust.* 20.2 (CSEL 25,1/536.9-537.2) Faustus believes that the power of God (that is, Christ) dwells in the sun. Augustine finally states in *C. Faust.* 20.5 (CSEL 25,1/539.27-540.4) that the Manichaeans do not “properly worship the sun, though he carries your prayers with him in his course round the heavens” (unde uos uerius dixerim nec solem istum colere, ad cuius gyrum uestra oratio circumuoluitur). Van der Horst (1974, 57), in his examination of Alexander of Lycopolis, does more justice to Manichaeism by stating “The sun and the moon they honour most of all, not as gods (οὐχ ὡς Θεοῦς) but as the means by which it is possible to attain God.”

Augustine probably took this idea from Plotinus. In the *Ennead* 5.5.7, Plotinus is describing the act of seeing with the physical eyes. But to see things of the mind, another light is needed and this light is not the physical light, but a light from within. For Augustine this light is Christ (see *Commentary* 194.22).

194.22 **erat lumen uerum, quod inluminat omnem hominem uenientem in hunc**

mundum John 1:9. See Chapter Four of the Dissertation for a detailed examination of this as well as the rest of his direct citations.

194.26 **tali errore decepti sunt** Augustine will condemn the whole of the Manichaean religion as a great error in *Mor.* I 35.77 (CSEL 90,7/82.4-5); *Gn. adu. Man.* 1.1 (CSEL 91/67.1-5) and *C. Faust.* 5.6 (CSEL 25,1/278.9).

Chapter Three

O'Donnell is correct in saying that in Chapter Three of the *Contra ep. fund.* there is a mini-confession (1992, vol. I, Li).

195.2 **inanes fabulae** These *inanes fabulae* are tales without any meaning or myth, the opposite of history. See *Sol.* 2.11.1 (CSEL 89/70.16-17) where Augustine states “Siquidem est fabula compositum ad utilitatem delectationemue mendacium.” This is also a very common phrase that Augustine uses to describe the Manichaean myth. See (among many) *Lib. arb.* I.2.4 (CCL 29/213.3-8); *Mor.* II. 9.17 (CSEL 90,7/102.16-103.6-20); *ep.* 7 (CSEL 34/15.4-25); *C. Adim.* 16 (CSEL 25,1/163.4); *Cont.* 22 (CSEL 41/167.10-13); *Conf.* 5.10.19 (CCL 27/68.29-43) “rebus fabulosis,” 6.5.7 (CCL 27/77.1-78.7) “multa fabulosissima et absurdissima”; *C. Faust.* 5.4 (CSEL 25,1/274.21-275.2); and *ep.* 140.36 (CSEL 44/231.13).

195.3 **uanas imaginationes** These *uanas imaginationes* are intimately tied with the *fabulae* directly above, and are either the ideas of the Manichaeans or refer to the images received from the senses. According to Augustine the main reason he was not a Catholic before was that he could not conceive of God in any other way but material. The senses are to be blamed (as well as the Manichaean teachings) for this. See *C. Acad.* 3.6.13 (CCL 29/42.11).

Manichaean cosmogony falls under this category early in Augustine's writings. See also *Mor.* I 17.32 (CSEL 90,7/37.8-12) and *Mor.* II 16.38 (CSEL 90,7/122.14-123.2) “...corporeis imaginibus...” Later in his debate with Felix (*C. Fel.* 2.3 (CSEL 25,2/831.7-25)) Augustine

states that Mani brought another nature against God, not by solid truth but by *inanes phantasmata*.

195.6 clementissimo medico The imagery of Christ the physician is a common one in Augustine (Van Fleteren 1973, 40) and is borrowed from his Manichaean days (Coyle 2001, 54 and n. 64). This is what he has in mind when he mentions healing in *Contra ep. fund.* 1 (CSEL 25,1/193.15). Coyle (1978, 391) also uses this citation from the *Contra ep. fund.* in his discussion of the idea of Mani as the physician. This title is applied to other Manichaean celestial deities such as Jesus the Splendour, Jesus the Saviour, as well as for Mani (Coyle, 1999, 143). See also van Tongerloo (2000, 613-621) who lists various Manichaean texts where Mani and other Manichaean deities are referred to as a physicians. This title was common in Christian circles as well: see Ambrose, *Expositio in euang. Luc.* VII, 207 (CSEL 32,4/375.15) (as pointed out by Coyle [1978, 391]) and *Hex.* 6.8.50 where Christ is the “good physician of souls.” Mani also alludes to himself as a physician in the *Acta Archelai* 15.14 (Vermes 2001, 62) who is responsible for cutting out the bad parts of the New Testament. Jerome is the only other Late Antique writer to use this particular phrase (*Commentary on Ezekiel* 2.7 [CCL 75/72.608]).

195.7 ut incommutabilis et immaculabilis O'Donnell (1992, vol. 2, 394) states that “the immutability of God (as found in *Conf.* 7.1.1) can scarcely be called a Christian doctrine, in so far as there is little explicit Christian scripture to warrant such an assertion.” Augustine states in *Ciu. Dei.* 8.6 that the Platonists are responsible for teaching him to see the link between immutability and the absence of any type of body with God (O'Donnell, vol. II, 394). See also Gilson (1959, 22). Augustine is also the first writer to use *incommutabilitas/incommutabiliter* (O'Donnell 1992, vol. 2, 395). See also *Nat. b.* 19 (CSEL 25,1/863.3,5).

195.7 substantia For Augustine, *substantia* can be used interchangeably with *natura* and *essentia*: see *Mor.* II. 2.2 (CSEL 90,7/89.19-90.1). Moon (1955, 114) states that Augustine

uses *natura* in the *Nat. b.* in order not to “be misunderstood” by the Manichaeans, but Augustine had no hesitation in using *substantia* here. The *Ep. fund.* uses both *natura* (12 [208.25]) and *substantia* (13 [209.12]).

195.8 **diuinis libris** The *diuinis libris* are the Christian scriptures that were known to Augustine. It is not clear whether or not Augustine knew of the “canon” of Manichaean writings since he never mentions them as such. For a discussion of Augustine’s knowledge of the canonical scriptures, see O’Donnell (1999, 100). Augustine gives a list of the Catholic canonical books in his *Doc. Chr.* 2.8.12-2.9.14 (CCL 32). As shown, the divine books are the supreme source of authority. See also *Nat. et gr.* 61.71 (PL 44, 282) “Only to the canonical writings do I owe consent without any hesitation.”

195.9 **omnia illa figmenta** See *Commentary* 195.2 on Augustine’s comments on *inanes fabulae* of the Manichaeans which are very similar to these *figmenta* which are always in relation to physical objects. See *Uera rel.* 10.18 (CCL 32/199.7-12) “Phantasmata porro nihil sunt aliud quam de specie corporis corporeo sensu attracta figmenta.” In *Conf.* 4.15.27 (CCL 27/53.51-52) Augustine states that when he wrote *On the Beautiful and the Fitting*, he was “uoluens apud me corporalia figmenta.” For direct statements on Manichaean *figmenta* in their cosmogony, see *Conf.* 6.3.4 (CCL 27/76.41-50) “sed contra carnalium cogitationum figmenta latrasse”; *C. Faust.* 5.7 (CSEL 25,1/279.8-24) and 32.20 (CSEL 25,1/781.22-782.14).

195.9 **consuetudine implicatos** This *consuetudo* is acquired/learned, and not to be thought of as something as given by nature. For his clearest statement on this see *Conf.* 8.5.12 (CCL 27/121.50-52) “Lex enim peccati est uiolentia consuetudinis, qua trahitur et tenetur etiam inuitus animus eo merito, quo in eam uolens inlabitur.” On this and the Manichaeans, see *Mor.* II 9.18 (CSEL 90,7/104.10-13) “Quis hunc diutius tolerare possit errorem, nisi qui aut ista non uidet, aut nescio qua incredibili consuetudine ac familiaritate uobiscum contra omnes moles rationis obduruit.” See also *Uera rel.* 9.16 (CCL 32/198.9-10) and *C. Fel.* II.8 (CSEL

25,2/836.30). Augustine was not the first to discuss *consuetudo*, but he was the first to link it heavily with free will (Rist, 1994, 176). And Augustine's statement is reminiscent of Cicero, who in his *Tusc. Disp.* I.16 also discusses how difficult it is to overcome the force of habit: "Nihil enim animo videre poterant, ad oculos omnia referebant. Magni autem est ingenii seuocare mentem a sensibus et cogitationem ab consuetudine abducere" as well as in *Nat. Deo.* 2.17.45, where Balbus, the Stoic states "nihil est difficulius a consuetudine oculorum aciem mentis abducere." On Augustine's knowledge of the *Tusc. Disp.*, see *Commentary* 193.15 and of *Nat. Deo*, see Hagendahl (1967, 96-110 and 517-522). See also Zumkeller (1994, 1:1253-66).

195.12 **persuasi** Augustine was probably thinking of his own persuasiveness in getting many of his friends to join Manichaeism. He mentioned Romanianus in *C. Acad.* 1.1.3.74 (CCL 29/5.73-4), Alypius in *Conf.* 5.6.7 (CCL 27/82.49-54), Verecundus and Nebridius in *Conf.* 9.3.6 (CCL 27/135.19-26). Brown (1969, 54) discusses the conversion of Romanianus and Alypius to Manichaeism. Augustine also helped to persuade his friend Honoratus (see *Util. cred.*) to join him in his new-found religion. It is also highly likely that his son, Adeodatus (372-389) was also brought up as a Manichaean, since it seems unlikely that Augustine the Manichaean would allow his son to be anything but a Manichaean himself. For an excellent survey of the Manichaean debating skills, see Lim (1995, 16-30) and Vermes, et. al., (2001, 24-31).

195.15 **cum in uestro dogmate rabiosus et caecus errarem** This is referring to his "nine" years with the Manichaeans, which he mentions in 206.8. Augustine was born in Nov. 354. He joined Manichaeism at the age of nineteen (in 373). According to him, he stayed nine years (till 382). But his appointment as the rhetor of Milan was not until autumn 384, and he states that he got this position because of his Manichaean connections. According to this calculation, Augustine was probably a Manichaean for at least eleven years and it still took him a while to reject Manichaeism after this, so we must nudge the date closer to twelve.

This agrees with Colish (1983, 27) who correctly states that Augustine was still a Manichaean up to and during part of the time he became involved in the Academics. Courcelle (1968, 78) was one of the first to discuss these discrepancies in Augustine's account; he believes it to be closer to ten. For a discussion of his years as a Manichaean, see Ferrari (1975, 210-216), who believes it was ten years. For other statements on his nine years, see *Mor.* I 18. 34 (CSEL 90,7/39.8-10); *Util. cred.* I.2 (CSEL 25,1/4.14-16); *Conf.* 3.11.20 (CCL 27/38.32-33) and 4.1.1 (CCL 27/40.1-12).

195.20 **Nemo...inuenisse ueritatem** Here Augustine gives us his blueprint for the entire work -- both sides are not to assume anything and in this way they will be able to find the truth together. It is an interesting tactic and shows how well the Manichaeans could argue their point. He is doing this for the benefit of his audience: not only the Manichaeans but Catholic Christians as well and if he can show that the foundation of Manichaean belief is rotten, then the superstructure above it can easily be collapsed. See a discussion in the *Introduction* to the dissertation on the intended audience. Despite this statement here, he begins below with stating the "Catholic Truth." Augustine also gives the same argument given to Honoratus, another Manichaean, in *Util. cred.* 7.16 (CSEL 25,1/20.13-15) "At enim apud paucos quosdam est ueritas. Scis ergo iam quae sit, si scis, apud quos sit. Nonne dixeram paulo ante, ut quasi rudes quaereremus" as well as to Secundinus in *C. Sec.* 2 (CSEL 25,2/908.2-5).

196.1 **ut uobiscum non orem** Organized prayers were very important to the Manichaeans. For the best example of Manichaean prayers see the Manichaean *Psalm Book* II (Allberry, 1938), hereafter *PB* II. See also de Blois (2000, 49-54). Augustine mentions their prayers many times. See *Mor.* II 15.36 (CSEL 90,7/1-22) "id est ad Manichaeos per eorum castitatem et orationes et psalmos" and *C. Fort.* I.3 (CSEL 25,1/84.24-85.15) "orationi uestrae interfuerim." See also *C. Faust.* 20.7 for a good discussion of the "simple and pure prayers (simplices et puras orationes) of the Manichaeans." According to Augustine (*C. Fort.* 3

[CSEL 25,1/85.5]), the Manichaeans would face the sun during their *orationem*. The Manichaeans had a canonical work titled “Prayers” (Lieu, 1985, 6).

196.1 **conuenticula** At this point in time the meetings of the Manichaeans were illegal. See *Mor.* II 19.69 (CSEL 90,7/150.5-16) “Et haec erat omnis excusatio impunitatis illorum quod eo tempore quo conuenticula eorum lege publica prohiberentur.” There were a number of laws that outlawed these *conuenticulae*. See *Codex Theodosianus* 16.5.3, decreed March 2, 372 (Kruegeri and Mommsen, 1990, 855) “Ubi cumque Manichaeorum conuentus uel turba huiusmodi repperitur, doctoribus graui censione multatis his quoque qui conueniunt...” and 16.5.7, decreed on May 8, 381 (Kruegeri and Mommsen, 857-8) “Si quis Manichaeus Manichaeae ex die latae dudum legis ac primitus a nostris parentibus... Illud etiam huic adicimus sactioni, ne in conuenticulis oppidorum, ne in urbibus claris consueta feralium mysteriorum sepulcra constituent; a conspectu celecri ciuitate penitus coherceantur...”

196.2 **omnibus rebus ad salutem animae** This is a key concept for Augustine: the salvation of the soul. If what they will be discussing does not fall under this category, then it is a total waste of time for him. His early view of this salvation is found in *Quant.* 3.4 (CSEL 89,1/135.8-13) where the soul’s salvation rests on renunciation of all corporeal things and of the “entire world.” Fortunatus the Manichaean desires the same thing: *C. Fort.* 37 (CSEL 25,1/112.22) “quia et ego animam meam cupio certa fide liberari.”

Chap Four

196.5 **spiritales** Many times in the past Augustine has stated that there are only a few who can understand. See *Ord.* 2.9.26 (CCL 29/121.38-122.20) “Ad quam cognitionem in hac uita peruenire pauci,” and *ep.* 11.2 (CSEL 34/26.9-14). There are two necessary conditions for someone to be spiritual: the first is that this person needs to be in the church and the second is that this person must have an understanding of the incorporeal or spiritual realities of the Neoplatonists (Teske 1989, 351). Augustine himself is one of these spirituals, since he admits that he had read the books of the Platonists and now understands these realities (see *Conf.*

7.20.26 [CCL 27/109.1]). See also *Commentary* 194.15 on the rarity of understanding as well as Chapter Five of the dissertation.

On this next section see Coyle (1978, 152).

196.10 **Tenet consensio populorum atque gentium** This section begins his description on why he is and will remain a Catholic. As he says later in this work, these are the things that the Manichaeans do not possess and therefore he cannot go back to being a Manichaean unless they possess them. The consent of the nations and its spread through the world is an important point for Augustine and is mentioned frequently in his writings. See *Uera rel.* 3.4 (CCL 32/190.51-54) and *C. Faust.* 11.2 (CSEL 25,1/315.19-316.8) “et uidebis in hac re quid ecclesiae catholicae ualeat auctoritas, ‘et tot populorum consensione firmatur.’” The spread of the church is a “prophetic truth”, and is also used against the Donatists (Brown, 1972, 267).

The consensus of the people was also important to Cicero. He states in his *Tusc. Disp.* I.15.35 “Quod si omnium consensus naturae uox est omnesque, qui ubique sunt, consentiunt.” See also his *nat. deo.* 1.43-45.

196.12 **tenet auctoritas** Augustine stresses the authority of the church because soon he must attempt to remove the authority of Mani and his writings. It is a key word in Augustine’s theology and it is used to “crush the infidelity of the unbeliever” (Portalié, 1960, 118). Van Fleteren (1973, 70) also believes that the ideas of authority and reason in Augustine came out of his experience with the Manichaeans. I agree and this is very clear in the *Contra ep. fund.* He also believes that Augustine saw that authority comes as a preparation for reason and with reason one can prepare for the soul ascending to God (70). This pattern is also seen in the *Contra ep. fund.* (a text which Van Fleteren does not discuss). On authority in Augustine’s writings, see *Mor.* I 25.47 (CSEL 90,7/52.16-18) “Unde illud exoritur, quod ab initio satis egimus, nihil in ecclesia catholica salubrius fieri, quam ut rationem praecedat auctoritas.” On authority in Augustine, see Van Fleteren (1973, 33-71), Eno (1981, 133-72), and Lütke (1990, 498-510). However, Cicero held the opposite opinion. In *nat. deo.* 1,9-11 he believes

that authority is often an impediment to those who wish to learn because they stop using their own judgement, and this view is very similar to that of the Manichaeans.

196.12 **miraculis inchoata** Miracles were very important to Augustine since their presence signified the existence of God (Portalié 1960, 118) and were a common feature in Late Antique Christian writers such as Chrysostom, Jerome and Paulinus of Nola (Van der Meer, 1961, 539). Miracles should also remind one of the works of nature and therefore of God (Boyer, 1955, 182). The greatest miracle was the resurrection of Christ. On the use of miracles and the early church, see *Util. cred.* 14.32 (CSEL 25,1/40.13-41.10), 15.33 (CSEL 25,1/41.26-42.2) and especially *Ciu. Dei* 22.8 (CCL 48/815) for a list of some twenty five miracles that took place around Hippo and Uzalis. Augustine, however, was not always certain that miracles had occurred beyond the period of the early church. For example, see *Uera rel.* 25.47 (CCL 32/216.27-217.34) where he states that miracles were not allowed to continue up to his time because it would cause the mind to “always seek visible things.”

196.13 **uetustate firmata** The antiquity of the church gives Augustine a support structure to base his entire theology on. For other comments on the antiquity of the church see *Util. cred.* 14.31 (CSEL 25,1/39.6) “Hoc ergo credidi, ut dixi, famae celebritate, consensione, uetustate robaratae”, and in 14.32 (CSEL 25,1/41.7).

196.13 **tenet ab ipsa sede Petri apostoli...commendauit** Cf. Mt. 16:18. In addition to the authority of the church, the authority of the apostles was also very important to the early church (Van den Brink 1966, 8). Augustine’s list of reasons why he will remain with the Catholic Church continues with the idea of the apostolic succession starting with Peter, which naturally follows all the way up to the ordination of Augustine (see below). He makes a similar statement in *Util. cred.* 17.35 (CSEL 25,1/45.17-46.2). See also *Mor.* I 33.71. In terms of the church at Rome, Augustine recognized its power and authority, although not with total deference (Merdinger 1997, especially 200-206).

196.15 **usque ad praesentem episcopatum successio sacerdotum** The foundation of the church rests on God, Christ, the apostles and finally its bishops (Van den Brink 1966, 11). Augustine is also letting the Manichaeans know that he is to be included in this list, since it is the church that he derives his authority from (O'Donnell 1985, 16). He repeats this statement in *C. Faust.* 11.2 (CSEL 25,1/315.19-316.8) "...usque ad hodiernum diem succedentium sibimet episcoporum serie..."

196.16 **catholicae nomen** The name Catholic was extremely important for Augustine, since by its own definition, the church was universal, that is, it was spread throughout the world. For the same argument see *Uera rel.* 7.12 (CCL 32/196.12-17) "Tenenda est nobis Christiana religio et eius ecclesiae communicatio, quae catholica est et catholica nominatur, non solum a suis, uerum etiam ab omnibus inimicis. Uelint nolint enim ipsi quoque haeretici et schismatum alumni, quando non cum suis, sed cum extraneis loquuntur, catholicam nihil aliud quam catholicam uocant."

196.25 **pollicitatio veritatis** This *pollicitatio veritatis* was a great problem that Augustine had with the Manichaeans, since for him Mani or other Manichaeans promised this truth but never delivered. He sees this as the biggest betrayal in all the years that he spent as a Manichaean striving for wisdom and believing that he was receiving that wisdom. Now he believes that this wisdom was nothing but illusions and this caused him spend all those years in a fruitless search while he could have been in the Catholic Church, learning the real truth. He mentions this in numerous works, and again in 206.25. See also *Mor.* II 17.55 (CSEL 90,7/138.3-4) "ut a uobis, magnis omnino pollicitatoribus rationis atque ueritatis"; *Gn. adu. Man.* 1.1 (CSEL 91/67.1-5), 2.27.41 (CSEL 91/167.7); *Util. cred.* 1.2 (CSEL 25,1/4.19-20); *S. Dom. mon.* 2.24.78 (CCL 35/176.1779-1781); *Diu. qu.* 68 (CCL 44A/174.9-10) "Nonnulli autem haeretici, qui non decipiunt nisi cum scientiam quam non exhibent pollicentur"; *Conf.* 3.6.10 (CCL 27/31.1-14); *C. Faust.* 13.6 (CSEL 25,1/383.22-384.24), 15.5 (CSEL 25,1/424.17-21) and 15.6 (CSEL 25,1/427.3-428.3) "si uero aenigmata esse dicuntur, cur non

fugis adulterum apertam ueritatem, ut inlicitat, promittentem et fabulosa fallacia, quos inllexerit, inludentem.”

Augustine is not the only one who speaks about the Manichaeans proclaiming the truth. See Ephraim, *The Discourses Addressed to Hypatius* in Mitchell (1912, p. cviii) “And if the feeble voice of the teaching is not drowned in (passing through) the innumerable ears of the Hearers, that is to say, is not confused so as to proclaim Error instead of Truth, - for, as they suppose, they proclaim Truth to their Hearers.”

Chapter Five

197.6 Manichaeus This is the first mention of Mani’s name in this work. Its form probably comes from the Syriac *M’ny hy’* meaning the Living Mani (Lieu 1994, 160 and 256 who refers to Schaeder 1927, 88-91). Augustine almost always uses the form “Manichaeus” when discussing the founder of the religion. However, in *Agon.* 28.30 (CSEL 41/130.12-17) he discusses two possible spellings for Mani’s name. The most important discussion on this topic by Augustine can be found in *C. Faust.* 19.22 (CSEL 25,1/520.20-521.4), where he states that in Mani’s own tongue his name was *Manes*, which as he and other have pointed out on numerous occasions, resembles “madness” in Greek. He also states that the Manichaeans believe his name comes from the two Greek words for *manna* and $\chi\epsilon\iota$, which means to pour forth manna. He also repeats this in *Haer.* 46.1. The form *Manichaeus* is also found in the *Kephalaia* (all English translations are from Gardner, 1995. For the citations from the *Kephalaia* [*Keph.*], I will give the main chapters and if applicable, give the page and line numbers from the Coptic found in Böhlig, et. al, 1940). For example, see *Keph.* 2 (17.21) and *PB* II as well as in some other anti-Manichean texts such as Alexander of Lycopolis, *C. Manich. opin.* chapter two (in Brinkmann 1989, 4). On Mani’s name, see also Tubach and Zakeri (2001, 272-286). See also Lieu (1994, 160, 256) for a more detailed study of these texts.

197.6 **Fundamenti epistulam dicitis** This is the third time in any of his previous works where he mentions a specific Manichaean work. The first (if this is indeed its title) is the “*Rule of Manichaeus*” as found in *Mor.* II 20.74 (CSEL 90,7/155.7-9): “*Proposita est uiuendi regula de Manichaei epistola.*” The second in Adimantus in *C. Adim.* It is more important to note that it is the first time that he uses the *Ep. fund.* and after this, he will continue to use it in every anti-Manichaean writing. See *C. Faust.* 21.16 (CSEL 25,1/589.25-590.3); *Nat. b.* 46 (CSEL 25,2/884.26); *C. Fel.* 1.1 (CSEL 25,2/801.10-11); *C. Sec.* 3 (CSEL 25,2/909.19).

197.8 **ubi totum paene, quod creditis, continetur** He uses the second person plural here to indicate that he is still writing to a group of Manichaeans as opposed to just a specific individual. This *totum* is the Manichaean idea of the Three Times and the Two Natures. See *C. Fel.* II.1 (CSEL 25,2/828.23-26) “*Ista enim epistula Fundamenti est, quod et sanctitas tua bene scit, quod et ego dixi, quia ipsa continet initium, medium et finem.*” On the Three Times, see Decret (1970, *passim*). Augustine states that the *Ep. fund.* is a less detailed description (see *Commentary* 224.24 and 229.12). But his information on the Three Times seems to have come from the *Ep. fund.*, since he only mentions the Beginning, Middle and End Time after he had read the *Ep. fund.* See also Decret (1978, vol. 2, 229-230, n. 160).

197.8 **...inluminati dicebamus a uobis** Stothert (1887, repr. 1996, 131) translates this as “For in that unhappy time when we read it” but a more correct translation is “For in that time when it was read to us wretched people.” The passive makes it clear that there was someone reading the letter to them and this would coincide more with the idea of a catechumen or a hearer (See also Van Oort 1991, 80). The Manichaeans believed that after it was read to the hearers they would be considered illuminated, although later we will see that the method used by the *Epistula Fundamenti* was slightly more complicated than just hearing it. No doubt this “illumination” fits well with the idea of knowledge of God in the Manichaean system, and it is possible that this is how the Manichaeans referred to their own religion by calling themselves

the Religion of Light. In *Util. cred.* 1.3 (CSEL 25,1/5.2-18) Augustine mentions that he was thought to be illuminated (*inlustratum*) when he believed the Manichaeans.

The idea of illumination is also found in other Manichaean writings. If the letter to Menoch (*Epistula Manichaei ad Menoch* found in *C. Jul. imp.* 3.172 (CSEL 85,1/473.1) is genuine (see Stein 2002; BeDuhn and Harrison, 2001, especially 162-172), then Mani wrote to Menoch and stated that he hopes that God will illuminate her mind. See also *PB* II 151.29 and 178.28. In *Keph.* 1 the teachings of Mani enlightened the mind of the disciples.

197.10 **Manichaeus apostolus Iesu Christi** This is part of Fragment 1 in Feldmann (1987, 10) and matches the *Ep. fund.* as found in *C. Fel.* 1.1 (CSEL 25,2/801.16-17). It was a very common title used by Mani and indicates that he was well versed in the New Testament literature (Quispel 1975, 236). Mani also used this title in his collection of canonical letters, of which most were unfortunately lost during World War II (Schmidt and Polotsky, 1933, 25 and now Gardner, 2001, 98). Ries (1995, 542) also discusses this passage and shows its similarity with the *Cologne Mani Codex* (*CMC*). For the critical text of the *CMC*, see Koenen and Römer, 1988) and is correct to point out how important it was for Augustine to spend so much of his time on this title of Mani.

This title “sans doute” comes from the original Syriac (Decret 1992, 108). Augustine first mentions that Mani was the apostle of Christ in *Mor.* I 33.72 (CSEL 90,7/77.18-78.1). He also states that every single letter that he has seen begins in with this formula: see *C. Faust.* 13.4 (CSEL 25,1/381.1-5) “Manichaeus enim uester non fuit propheta uenturi Christi...Omnes tamen eius epistulae ita exordiuntur: “Manichaeus apostolus Ieus Christi.” Augustine is not our only source of information regarding Mani being an apostle of Christ. The beginning of Mani’s *Living Gospel* (Chapter 66.1, p. 53) in the *CMC* contains this title, which corresponds to Paul’s title: “I, Mani, Apostle of Jesus Christ, through the will of God, the Father of Truth (διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ).” This is mentioned again in *CMC* 68-69. On the will of God and Mani in the *CMC*, see Koenen (1990, 30). Here Koenen believes that the

phrase ‘will of God’ “clusters around Mani’s incarnation and his deeds of salvation” (30). In *CMC* 19.8 and 69.9 Mani also states that God sent the Syzygos to Mani by God’s own good will (εὐδόκησεν).

This title also appears in the anti-Manichaean work *Acta Archelai* 5.1 and 15.1 (Vermes 2001, 41 and n. 14 and 59) and *MI7* (Boyce 1975, 33). There are also many texts that describe the apostleship of Mani, although none of these specifically state that he is an apostle “of Jesus Christ.” For example, Mani is called the Apostle all throughout the *Keph.*; see *Keph.* 1 (9,11-16, 31); *PB II* 26:27, 32:10 “Glory to you, O Paraclete, our apostle”; the Manichaean *Homilies (Hom.)*, p. 11; *CMC* 45.1, 70.12, 71.1, as well as in the new material from Kellis (Gardner 2001, 93-104).

It is well known that the apostle Paul played a fundamental role in Manichaean theology so it should be no surprise that Mani sees himself as another apostle of Christ. For this Pauline influence, see Koenen (1978), Betz (1986, 215-234), Fredrickesen (1988), Bammel (1993, 1-25), Ries (1989), Decret (“L’Utilisation”, reprint, 1995). For a list of where this title occurs, see Lieu (1994, 271). This designation (apostle of Jesus Christ) is used by Paul and by Peter. See Rom. 1:1; 1 Cor. 1:1; 2 Cor. 1:1; Gal 1:1; Eph. 1:1; Col 1:1; 1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1; as well as 1 Peter 1:1 and 2 Peter 1:1. Feldmann (1987, 25) states that this phrase “most reminds one of Gal. 1.1” along with the phrase from the *CMC*. These two do resemble the title of Mani in the *Ep. fund.*, but it is instead coming from *I Peter* (see *Commentary* 197.11 below).

Ries (1972, 342) also sees in this section of the *Ep. fund.* a parallel in the *PB II* (9.3-5; Coptic and translation from Allberry, 1938 unless otherwise noted) and thinks that this passage may be a “version liturgique” of the *Ep. fund.* and places it under the category of “La doctrine Manichéene du Paraclet.”

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i> 5	<i>PB II</i> 9.3-5
---------------------------	--------------------

<i>Contra ep. fund. 5</i>	<i>PB II 9.3-5</i>
Manichaeus apostolus Iesu Christi providentia dei patris. Haec sunt salubria verba de perenni ac uiuo fonte (Manichaeus, an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the providence of God. These are the beneficial words of the immortal and living fount).	<p> ΜΑΡΝΟΥΟΥΤ ΜΠΠΝΑ ΜΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΣ ΜΑΡΝΣΜΑΜΕ ΜΠΝΧΑΪΣ ΙΗΣ ΠΕΤΑΦΤΝΝΑΥ ΝΕΝ ΜΠΠΝΑ ΝΤΕ ΤΜΗΕ ΑΦΕΙ ΑΦΠΑΡΧΗ ΑΤΠΑΛΗΗ (Let us worship the spirit of the Paraclete. Let us bless our Lord Jesus who sent him to us, the Spirit of Truth. He came and separated us from the error...) </p>

197.11 **providentia** As stated above, this formula used by Mani is based on Peter’s title in 1 Peter 1.1-2. The *Vulgate* reads: Petrus apostolus Iesu Christi...secundum praescientiam Dei Patris. The key word here is *praescientia*. In the *Ep. fund.* the translator had used *providentia*, which is fairly unusual in the *New Testament* and is never used in the opening sections of Paul’s letters (it is always *uoluntas* and θέλημα in the Greek) nor is any variation noted in the *Uetus Latina* for his letters. However, there is a variation in the *Uetus Latina* for 1 Peter 1.2, used in a pseudographical work of Vigilius, who was a North African bishop from the early fifth century. Here the author used *providentia* instead of the usual *praescientia*. There are also two other possibilities for the presence of *providentia* in the *Ep. fund.* The first is that the Latin translator might have been was using a manuscript that no longer survives, or that he or she just decided that *providentia* made more sense in this context. As shown in Chapter Three of the dissertation, there were a number of different Latin manuscripts existing at the time of Jerome and Augustine. The second possibility is that the translator is following his memory and makes a mistake or that he/she was not totally comfortable or skilled in translation into Latin.

197.11 **dei patris** The designation of God as the Father in Manichaeism is common as well as the simple designation “Father” (Van Lindt, 1992, 7). It is also a New Testament designation; see (among others) I Cor. 8:6. For an excellent overview of this title in Manichaeism, see van Tongerloo (1994, 329-42).

197.11 **Haec sunt salubria verba** These words are divine knowledge. This text matches the *Ep. fund.* found in *C. Fel.* 1.1 (CSEL 25,2/801.10-24). Feldmann (1987, 26) believes that these words may be from the Manichaean deity called Jesus the Splendour. He then lists *Keph.* 16 (53.18-54.9) in which Jesus the Splendour gives Adam hope and the good news and *Keph.* 60 (152.7-16) where Jesus the Splendour “manifests and reveals about everything, both the external and the internal, both what is above and what is below.” He also examines Mani’s Twin (p. 28) as the source of these words. However, the *Living Gospel* (as found in the *CMC*) may be of help here. In *CMC* 66 Mani states “From him (God the Father of Truth) I came and I am also from his will. And from him all that is true was revealed to me and I am from [his] truth. I saw [the truth of eternity which he revealed.]” The source of Mani’s words here is God and in both texts Mani is sent by God’s will. In the *Ep. fund.*, Mani does not specifically state where the words of the living fount are from, but as can be seen from the *Living Gospel*, they must be from God.

197.12 **de perenni ac uiuo fonte** The image of the fountain as a source of knowledge is fairly common in Manichaean writings. Feldmann (1987, 28-9) mentions a possible connection here with *Logion* 13 in the *Gospel of Thomas* and the 47th chapter of the *Acts of Thomas*. In *Logion* 13 Jesus says to Thomas “I am not your teacher because you became drunk from the bubbling spring which I have measured out. And he took him off alone and told him three things” (translation is my own). This is a possible source but it seems that the stress in the *Ep. fund.* is on the source of the words, as opposed to *Logion* 13 where the words themselves are the fount. This *logion* seems to be connected more with Jn 4.13-15. See also Rev. 7.17 and 21.6. On other Manichaean texts, see *C. Fort.* II.19 (CSEL 25, 1/97.15-21), *C. Fort.* II.21 (CSEL 25,1/103.3-10); *PB* II, 102:15, 75:27, and *Keph.* 38 (90:15-19). For a similar non-Western text see *M842* R1-4, 7-9, R 18-V 13 (Middle Persian) Line 2, “Welcome, my [powerful] word, from which I let others drink eternal life!” (Klimkeit, 1993, 46).

197.15 **Nostis enim me statuisset nihil a uobis prolatum temere credere** The use of the perfect here points to his days as a Manichaean. He needs a good reason to believe. In *C. Faust.* 18.3 (CSEL 25,1/491.27-492.20) Augustine accuses Faustus of the same thing: “Tu uero, qui temere omnia credis, qui naturae beneficium rationem ex hominibus damnas.” The argument in the *Ep. fund.* is similar to one that he uses with his Manichaean friend Honoratus in *Util. cred.* 14.31 (CSEL 25,1/40.3-4). Here he states that Honoratus was trying to convince Augustine by faith, but that (he claims) Honoratus promised to convince Augustine with reason “Simul etiam contra promissum facitis fidem potius imperando quam reddendo rationem.” Alexander of Lycopolis (*C. Mani. opin.* 3 in Van der Horst, 1974, 58) also states that those won over to Manichaeism were done so because they uncritically accepted the Manichaeans theory.

197.18 **Promittebas enim scientiam ueritatis, et nunc quod nescio cogis, ut credam** See *Commentary* 196.25 for the *pollicitatio ueritatis*. It is important to remember that he states that he is compelled to believe what he doesn’t know. He repeats this in the *Conf.* 6.5.7 (CCL 27/77.1-78.7) “...quam illic temeraria pollicitatione scientiae credulitatem inrideri et postea tam multa fabulosissima et absurdissima, quia demonstrari non poterant, credenda imperari.”

197.19 **cogis** That he himself would be compelled to believe is a frequent charge that Augustine makes against the Manichaeans. See also lines 198.2, 203.10, 209.5, 223.25, 234.2, 235.25, and 239.13. The use of *cogo* by Augustine has also been noted by Russell (1999, 121 n. 20).

197.19 **Euangelium mihi fortasse lecturus es et inde Manichaei personam temptabis adserere** Augustine certainly has a good reason for using *fortasse* here since he knows that it is ridiculous to ask a Manichaean (or anyone mildly familiar with the scriptures) to find the name of Mani in the New Testament. This indicates that what Augustine defines as “apostle” is something different to what the Manichaeans do or that, more likely he is trying to cause problems for the Manichaeans. The Manichaeans know that he is not found there. In the

Manichaean *PB* II 143:16, 192.5 and 194.4 there is a list that contains the original apostles as well as some Manichaeans and Mani. Mani is not included in the list of the original twelve, nor is it found in *Keph.* 2 (18-19). No Manichaean would see Mani as one of these twelve disciples and Augustine must know that. He uses this *fortasse* as a device to stir up problems for them.

197.22 **Ego uero euangelio non crederem, nisi me catholicae ecclesiae conmoveret auctoritas** This is probably the most famous phrase from this work (Portalié 1960, 120-1 and Van Den Brink 1966, 3). Portalié discusses this phrase as well as *Contra ep. fund.* 4.5 and states that above scripture and tradition is the “living authority of the Church” (1960, 120). See also Mayer (1974, 299, n. 80). For the history of the use of this verse, see Coyle (1978, 151, n. 620). The authority of the church is the prime reason that Augustine is and will remain a Catholic and there is nothing that can shake this authority for him. This issue runs very deep in Augustinian theology, which he writes about authority from the very beginning. The authority of the Church comes first, and then the scriptures. This is the path that Augustine is following in this work.

On authority and the Church in Augustine’s writings, see his clearest statements in *Mor.* I 25.47 (CSEL 90,7/52.16-18) “Unde illud exoritur, quod ab initio satis egimus, nihil in ecclesia catholica salubrius fieri, quam ut rationem praecedat auctoritas” and *Util. cred.* 15.33 (CSEL 25,1/41.11-17). Fortunatus states nearly the same thing, except that he is relying on the authority of the scriptures, as opposed to Augustine’s authority in the church; see *C. Fort.* II.20 (CSEL 25, 1/99.6-13) “Et quia nullo genere recte me credere ostendere possum, nisi eandem fidem Scripturarum auctoritate firmaverim.” The combination of reason and authority in Augustine’s writings is probably from his past Manichaean interactions (Rist, 1994, 56).

197.26 **Elige, quid uelis** This begins a very long and drawn out argument and he is being mildly devious. The choices that Augustine gives them in responding to his non-belief of

Mani as being the Apostle of Jesus Christ is either that the Manichaeans say (1) “Believe in the Catholics” (197.26) or (2) “Do not believe in the Catholics” (198.1) or (3) “You believed the Catholics for good reason when they praised the Gospel, but you were wrong to believe them when they were finding fault with Manichaeus” (198.4). To answer the first, Augustine says that the Catholics do not want him to believe in Mani, and therefore he cannot believe in him. He says that if the Manichaeans respond with the second, then they cannot claim the Gospel because the Gospel belongs to the Catholic Church. If they give the third response, Augustine will accuse them of trying to convince him without a good reason! Either way, he sets them up for failure.

197.26 **non recte facies per euangelium me cogere ad Manichaei fidem** If the Manichaeans do not accept the entire Catholic faith, then they cannot pick and choose pieces of the Catholic faith which they might agree with. He makes this very clear in 198.11. Earlier he also makes it clear that the Manichaeans cannot use the Gospel to gain adherents since it is the very gospel that they do not accept. For a similar argument, see *Mor.* I 9.15 (CSEL 90,7/18.14-15) “Quod si non potest dicere, quid calumniaris in quo libro credam, quod me oportere credere confiteris.”

198.3 **Manichaei fidem** (as opposed to the Catholic faith). For this Manichaean faith, see *C. Fort.* 1.3 (CSEL 25, 1/84.24-85.15) where Augustine denounces the faith that they once taught him. See also *C. Faust.* 24.1 (CSEL 25,1/717.9-718.17) where Faustus discusses his own faith and *PB* II 163.23 and 163.30 for the “*Catechumens of the Faith.*” For a more detailed discussion of the Manichaean faith, see *Commentary* 202.19.

198.6 **quod uis credam, quod non uis, non credam** Augustine says the same thing on this topic in *C. Faust.* 32.16 (CSEL 25/776.4-6) “Si enim, quod uultis, ei credimus, et quod non uultis, ei non credimus, iam non illi, sed uobis credimus.” Evodius (*C. Manich.* 22 [CSEL 25,1/960.18]) also uses this argument: that they cannot pick and choose scriptural passages and reject those that they do not understand.

198.9 **nisi me non credere iusseris** Augustine states more than once that when he was a Manichaean he was ordered to believe, despite his insistence that the Manichaeans use only reason without faith. See *Util. cred.* 11.25 (CSEL 25,1/31.9) “Nam quomodo sine culpa possimus sequi eos, qui credere iubent, iam dictum est”; *Conf.* 5.3.6 (CCL 27/59.58-60.66) “Ibi autem credere iubebar” and 6.5.7 (CCL 27/77.1-78.7).

198.28 **in apostolorum actibus** Augustine knew full well that the Manichaeans did not accept the Acts of the Apostles. For his comments on this, see *Util. cred.* 3.7 (CSEL 25,1/9.13-24); *C. Faust.* 19.31 (CSEL 25,1/534.25-535.6) and *C. Faust.* 32.15 (CSEL 25,1/774.23-775.8). This fact is probably unknown to his Catholic audience. The Manichaeans, on the other hand, would know exactly what he was doing. Stroumsa (1988, 74) has pointed out that it matters little if the Manichaeans would be convinced with Augustine’s arguments: “it is the way a Late Antique intellectual argued.”

199.6 **spiritum sanctum paracletum** Augustine first mentions that Mani could be found in the New Testament as the figure of the Holy Spirit, and this begins a new line of argument against the Manichaeans. But his method will remain the same: the Manichaeans have used the Gospel regarding the Holy Spirit, but it belongs to the Catholic Church and therefore the Manichaeans cannot use it. We know from Manichaean texts that Mani was seen either as the Holy Spirit or sent by the Holy Spirit. What follows is a very long, drawn out series of hypothetical questions that Augustine proceeds to ask and then answer. Decret, who examined the relationship of the Holy Spirit and Mani in the writings of Fortunatus, Faustus and Felix is certainly correct to state that Augustine has overstated his case (1970, 301): “Augustin s’étend volontiers sur la morale manichéenne mais, en ce domaine, l’évêque d’Hippone, qui donne libre cours à la verve et à l’humour, tend trop souvent à forcer les traits et tombe ainsi dans la caricature.”

Chapter Six

199.10 **Manichaeus apostolus Iesu Christi, et non sit: paracletus apostolus Iesu Christi**

With this question Augustine begins a very long argument on why Mani is neither an Apostle nor the Paraclete. If Mani was sent by Christ, then he can rightly say that he is the apostle of Him. But Augustine begins with the unsaid idea that Mani is sent by the Paraclete and therefore should be the Apostle of the Paraclete. As in the previous chapter, Augustine will try to cover all the hypothetical reasons for what Mani really is. Augustine asks three questions 1) did the Paraclete send Mani (*Commentary* 199.12); (2) is Christ the Holy Spirit?; and (3) is the Paraclete Mani?

199.12 **Si autem missus...cur lego...Manichaeus apostolus paracleti?** On this passage,

Ries (1995, 540) notes that the Manichaeans have “repris la tradition de leur Fondateur qui n’a pas hésité à se présenter comme le Paraclet annoncé par Jésus” and he cites *Keph.* 1 (14.7-11) and *Jn.* 14.16. Did the Paraclete send him? Augustine also discusses this option in *C. Faust.* 13.17 (CSEL 25,1/398.20-399.2). He seems confused as to whether Mani is the Holy Spirit or whether he was sent by the Holy Spirit. This confusion here is very important, since it indicates his ignorance of the life of Mani as well as Manichaean theology: “Cum enim Christus promiserit suis missurum se paracletum, id est consolatorem uel aduocatum, spiritum ueritatis, per hanc promissionis occasionem hunc paracletum dicentes esse Manichaeum uel in Manichaeo subrepunt in hominum mentes ignorantes, ille a Christo promissus quando sit missus.” Decret (1970, 301) notes this passage in *C. Faust.* as well. A few years earlier Augustine had stated in *Util. cred.* 3.7 (CSEL 25,1/10.8-9) that the Holy Spirit came to us through Mani “dicunt spiritum sanctum, quem dominus discipulis se missurum esse promisit, per ipsum ad nos uenisse.”

199.14 **Si dicis ipsum esse Christum...uobis** Felix states that Mani is the Holy Spirit (*C.*

Fel. 1.9 (CSEL 25,2/811.12). The Manichaeans were not the only Christian groups to think that Jesus was the Paraclete, or that the Paraclete was in Paul, or was Paul. This is clear in the *Acta Archelai*, Chapter 38.10 (Vermes 2001, 101) where Archelaus states: “Again, that it was

truly the Paraclete himself who was in Paul, our Lord Jesus Christ says in the Gospel: 'If you love me, keep my commandments. And I shall ask my Father, and he will give you another Paraclete' (Jn. 14.15-16). By this he also shows that he himself is the Paraclete, when he says 'another.'” Augustine argues exactly the opposite here in the *Contra ep. fund.*: Christ is not the Paraclete because He is sending another.

199.25 in aliis epistulis apostolum Christi se nominat, in aliis paracleti? Christi semper audiui Augustine reveals that he was familiar with other letters by Mani which all began in the same manner as the *Ep. fund.* In *C. Faust.* 13.4 (CSEL 25,1/381.4-5) Augustine repeats the same thing: “Omnes tamen eius epistolae ita exordiantur: “Manichaeus apostolus Iesu Christi.” See also *C. Faust.* 13.7 (CSEL 25,1/398.3-399.18), 15.5 (CSEL 25,1/424.1-425.26).

200.3 superbia, mater omnium haereticorum Pride was the greatest sin for Augustine. See *C. Acad.* 2.18. For a very similar phrase see *Gn. adu. Man.* II 8.11 (CSEL 91/130.1-11) “...Sicut enim est mater omnium haereticorum superbia, ausi sunt dicere quod natura ei sit anima.” See also *Uera rel.* 25.47 (CCL 32/217.34-40) “sed ad hanc nulla superbia perducit. Quae si non esset, non essent haeretici neque schismatici nec carne circumcisi”; *Doc.*

*Chr.*1.14.13 (CCL 32/14.13-15) “Quia ergo per superbiam homo lapsus est, humilitatem adhibuit ad sanandum”; *Conf.* 5.5.8 (CCL 27/60.1-61.17); *C. Faust.* 22.22 (616.19-617.11). Burns (1988, 9-27) argues that pride is the primary evil and I think he goes too far when he states that “the entire Manichean dualistic doctrine was based on pride” (p. 22). It is also possible that Augustine was once again influenced by the *Enneads* V.1, which also contains the idea that pride caused the soul to fall into matter (Torchia 1987, 67).

200.4 ...sed ita susceptum, ut ipse paracletus diceretur? We finally see that Augustine believes that Mani was assumed by the Paraclete and not sent by him, the very same way that the Catholic faith believes Jesus the Man was assumed (*susceptus*) by the Son of God (see *Commentary* 200.7). To say that a human was assumed by the Paraclete was probably the worst form of pride that a human could have; see *Commentary* 200.13. *Decret* (1970, 286)

200.13 **Singularis audacia ista et ineffabile sacrilegium!** These adjectives are common when Augustine describes the Manichaean beliefs. The fact that Mani is thought to be the Holy Spirit obviously upsets Augustine and he begins to rail against the Manichaeans despite his statement at the beginning that he would treat them kindly. For these adjectives, see *Mor.* I 34.75 (CSEL 90,7/81.7-10) “Sed et illa quam uana sint, quam noxia, quam sacrilega et quemadmodum a magna parte uestrum atque adeo paene ab omnibus uobis non obseruentur, alio uolumine ostendere institui”; *F. et symb.* 4.10 (CSEL 41/14.3-12); *Cont.* 22 (CSEL 41/168.2-7) “conamini inducere et apostolicas litteras, quae uos ab ista sacrilega peruersitate corrigant, non uultis audire”; *Agon.* 4.4 (CSEL 41/105.4-22); *C. Fel.* 2.1 (CSEL 25,2/828.23-829.6) and *Nat. b.* 10 (CSEL 25,2/859.8-15).

Chapter Seven

200.15 **cum pater et filius et spiritus sanctus uobis etiam confitentibus non dispari natura copulentur** Faustus confirms that the Manichaeans believe in the Trinity, although it is different than the Catholic version: *C. Faust.* 20.2 (CSEL 25,1/536.9-537.2) “Igitur nos patris quidem dei omnipotentis et Christi filii eius et spiritus sancti unum idemque sub triplici appellatione colimus numen; sed patrem quidem ipsum lucem incolere credimus summam ac principalem, quam Paulus alias inaccessibilem uocat, filium uero in hac secunda ac uisibili luce consistere...” See also *Commentary* 199.14 and Wurst (2000, 648-657) for a discussion of this very passage. Augustine is referring to the Manichaeans in *Ep. Rom. inch.* 15.14 (CSEL 84,1/167.17-23) when he states “Alii unam quidem et eandem trinitatis substantiam esse fateantur, sed de ipsa diuina substantia tam impie sentiant ut eam commutabilem et corruptibilem putent.” There are also trinitarian statements in other Manichaean works. For example, see *PB* II (115) titled “A Psalm to the Trinity.”

200.16 **natura** On Augustine’s uses of the word *natura*, see Boyer (1957, 175-186). For a useful discussion on *natura*, see *Lib. arb.* 3.13.36 (CCL 29/297.15-19) “Omnis autem natura aut corruptibilis est aut incorruptibilis. Omnis ergo natura bona est. Naturam uoco quae et

substantia dici solet; omnis igitur substantia aut deus aut ex deo, quia omne bonum aut deus aut ex deo.” Cf. also *Nat. b.* 4 (CSEL 25,2/857.5-8) “Mala itaque natura dicitur, quae corrupta est; nam incorrupta utique bona est. Sed etiam ipsa corrupta, in quantum natura est, bona est; in quantum corrupta est, mala est.”

200.16 cur hominem susceptum ab spiritu sancto Manichaeum non putatis turpe natum ex utroque sexu praedicare This is an important point for Augustine. First, he mentions that Mani was assumed (*susceptum*) by the Holy Spirit. Second, he demands to know why it is that Mani can be born from two human parents but still be adopted by the Holy Spirit without degrading the Holy Spirit. If this is so, then why can’t Christ be born from one human parent? He also mentions this point as well in *C. Fel.* Evodius also comments on this (see especially *C. Manich.* 23). See also Alexander of Lycopolis *C. Manich. opin.*, chapter 18 (Van der Horst 1974, 83) who states “For they (the Manichaeans) concede that he too was a blend of matter and the power included therein.”

200.18 hominem autem susceptum ab unigenita sapientia dei natum de uirgine credere formidatis? According to the *Confessions*, this is what Augustine believed when he was a Manichaean. See 5.10.20 (CCL 27/69.66-70) “Talem itaque naturam eius nasci non posse de Maria uirgine arbitrabar, nisi carni concerneretur...” Augustine argues against this many times in his writings. For an earlier statement, see *Quant.* 33.76 (CSEL 89,1/225.3-7) “Iam uero eos, qui ad exemplum salutis nostrae ac primitias a filio dei potentissimo, aeterno, incommutabili susceptum hominem eundemque natum esse de uirgine ceteraque huius historiae miracula inident...” The argument that Christ could not have been born can be found throughout Manichaean literature. See Fortunatus, in *C. Fort.* 19 (CSEL 25,1/97.1-7) “Secundum carnem adseritis ex semine Dauid, cum praedicetur ex uirgine esse natus, et filius de magnificetur...” Faustus states the same thing in *C. Faust.* 16.4 (CSEL 25,1/442.27-443.7) and in *C. Faust.* 2.1 (CSEL 25,1/253.18-22) he gives a biblically based reason why Christ is not born of the flesh: “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.” See also *Keph.* 1 (12.21) and the *PB* II 52.22-27. Here Allberry (1938, 52, n. 22-27) states “A Manichee ‘makes God pure’ by denying that he was born of a woman, ‘in a womb corrupted.’” And in an interesting twist, Jerome noted in his *Adversus Jovinianum* that Jovinian had accused the Catholics of being Manichaeans because they believed that Mary *remained* a virgin after giving birth to Christ, which he thought implied that Christ did not have a real body, as noted by Evans (1981, 238).

200.20 **Si caro humana, si concubitus uiri, si uterus mulieris...** Augustine has no hesitation in speaking about the sexual organs of Mary; see Asiedu (2001, 311 and n. 33). Augustine says nearly the same thing in *F. et symb.* 4.10 (CSEL 41/13.15) “Nec nobis fidem istam minuat cogitatio muliebrium uiscerum, ut propterea recusanda uideatur talis domini nostri generatio, quod eam sordidi sordidam putant.” The Manichaeans were not the only group to have problems with the flesh of Christ. Augustine gives the example of Porphyry in *Ciu. Dei* 10.24 (CCL 47/297.12-298.50).

200.28 **uerbum dei** Augustine describes why Christ is called the Word of God in *F. et symb.* 3.3-4 (CSEL 41/6.13), where he states that the Word is not like the passing away of our spoken words, but is the Eternal Word.

Chapter Eight

201.19 **nisi ut spiritum sanctum ipsum esse tertium crederemus** No longer is Mani seen as being sent or being assumed, but that he *is* the Holy Spirit.

201.21 **Spiritus sanctus nominatus non est** Here Augustine claims that Mani is the Holy Spirit because Mani neglected to mention the Holy Spirit specifically in his introduction to the *Ep. fund.* Evodius, *C. Manich.* 24 (CSEL 25,2/961.15) also stated that Mani claims to be the Holy Spirit. Augustine also looks at the absence of the Holy Spirit in the writings of Paul, but

he comes to a different conclusion. In *Ep. Rom. inch.* 11.1-6 (CSEL 84,1/159.5-20), written just before *Contra ep. fund.*, Augustine writes “Quod autem apostolus gratiam et pacem a deo patre et domino nostro Iesu Christo dicit non adiungens etiam spiritum sanctum, non mihi alia ratio uidetur nisi quia ipsum donum dei spiritum sanctum intelligimus. Gratia porro et pax quid aliud quam donum dei?” and in Chapter 12 (CSEL 84,1/160.7-161.16) he looks at this absence in I Peter. The difference between Mani’s letter and Paul/Peter is that “Nec aliae apostolorum epistolae, quae usus ecclesiasticus recipit, parum nos admonent de ista trinitate in principiis suis” (*Ep. Rom. inch.* 12.1 (CSEL 84,1/160.7-9)). In this work he also states (once again) that Mani claims to be the Holy Spirit; see *Ep. Rom. inch.* 15.14 (CSEL 84,1/167.17-23).

202.3 Quid ergo aliud suspicer nescio Augustine clearly does not know the reason for Mani’s title, an apostle of Christ. This “suspicion” of what is happening here is continued in 202.21.

202.4 nisi quia iste Manichaeus...pro ipso Christo se coli uoluit Here he implies that Mani wanted to be worshipped instead of Christ. It seems unlikely that Mani would actually desire that, considering the great importance of Jesus in the Manichaean religion, as seen in the Manichaean PB II. This is also clear from a large number of other writings (*Keph.*, *Homilies*). For a useful discussion of Jesus in Manichaeism, see Franzmann (2000, 220-246 and 2003) which includes an up-to-date bibliography, as well as Rose (1979).

202.9 nullis uigiliis, nullo prolixiore ieiunio indicto auditoribus, nullo denique festiuiore adparatu For an excellent survey of the celebration of Easter during the time of Augustine, see Van der Meer (1961, 288-293). Easter eve was the “most joyful vigil of Christendom, not a vigil for a handful of people, but the feast of a multitude that could not be numbered” (Van der Meer 1961, 361). For Manichaean fasting, see *C. Faust.* 6.4 (CSEL 25,1/288.12-290.24), 8.2 (CSEL 25,1/307.2-17). See also *PB II* 35.21 which mentions the watch at night, which

must be a vigil that was kept for Mani, as well as 57.24 and 166.14. And on this vigil, see Harmless (1995, especially 302-313). See also *C. Faust.* 30.3 (CSEL 25,1/749.11-750.12).

202.11 **cum bema vestrum, id est diem, quo Manichaeus occisus est** On the Bema festival, see Wurst (1995), Allberry (1938a) and Ries (1976, 218-233). This mention here is one of three important sources for our knowledge of the Manichaean Bema Festival along with the Psalms of the Bema in the *PB II* and *M801* (Pedersen 1996, 269). Augustine states that the Bema is the name of the festival which took place at the same time as Easter, and not the raised platform itself. Augustine also mentions the Bema in *C. Faust.* 18.5 (CSEL 25,1/494.17-21) “Uultis ergo, ut et uos dicamini in mense Martio Martem colere? Illo enim mense bema uestrum cum magna festiuitate celebratis.” This Bema plays a prominent role in the *PB II*. See *PB II*, 20.19 where Mani is seated on the Bema. See also *PB II* 24.17-19 which notes the joy that the Catechumens and the Elect feel when they see Mani’s Bema; *PB II* 25.18-20 in which the participators ask that their sins from the previous year be forgiven in front of the Bema and 35.16 which states that Mani left the Bema as a memorial of the Paraclete. For other references to the Manichaean Bema, see Puech (1949, 185 n.368).

202.16 **Christum autem, qui natus non esset, neque ueram, sed simulatam carnem humanis oculis ostendisset, non pertulisse, sed finxisse passionem** This false suffering of Jesus is discussed by Augustine in many of his writings. For him, the denial of the real passion would mean a loss of faith in terms of human nature. More importantly though, if Christ had a phantom body, then humanity would have no hope. See *C. Faust.* 5.5 (CSEL 25,1/277.6-278.8) “et istum Christum, qui dicit: ego sum ueritas, speciem carnis, mortem crucis, uulnera passionis, cicatrices resurrectionis mentitum esse suadetis?” Faustus, in *C. Faust.* 29.1 (CSEL 25,1/743.15-744.9) says “Ergo magia erat, quod uisus ac passus est, si natus non est....denique nos specie tenus passum confitemur nec uere mortuum; uos pro certo puerperium fuisse creditis et utero muliebri portatum...ut iam probatum a nostris est, angeli et uisi hominibus et locuti esse monstrentur...” See also *C. Faust.* 32.22 (CSEL 25,1/783.5-

784.5); *C. Sec.* 25 (CSEL 25,2/943.4); *ep.* 236.2 (CSEL 57/ 524.12) “negantes scilicet Christum natum esse de uirgine nec eius carnem ueram confitentes fuisse sed falsam ac per hoc et falsam eius passionem et nullam resurrectionem fuisse contendunt.” Augustine is certainly not the only one to note this. See (among many) Pope Leo, *s.* 34.4 (Schipper and Van Oort, 32-35).

202.19 **qui se christianos dici uolunt** This is the first time in this work that he says the Manichaeans called themselves Christians. There is no doubt that the Manichaeans that Augustine was involved with believed themselves to be true Christians. See Van Oort (1996, 44) who states “Nowhere in his thirty-three *opuscula*, *quaestiones* and *tractatus* against the Manichaeans, nowhere in his *confessions* or *City of God* does Augustine consider Manichaeism as anything but a *Christian* religion.” Markus (1990, 19) is certainly correct when he states that the debates between the years 380-430 all revolved around the question of what is meant to be a Christian. For Augustine’s view of the Manichaeans being Christian, see *Util. cred.* 14.30 (CSEL 25,1/37.20-23) “Itaque ille haereticus -- siquidem de his nobis sermo est, qui se christianos dici uolunt -- quam mihi rationem adferat, quaeso te? Quid est, unde me a credendo ueluti a temeritate reuocet? Si nihil me credere iubet”; *S. Dom. mon.* 1.5.13 (CCL 35/13.281-14.285); *Cont.* 23 (CSEL 41/170.2-9); *C. Faust.* 12.24 (CSEL 25,1/353.9-25) and 22.16 (CSEL 25,1/603.28-5).

Faustus also believes that they were the true Christians: *C. Faust.* 1.2 (CSEL 25,1/251.22-252.12) “Faustus dixit: Satis superque in lucem iam traductis erroribus ac Iudaicae superstitionis simul et semichristianorum abunde detecta fallacia a doctissimo scilicet” and 18.1 (CSEL 25,1/490.7-16). Alexander of Lycopolis, in *C. Manich. opin.* 2, also believed that the Manichaeans were a type of Christianity (Van der Horst, 1974, 52). The discovery of the *Cologne Mani Codex* has also proved that Judaism/Christianity played an important role in the formation of Mani’s religious formation.

202.24 **totius iam orbis festissimum tempus est** For Augustine it was “prophetic truth” that the church should be spread throughout the entire world (Brown 1972, 267). That Christians were spread throughout the whole world was an important reason to join the Catholic Church (Coyle 1978, 152, n. 621). He states this idea as well in *Agon.* 29.31 (CSEL 41/131.18-20) “Et alia multa, siue in ueteris siue in noui testamenti libris quae scripta sunt, ut apertissime declarent ecclesiam Christi per orbem terrae esse diffusam.” Augustine’s insistence of this may be a reaction to Mani’s claim of the same thing for his church. For this claim see *Keph.* 1 (16.1-15) “...I have [sown] the seed of life. I have [...] them [.....fr]om east to west. As you yourselves are seeing, [my] hope has gone toward the sunrise of the world, and [every] inhabited part; to the clime of the north, and the [...]. Not one among the apostles did ever do these things” and *Keph.* 38 (100.30). See *Commentary* 196.10-196.16 where he discusses the reasons why he stays in the Catholic Church.

Chapter Nine

This is a fairly short chapter, being mostly the quotes from *Acts*. See Chapter Four for an in-depth look at *Acts*.

203.5 **Fortasse dicas mihi: quando ergo uenit a domino promissus paracletus?** Here is another argument that Augustine gives to the Manichaeans. In this case, though, this is probably what the Manichaeans did ask. What follows is a long excerpt from *Acts*. In *Agon.* 28.30 (CSEL 41/130.12-17) Augustine also gives the account found in *Acts* just after he states “Nec eos audiamus, qui dicunt spiritum sanctum, quem in euangelio dominus promisit discipulis, aut in Paulo apostolo uenisse aut in Montano et Priscilla, sicut Cataphryges dicunt, aut in nescio quo Manete uel Manichaeo, sicut Manichaei dicunt. Tam enim caeci sunt isti, ut scripturas manifestas non intellegant.” The use of the subjunctive here (*fortasse dicas*) allows Augustine to set up a question that he wants answered, and this is a common rhetorical device in this work. Ambrose will also use this technique in *Mysteries*, 9.50 (see Ramsey 1997, 157).

203.8 Nunc uero cum in actibus apostolorum manifestissime sancti spiritus praedicetur aduentus What Augustine fails to mention here is that the Manichaeans did not accept the *Acts of the Apostles* as a legitimate book nor did he mention this above (see *Commentary* 198.28). See also *C. Faust.* 13.17 (CSEL 25,1/399.2-5), 15.4 (CSEL 25,1/423.1-5), 32.18 (CSEL 25,1/778.25-779.25). Augustine, in *C. Fel.* 1.2 (CSEL 25,2/802.24-27) repeats what he does in *Contra ep. fund.*: he reads from the *Acts of the Apostles* where it talks about the coming of the Holy Spirit, after he reads *Lk.* 24.36. The *Acts of the Apostles* was read during Easter (Van der Meer 1961, 344) so this would be another difference between the Manichaean Bema Festival and the Catholic pascal feast.

Chapter Ten

205.17 Clarificatio enim domini nostri apud homines resurrectio est a mortuis et in caelum ascensio For a very similar statement, see *Doc. Chr.* 1.15.14 (CCL 32/14.1-2), which was written soon after, *C. ep. fund.*: “Iam uero credita domini a mortuis resurrectio et in caelum ascensio magna spe fulcit nostram fidem.” See also Chapter Three of the dissertation on the discussion on John 7.39.

206.9 quibus me credere si prohibetis, ne temere credam quod nescio--sic enim soletis monere This is a frequent complaint of Augustine against the Manichaeans: that they used reason (knowledge) before belief. See (among many others) *Mor.* I 29.61 (CSEL 90,7/63.12-65.2); *Util. cred.* 11.25 (CSEL 25,1/31.9-10) “Quare iam superest, ut consideremus, quo pacto hi sequendi non sint, qui se pollicentur ratione ducturos,” 12.27 (CSEL 25,1/34.18-21), 14.30 (CSEL 25,1/37.20-23), 14.31 (CSEL 25,1/38.5-11). Despite all of this, he then stated in the *Conf.* 5.3.6 (CCL 27/59.58-60.66) and *Conf.* 6.5.7 (CCL 27/77.1-78.7) that he was ordered to believe Mani.

206.12 ueritatem, de qua dubitare non possim The search for truth is a constant theme running through Augustine’s writings and was the driving force behind all of his thoughts; see Boyer (Paris, 1920). In Augustine’s writings, see *Gn. adu. Man.* II.29.43 (CSEL

91/172.35-40) “Ego enim, quod bona fide coram deo dixerim, sine ullo studio contentionis sine aliqua dubitatione ueritatis et sine aliquo praeiudicio diligentioris tractationis quae mihi uidebantur exposui”; *Uera rel.* 31.57(CCL 32/224.1-4); *Util. cred.* 38.36 (CSEL 25,1/47.5-48.4); *Lib. arb.* 3.21.60 (CCL 29/310.29-42); *Mend.* 17 (CSEL 41/436.23-25) and *Nat. b.* 18 (CSEL 25,2/862.6-28).

Chapter Eleven

206.18 **salubria uerba ex perenni ac uiuo fonte** See *Commentary* 197.11 and 197.12.

206.19 **audierit et isdem primum crediderit deinde quae insinuant custodierit** Here is the first step in accepting this “*salubria uerba*”: one first hears them, and then *believes* them. Augustine, though, will ignore this and will state over and over that the Manichaeans use reason first and scoff at those who first believe (see *Commentary* 206.10). But in the *Ep. fund.* belief in these words is the first step. There are many instances of “believing” Mani’s words in other Manichaean texts. In *Keph.* 1 (16:23-29) Mani’s disciples have received his writings and have “believed in it (ΝΑΖΤΕ ΑΡΑC).” See also *Keph.* 38 (102.10-15).

206.19 **isdem** var. *eisdem* (PL 42, 182) or *iisdem* (as found in *C. Fel.* 1.1).

206.20 **numquam erit morti obnoxius** This death is the eternal death. Fortunatus, in *C. Fort.* II.21 (CSEL 25,1/103.3-10), on the other hand, after describing the soul being washed in a divine fountain, states that it can be restored to the kingdom of God from where it came. Puech (1968, 203-216) thinks that there is an influence on this passage from *Logion* 1 of the Gospel of Thomas (ΠΕΤΑΖΕ ΕΘΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ ΝΗΝΕΙΩΑ ΧΕ ΚΝΑΧΙ ΤΠΕ ΑΝ ΗΠΠΟΥ [And he said, whoever finds the interpretation of this will not experience death]). Aland (1975, 141-2) however, thinks this passage is an allusion to Jn 8:51 “si quis sermonem meum servauerit mortem non videbit in aeternum.” Because of the inclusion of eternal life (see below), I would have to agree with Aland for a possible source for this saying.

206.21 **aeterna et gloriosa uita fruetur** The mention of eternal life is common in Manichaean literature. See *Ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/899.3-15) “...Noli comes esse lati itineris,

quia Amorrhaeum expectat, sed ad artam festina uiam, ut consequaris uitam aeternam.”

There are also a number of *Keph.* that mention eternal life which is always connected with the knowledge of the mysteries of the cosmogony. For example, see *Keph.* 7 (35.13-14) and *Keph.* 65 (164.1). There is also a similar phrase in one of the personal Manichaean letters from Kellis (*P. Kell. Copt.* 29, in Gardner et al. 1999, 203) where Piene, a Manichaean who is being trained by a Teacher, mentions to his mother Maria “This is my prayer every hour to the Father, the God of Truth, that He may preserve you healthy in your body, joyful in your soul and firm [in] your spirit; for all the time that you [will] spend in this place. Also, after this place you may find life in the kingdom for eternity.”

206.22 Nam profecto beatus est iudicandus To be judged blessed after hearing this information is a common theme that runs through Manichaean writings. The *Keph.* are full of such passages. See (among many) *Keph.* 2 (22.35-23.13), *Keph.* 5 (29.11-14 and 30.8-11); the *PB II*, especially the end of Psalm 61.5-8 “Holiness to the holy Spirit, the wisdom () of the...of Truth that reveals the beginning... ..Blessed is every man that has known the... .. Light (?)... ..and his wisdom (), for he shall live for ever.” Cf. also 11.25-28; 25.27-29; 185.20-26; 210.19-30; as well as the Manichaean *Homilies (Hom.)* 13.21. For non-Western texts cf. *M 17* and *M 172 I* Line 2 (Klimkeit 1993, 146) “...The blessed ones will receive this message, the wise ones will understand it, the strong ones will take on the wisdom of the wise...” and *M74* (Klimkeit 1993, 161).

206.25 pollicitatio est, nondum exhibitio ueritatis See *Commentary* 196.25.

207.7 liber Here Augustine refers to the *Ep. fund.* as a book, as opposed to a letter (199.10 and 207.21). For Augustine, *liber* can be used in the “sense of a ‘self contained work’ (when the work comprises only of one “liber”) or in that of ‘part of a larger work’ (when the work is composed of two or more ‘libri’)” (Coyle 1978, p. 68).

207.11 dei inuisibilis There is a textual variant found in *C. Fel.* 1.16 (CSEL 25,2/819.9) which reads “*Pax uobis inuisibilis.*” The idea of an invisible God is also another common

theme in Manichaean writings. See *C. Faust.* 13.6 (CSEL 25,1/384.3). The Coptic Manichaean material contains a number of references to the Father as ‘hidden’ which could be understood as invisible. See *PB II* 1:7, *PB II* 115.13; *Keph.* 16 (49.15-16), 28 (81.9-11). See also Van Tongerloo (1994, 329-42). This title of God is also found in the New Testament: see *Rom.* 1.20 and 1 *Tim.* 1.17.

207.12 **cum fratribus sanctis et carissimis** var. *charrisimus*. There is a difference in the text found here and the text in *C. Fel.* 1.16 (CSEL 25,2/819.10) “cum fratribus suis et carissimis...” Feldmann (1987, p. 34) has pointed out that this part of the *Ep. fund.* indicates that it might have been directed to a number of people instead of just one. This letter is directed to Patticius (207.25), but “the most holy and dear brothers” are mentioned in the introduction. Could this introduction then have been added on to the original letter, which would then start at 207.25? Probably not. For Augustine’s testimony we know that this letter was read out to the Manichaean congregation (CSEL 25,1/197.9) because its contents were so important. When he wrote this letter Mani was probably thinking in the style of Paul’s letters, some of which were directed at individuals but read community-wide.

207.18 **dextera luminis** This text agrees with *C. Fel.* 1.16 (CSEL 25,2/819.12). The Right Hand of Light was a very important symbol for the Manichaeans. It was the right hand of the Living Spirit that pulled out the Primal Man from the Kingdom of Darkness. Secundinus also mentions the ‘right hand of truth’ (*dextera ueritatis*) in *ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/893.19). There is also the Right Hand of Light (*dextera lucis*) mentioned in the introduction of Mani’s letter to Marcellus in *Acta Archelai* 5.1 (Vermes 2001, 41). Later in *Acta Archelai*, the (ex) Manichaean Turbo then describes the symbolic use of the right hand (in 7.4-5) (Vermes 2001, 47-48). See Puech (1949 170, n. 317) for a full list of references to this symbol, as well as Puech (1979, 372-3), Rose (1979, 159, 194) and Feldmann (1987, 29-30).

207.21 **causam** This *causa* is the question that was put to Mani by Patticius on the nature of the birth of Adam and Eve and the ensuing discussion of Manichaeism cosmogony (see lines 208.1-2, following).

207.23 **eidentissimam pollicitationem** See *Commentary* 196.25. This promise that Mani supposedly gives is the basis for Augustine's whole argument against the Manichaeans. The promise of clear and understandable knowledge must be given without the resort to belief and despite the fact that the introduction of the *Ep. fund.* asks the listeners to believe what will come, Augustine casts this aside and demands to be told something using reason.

Chapter Twelve

207.25 **dilectissime** Milne (1927, xxii) incorrectly notes that Augustine uses this word twice in *C. Faust.* when quoting Mt. 3.17, 17.5; Mk 1.2, 9.7; and Lk 3.22, 9.35. He states that all the Latin manuscripts have *dilectus* and not *dilectissimus* and that this exception "seems worthy of note." He later corrects himself to state that it is not Augustine who uses this word, but Faustus (1927, xxix, Supplementary Notes).

207.25 **Pattici** Patticius (or Patteg the teacher) is well known to be a disciple of Mani. Mani's father also has the same name, but Mani's father was a house-steward, and not a teacher (Lieu 1985, 64). Lieu then points the reader to text 13941 + 14285 V 5, in Sundermann (1981, 36). To summarize Lieu (64), the missionary journeys of Adda and Patik to the Roman Empire are the best documented. Mani instructed both of them to familiarize themselves with Mani's teaching and take with them 'writings of Light' (p. 64). See *M2* (Klimkeit, 1993, 202) "Title: 'The coming of the Apostle into the Lands ... They (Adda and Patteg) went to Rome. They observed many disputes among the religions. Many elect and auditors were chosen. Patteg was there for a year. Thereafter he returned to the Apostle.'" as well as *M2I6* (Klimkeit 1993, 203). These texts show that Patticius was in the West and brought writings from Mani and this would date Patticius' arrival in the Roman Empire sometime before 276 (the date of Mani's death). See also Decret (1978, vol. 1, 118-123) and

Tardieu (1982, 9). It would not be surprising that he would bring with him a letter addressed to himself from Mani since he could use this letter as a show of his own authority and this would explain how this letter got to the West. These texts also show that Patticius left the Roman Empire (presumably without Addai) and went back to Mani. It is possible that Patticius left this letter in the West when he returned to Mani. Scoppello (2001, 229) wonders whether Patticius could be the ‘Babylonian catechumen’ of Mani in *Keph.* 57. It is probable that he is the same one. See Chapter Two of the dissertation for a deeper discussion of this question.

208.1 **cuiusmodi sit natiuitas Adae et Euae, utrum uerbo sint idem prolati, an progeniti ex corpore** Augustine also mentions the Manichaean version of Adam and Eve in *Mor.* II 19, *Nat. b.* 46 (CSEL 25,2/884.24-886.17) and *Haer.* 46.14 (CCL 46/317.146). The question of the manner of births was a very important one in Manichaeism and as stated above, it is the reason (*causa*) for this very letter. Decret (1978, 119-123) notes that this was an important question both in N. Africa as well as in Egypt, as found with Origen. There are many other Manichaean texts that look at this subject. Scoppello (2001, 225-228) notes *Keph.* 57, but she does not mention other important Manichaean texts on this issue. In *Keph.* 57 (144.15-22) a Babylonian catechumen asks a series of questions on the birth of Adam: “...when he was fashioned, how did they sculpt him? Or, how did they beget him? [Rath]er, is his begetting like the begetting that is brought forth today, amongst humankind; or not? Does a distinction exist between his birth and the one that they bring forth today?” Mani tells the catechumen that Adam’s birth was different than births today since Adam was so much larger and lived many more years than people do today, which was a common belief in antiquity; see *Ciu. Dei* 15.9 (CCL 48/465.28-30) where Augustine quotes Pliny the Elder on this issue.

Mani also tells the catechumen that Adam’s birth was different in that he was not born from a woman’s uterus (*Keph.* 57, 147.5-10). *Keph.* 64 (157.2-32) also discusses the birth of Adam: he was better for a number of reasons, but the most important was that the disturbance

between the good and evil happened on his account. Adam has the “seal of the entire universe on him.” Also an important fragment on the issue of Adam and Eve was found by Zieme (1997, 401) which is titled “*Begun has the chapter on the birth of Adam and Eve.*” Unfortunately this was all that survived of this work.

208.4 in uariis scripturis reuelationibusque Mani and other Manichaeans were very active in “correcting” material and shaping it into the Manichaean belief structure, which shows that they were very dynamic in reading other material that was not their own. Regarding the Manichaeans reading material from other sects, see also *Keph.* 2 (17.21-35) and the Manichaean *Homilies* 8.1-6 where it states that there are many who have “testified about the Great War.”

208.23 Unde si tibi uidetur, inquit, ausculta prius First of all, one should listen, as Mani said in *Contra ep. fund.* 11 (CSEL 25,1/206.19) “*quae qui audierit...*”

208.24 ante constitutionem mundi What happened before the creation of the world in the Manichaean religion is the beginning of the battle between Good and Evil. In the *CMC* Mani’s Twin (his Syzygos) revealed to him the conditions of the Twin, the Father, and the entire world before the foundation of the world (*CMC* 65.12) as well as how the “foundation of all good and evil deeds has been laid...” The *PB* II (3.22) also states that the Paraclete revealed the “mysteries that were before the foundation.” See also *C. Fort.* 9 (CSEL 25,1/88.24-89.3) “*Si non potest ei aliquid nocere, quid ei factura erat gens tenebrarum, contra quam dicitis bellum gestum esse a Deo ante constitutionem mundi, in quo bello nos id est animas, quas modo indigere liberatore manifestum est, commixtas esse omni malo et morti implicias asseritis?*” and *C. Fort.* 22 (CSEL 25,1/107.4-8) also states that before the creation of the world “souls were sent...against the contrary nature.” See also *Commentary* 208.27.

208.24 et quo pacto proelium sit agitatum This battle is a constant theme throughout Manichaean writings (see Lieu 1992, 10-17 for a description of the beginning of the battle). Cf. *C. Faust.* 6.8 (CSEL 25,1/296.17) where Augustine calls it a “*pugna*” and later in *C.*

Faust. 28.5 (CSEL 25,1/6) he refers to it as a “*bellum*.” Secundinus in *ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/899.16 and 900.5) also calls it a “*pugna*.”

208.27 **Quis enim credat ante constitutionem mundi ullum proelium fuisse commissum?**

Augustine had difficulty with the idea that there was a battle before the creation of the world.

The notion of history for Augustine is confined purely to the “human sphere” (Brunner 1982, 79) and thus he believes that nothing (including time) was before the world was created.

Augustine probably derived this idea from Plotinus’ *Ennead* 3.7 (Peters 1984, 55). Ambrose states the same in *Hex.* 1.6.20. Augustine follows a long tradition: see Pelikan (1993, 107-119) on this issue in the Cappadocians; Van Winden (1963, 105-121) and Leftow (1991, 157-172) specifically for Augustine’s response. Here in *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine will remark that this is “*Iam incredibilia et omnino falsa proposuit*” (208.26-27). For his remarks on time and creation, see (among many) *Gn. adu. Man.* I.2.3 (CSEL 91/69.14-21) “*Deus enim fecit et tempora, et ideo antequam faceret tempora, non erant tempora. Non ergo possumus dicere fuisse aliquod tempus, quando deus nondum aliquid fererat. Quomodo enim erat tempus quod deus non fecerat, cum omnium temporum ipse sit fabricator? Et si tempus cum caelo et terra esse coepit, non potest inueniri tempus, quo deus nondum fecerat caelum et terram*”; *Conf.* 11.14.17 (CCL 27/202.1-3); *Ciu. Dei* 11.6 (CCL 48/326.1-27). See also Christian (1953, 1).

Secundinus, in *ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/899.16-900.5) questions Augustine’s knowledge on what happened before that battle as well as the battle itself, which sheds light on Augustine’s actual knowledge of Manichaean cosmogony. For a detailed discussion of this, see Chapter Three of the dissertation. See also Ambrose, speaking about Gen. 1.1 in *Hex.* 1.2.5, who states that Moses “linked together the beginnings of things, the Creator of the world, and the creation of matter in order that you might understand that God existed before the beginning of the world or that He was Himself the beginning of all things.”

209.1 **Persas et Scythas ante multos annos secum bellasse...non expertam**

conprehensamque cognoscere There are three types of belief in the writings of Augustine:

1) those things which can be believed but never understood; 2) those of which both belief and understanding go together and 3) those things which must first be believed and then understood (Markus 1967, 350). Here Augustine is discussing the first type: these wars can be believed, but can never be known by experience. Augustine demands a fact with or without belief. He wants to know something by personal experience, but this is impossible to get ‘knowledge’ about something that happened before humans existed. And because Mani promised this ‘without ambiguity’, this ‘something’ must not be obtained by a belief, therefore Augustine will not allow the Manichaeans to include this belief since he claims that they only use reason. For Augustine, “to believe something” means that one must have either an authority by which one believes or a reason. Since Mani is not an authority, then a reason must be given and this reason as he states just below must be very clear and intelligible. For a similar statement, cf. *Uera rel.* 25.46 (CCL 32/216.6-12) “Temporalium autem rerum fides siue praeteritarum siue futurarum magis credendo quam intellegendo ualet, sed nostrum est considerare, quibus uel hominibus uel libris credendum sit ad colendum recte deum, quae una salus est.”

Chapter Thirteen

209.11 **Haec quippe, inquit, in exordio fuerunt duae substantiae a se diuisae** Here begins the most basic cosmogonical idea in Manichaeism: the separation of the Light and Darkness in the Beginning. This section was read aloud by Augustine in his debate with Felix (*C. Fel.* 1.16, CSEL 25,2/820.7-8), but it was not written down. The idea of the two natures is found throughout the history of Manichaean texts and was probably the most well-known tenet of the Elect and the Hearers. Augustine mentions these two substances over and over again throughout his writings. His earliest reference to the Two Natures occurs in *Mor. II* 3.5 (CSEL 90,7/91.4-92.2) “Quod si duae naturae sunt, ut affirmatis, regnum lucis et regnum tenebrarum.” Cf. also (among many) *Uera rel.* 9.16 (CCL 32/198.1-6) “qui duas naturas uel substantias singulis principiis aduersus inuicem rebelles esse arbitrantur”; *Cont.* 22 (CSEL

41/168.2-7) “Qui nobis uel ex apostolicis litteris duas sine initio naturas, unam boni, alteram mali”; *Conf.* 5.10.20 (CCL 27/68.44-54); *Nat. b.* 41 (CSEL 25,2/874.21-875.7); *Haer.* 46.2 (CCL 46/313.7-10) and *C. Iul.* 1.8.36 (PL 44, 666).

Fortunatus, in *C. Fort.* 1.14 (CSEL 25, 1/91.5-18) bases these two natures on Mt. 15.3 and 3.10 (The tree which my heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted up and cast into the fire, because it brings not forth good fruit). Faustus, in *C. Faust.* 21.1 (CSEL 25,1/568.9-15...569.11-14) states “Quia bonorum et malorum duo principia traditis. Est quidem, quod duo principia confitemur, sed unum ex his deum uocamus, alterum hylen, aut, ut communiter et usitate dixerim, daemonem.” Felix, in *C. Fel.* 2.2 (CSEL 25,2/829.13-21) also uses Biblical quotes to support the two natures. He gives Mt. 7.17 (The good tree never bears rotten fruit, and the evil tree never bears good fruit) and Mt. 13.27-8. Secundinus, in *ep. Sec.* (CSEL 25,2/899.11-15) tells Augustine to stop making the two natures one “desine duas naturas facere unam, quia adpropinquat domini iudicium. Uae, qui accipient, qui, quod dulce est, in amaritudinem transferunt!” He also tells Augustine (CSEL 25,2/899.16-900.5) that it cannot be explained why there are two natures, since ‘divine reason surpasses the hearts of men.’ Augustine answers this in *C. Sec.* 26 (CSEL 25,2/946.21).

For other Manichaean texts, see *PB II* 9.3, in which Allberry (1938) directs the reader to this passage in the *Contra ep. fund.*; *PB II* 86.15-17; *Keph.* 2, 16.32 discusses these two natures, but ties it in with the saying of Jesus regarding the Two Trees (*Lk.* 6:43-44) and *Keph.* 120, 286.24-288.18 which is titled “Concerning the Two Essences.” On Mani being the separator of the Two Natures, see *PB II* 26.28-29. For non-western texts see (among many) *M* 5794 (T II D 126 I, trans. in Klimkeit (1993, 216) “The religion which I have chosen is greater and better than the other religions of the ancients in ten ways: ...Fourth, this revelation of the two principles and my living scriptures.”

Augustine is not the only one to argue against the idea of two primordial natures. See Titus of Bostra, *Adu. Manich.* 1.3, 1.4 and Alexander of Lycopolis, *C. Manich. opin.* 2 (Van

der Horst , 52) ‘He laid down as principles (ἀρχαίς) God and Matter, God being good and matter evil...’ and especially Chapter Three (p. 59).

209.12 **luminis quidem imperium tenebat** Fortunatus, in *C. Fort.* 1.3 (CSEL 25,1/85.18) states something similar: God “aeternam lucem et propriam inhabitet.” Faustus in *C. Faust.* 20.2 (CSEL 25,1/536.9-14) states that the Father dwells in Light inaccessible, based on 1 Tim. 6.16. Augustine counters this idea in *C. Faust.* 20.7 (CSEL 25,1/541.4-11) by stating that this idea of light in which the Father dwells was taken from the visible light.

209.15 **continens apud se sapientiam et sensus uitales** Augustine, in *Nat. b.* 44 (CSEL 25,2/881.12-20) mentions the *uitalis substantia*, which is the *dei natura*. As will be seen, it is these “*sensus uitales*” that are harmed in the story found in the *Thesaurus*. Augustine continues with a description of the blessed Father in the Manichaean *Thesaurus*, found in *Nat. b.* 44 (CSEL 25,2/881.20-882.1). See also Evodius’ *C. Manich.* (CSEL 25,2/956.2-6).

209.16 **per quos etiam duodecim membra luminis sui comprehendit** These twelve *membra* are the twelve aeons or worlds (*saecula*) which are found in other texts. For example, see *C. Faust.* 15.15 (CSEL 25,1/425.16-19) where Augustine is describing the Manichaean *Song of the Lovers*, which includes a mention of the twelve aeons (worlds): “Huc accedit, quia non a te solus adamatus est; sequeris enim cantando et adiungis duodecim saecula floribus conuestita et canoribus plena et in faciem patris flores suos iactantia. Ubi et ipsos duodecim magnos quosdam deos profiteris, ternos per quattuor tractus, quibus ille unus circumcingitur.” The direction of the regions given here is also found in *Keph.* 4, 25.7 “These (Twelve Aeons), who are the first evocations that he evoked (to mirror) his greatness, he spread them out to the four climes, three by three before his face.” The twelve are also mentioned in other Manichaean texts. See *PB II* 1.13-15. For non western texts, see *M730R* and VII (Klimkeit [1993, 31]) “He holds the twelve diadems of Light, and before Him stand twelve great ones, His own sons, like twelve bright forms of the Father of Light”; and *M10 R* 10-V22.

The Manichaeans are not the only religious group to have Twelve Aeons. See *Apoc. John* II 7.32-8.22 (text and translation in Waldstein and Wisse 1995, 49-53). These twelve aeons “attend the Son” and “belong to the Son.”

209.17 **regni uidelicet proprii diuitias adfluentes** The Twelve Aeons are also described as the “twelve great Rich Gods” found in *Keph.* 4 (25.15).

209.22 **copulata sibi habet beata et gloriosa saecula neque numero neque prolixitate aestimanda** This description of the *saecula* belongs to that of the Aeons of the Aeons, which surround the Father, as found in numerous Manichaean writings, from the Roman West to the Chinese East. The *Manichaean Song of Lovers*, as found in *C. Faustum* also states that besides the Twelve great gods there are *innumerabiles regnicolas*, which are probably the Aeons of the Aeons (*C. Faust.* 15.5 [CSEL 25,1/425.22-23]). Moon (1955, 215) states that “properly speaking, *saecula* denote the divine Eons which dwelt with the Father of Light, but since the Kingdom of Light and its inhabitants are consubstantial with the Father, Augustine uses the terms *regna* and *saecula* interchangeably.” See also *PB II*, 1.13-4, *PB II* 136.33-35 “His 12 Aeons. The Aeons of the Aeons. Householders of the Land of Light”; *Keph.* 9, *Keph.* 119 and the Sogdian fragment *M 178* (Henning 1948, 308).

Van Lindt (1992, 28) notes that there is a difference here in the description given between Augustine and the cosmogonical description given by Theodore Bar Konai. “The citation by Aug. from the *epistula Fundamenti* gives a different view (from Theodore Bar Konai) on the organisation of the Land of Light. Indeed, it is here stated that ‘God the Father’ has ‘twelve members of Light’ and moreover ‘beata et gloriosa saecula, neque numero, neque prolixitate aestimanda’ —good and glorious aeons, whose number nor duration can be estimated...As such Theodore accords with the *Kephalaia* and Augustine with the *PB* where ‘the twelve members’ are the ‘twelve aeons’ and the ‘innumerable Aeons’ the ‘Aeons of the Aeons.’” He also states (29) that “In contrast with the *PB* ‘the Twelve Aeons’ are never mentioned as such in the *Kephalaia*.” *Keph.* 64.34 has “the twelve light limbs that are his

(God’s) twelve wisdoms.” See also Gharib (2000, 266) who lists the Aeons of the Aeons as found in the Coptic, Latin, Chinese and Parthian texts. There are also ‘aeons of the aeons’ (**ΝΙΛΙΩΝ ΝΤΕ ΝΙΛΙΩΝ**) found in the Nag Hammadi writing *Tripartite Tractate* 58.31 (Attridge and Pagels 1985, 205). Here the Son rests upon these “imperishable spirits, just as the Father rests upon the Son.” See also *Tripartite Tractate* 68.

209.25 nullo in regnis eius insignibus aut indigente aut infirmo constituto In agreement with PL and Jolivet (1961, 424), the text has been emended from *infirmo* to *infirmo*. *Infirmo* can have the meaning of the “lowest or humblest” but the idea of not having weakness in the Land of Light (*infirmo*) fits the context better. This passage from the *Ep. fund.* (209.25-28) is also given in *C. Sec.* 3 (CSEL 25,2/909.20-21) and Evodius (*C. Manich.*), with minor variations.

209.26 Ita autem fundata sunt eiusdem splendidissima regna supra lucidam et beatam terram This land is also found in *Keph.* 20, 63.27-33, which describes the ‘great earth’ and the rich gods (which we have seen are the Twelve Aeons) and the angels which are found over it. For a Sogdian description of this earth or land, see Gharib (2000, 261). This exact passage is found in *C. Fel.* 1.17 (CSEL 25,2/820.10-12), (although with *super* instead of *supra*), *Nat. b.* 42 (CSEL 25,2/877.18-20) and a significant variation found in Evodius, *C. Manich.* (CSEL 25,2/955.1-2):

<i>Contra ep. fund.</i>	<i>C. Fel.</i>	<i>Nat. b.</i>	<i>C. Manich.</i>
Ita autem fundata sunt eiusdem splendidissima regna supra lucidam et beatam terram	Ita autem fundata sunt eiusdem splendidissima regna super lucidam et beatam terram	Ita autem fundata sunt eiusdem splendidissima regna supra lucidam et beatam terram	ita etiam fundata eiusdem splendidissima saecula

As can be seen, there is a major difference between the text of the *Ep. fund.* as used by both Augustine and Evodius. The text of Evodius is lacking the full description of the Land. In its place the text has *saecula*. This could not be a scribal mistake since it is unlikely that a scribe would leave out the description of the Land of Light and put in its place ‘*saecula*.’ It

appears that Evodius is using a different copy of the *Ep. fund.* from those of Augustine (the copy he had when he wrote this present work and the copy he took from Felix.

209.28 **ut a nullo umquam aut moueri aut concuti possint** This exact passage is also found in *C. Fel.* I. 17 (CSEL 25,1/820.12), *Nat. b.* 42 (CSEL 25,2/877.18-20) and another variation found in Evodius *C. Manich.* (CSEL 25,2/955.2-3). The idea that this realm was unshakeable will give Augustine plenty of ammunition against the Manichaeans. In *Contra ep. fund.* he does not discuss this issue, but he does so in *Conf.*: if the Land of Light was immovable, why would it have to fight against the Land of Darkness? This is a question that was put forward to the Manichaeans by Augustine's friend Nebridius (*Conf.* 7.2.3 (CCL 27/93.1-6)). Cf. also *Nat. b.* 42 (CSEL 25,2/877.26-878.3). This unshakeable kingdom is also found in other Manichaean texts. In Gharib (2000, 261 n. 25) there is a Sogdian text *M178*, (Henning, 1948, 307) which states that "its (The Fifth Greatness, the Light earth...) divine pavement is of the substance of a diamond that does not shake for ever." See also the Chinese *Hymnscroll* 271 which states "precious soil of diamond, radiating, illuminating downward,...with no quaking and not shaking..." (Gharib, 262 n. 26) and *PB II* 155.20 where God is called the "Foundation unshakeable."

Chapter Fourteen

210.9 **teneret** The text was changed here from *terret* (as found in CSEL) to *teneret*, which PL (vol 42, p. 183) has and Jolivet (1961) retained.

210.11-211.2 **Quapropter aut ea, quae dicit, proba mihi uera esse, ut ostendas, quae non possum credere...** Augustine wants the Manichaeans to prove true what he does not believe or make him believe what they cannot prove logically. For the first, Augustine wants understanding before belief. But he has shown that one cannot prove without a doubt what someone has said is true without belief. For the Manichaeans to prove the second, they must provide a figure of authority to Augustine, which of course would be Mani. An authoritative figure would allow him to believe what he does not understand. But as we have seen,

Augustine had already rejected him. Therefore Augustine has put out a demand to the Manichaeans which he knows they cannot fulfill. The first half of this chapter deals with this issue.

211.6 non iam hominibus, sed ipso deo intrinsecus mentem nostram inluminante atque firmante? Belief must come first when observing something is not possible. Once again Augustine repeats the idea that only God can illuminate the mind, which ties in with chapter two where he had used Mal. 4.2 and John 1.9. See Chapter Four of the dissertation. This inner illumination is also mentioned in *Mor.* I 11.18 (CSEL 90,7/21.11-17), where he states that in order to be truly happy, one must be “inwardly illuminated and occupied by His Truth and Holiness.” Ambrose as well discusses this illumination in *De Isaac* 3.8. On this illumination, see Bourke (1992, 40); Rist (1994, 79) who shows there is a Platonic background to this; and Nash (1971, 47-66).

211.11 certa et manifesta cognosceret, ipse significat, quid intersit inter cognoscere et credere See *Commentary* 209.1.

211.12-14 Ipse enim cognoscit, cui apertissime ista monstrantur; eis autem, quibus haec narrat, non cognitionem insinuat, sed credulitatem suadet Augustine is implying that Mani, who was told his revelations, would be the only person who could actually know this. Mani would then have to persuade others to believe this. They could never *know* it and this is the difference between to know and to believe. See also *Mag.* 11.37 (CCL 29/195.32-43) and *Conf.* 10.3.4 (CCL 27/156.28) “Sed quis adhuc sim ecce in ipso tempore confessionum mearum, et multi hoc nosse cupiunt, qui me nouerunt, et non me nouerunt, qui ex me uel de me aliquid audierunt, sed auris eorum non est ad cor meum, ubi ego sum quicumque sum....creditori tamen uolunt, numquid cognitari?”

211.14 Cui quisquis temere consenserit, Manichaeus efficitur, non certa cognoscendo, sed incerta credendo Thus the Manichaeans are guilty of believing things which cannot be known without a clear knowledge of what these things are.

211.23 **consensione doctorum indoctorumque celebrantur et per omnes populos**

grauissima auctoritate firmata sunt? Once again he brings up the authority of the Catholic church, which he had stated earlier. See *Commentary* 196.10 and 196.12.

211.26 **primum pollicens rerum certarum cognitionem, postea et incertarum imperans**

fidem This was the biggest crime that Mani had committed – he first promises something that he does not deliver, and then demands faith for even the most doubtful things. As shown, this is a constant theme in the *Contra ep. fund.*

Chapter Fifteen

212.5 **superstitione** This is the only place in this work that Augustine calls Manichaeism a superstition, but he uses this word many times in other works, including his first: *C. Acad.*

1.1.3.74 (CCL 29/5.73-4) “Ipsa me nunc in otio, quod uehementer optauimus, nutrit ac fouet, ipsa me penitus ab illa superstition....” Cf. also *B. uita.* 1.4 (CCL 29/66.81-2); *Mor. I* 29.59 (CSEL 90,7/62.1-4), 34.75 (CSEL 90,7/81.6); *ep.* 7 (CSEL 34/15.22); *Duab. an.* 12.18 (CSEL 25,1/75.2-7), *S. Dom. mon.* 2.9.32 (CCL 35/121.682-688); *Conf.* 4.4.7 (CCL 27/43.9-12); *C. Faust.* 16.9 (CSEL 25,1/447.25), 18.7 (CSEL 25,1/496.14) and *Haer.* 46.9 (CCL 46/314.62) “...exsecrabilis superstitionis...” The Manichaeans called Judaism and the Christianity of Augustine (which Faustus calls “semi-Christianity”) a superstition. For example, see *C. Faust.* 1.2 (CSEL 25,1/251.22), 16.1 (CSEL 25,1/440.6) “Siquidem esset etiam tum liberum nobis odio manente atque execratione superstitionis eorum solas ab eisdem de Christo excerpere prophetias” and 18.3 (specifically against Judaism) (CSEL 25,1/492.18-19) “uanae superstitioni succumbere.”

212.9 **Iuxta unam uero partem ac latus** This is part of the *Ep. fund.* is also found in *C. Fel.*

1.19 (CSEL 25,2/824.16-17), although the text in *C. Fel.* is slightly different: “Iuxta uero unam partem ac latus inlustris illius ac sanctae terrae.” As in his previous statements, Augustine gives more of the text. As will be shown, Augustine will have many problems with this statement (see also Chapter Four of the dissertation). A side to the Land of Light

must mean that it is not infinite on all sides because it is encroached upon from the bottom. Augustine also has a problem with the idea that something material is bordering something immaterial. Cf. also Titus of Bostra, *Aduersus Manichaeos* I. 9 where he too discusses the question of the boundary. This discussion of the ‘*iuxta*’ continues in *Contra ep. fund.* 20 (CSEL 25,1/217.2).

For an important study on this phrase, see Bennett (2001, 68-78). Bennett argues that Titus of Bostra, Severus of Antioch and Theodoret of Cyrrhus, who all discuss this division of the primordial space into four quadrants, rely on a Greek text (and not Syriac) which was not from the hand of Mani but might have been from some material “excerpted from Mani’s *Living Gospel*” (69). Bennett believes that these other texts, including the description as given by Augustine in the *Contra ep. fund.*, ultimately came from Mani’s *Living Gospel*, or at least a text that was derived from one of Mani’s own writings (2001, 78). This is a possibility, except that Augustine never mentions the title of this work (see Chapter Two of the Dissertation for a discussion of Augustine’s knowledge of the *Living Gospel*) and as Bennett points out, the surviving fragments of the *Living Gospel* do not make reference to this aspect of Manichaean cosmogony. It should also be pointed out that at this point in the *Contra ep. fund.*, Augustine is referring to more than one work (*non dico alias...*). See also Commentary 224.24.

212.10 **profunda et immensa magnitudine** A similar description is given by Aug. in *Mor.* II 9.14 (CSEL 90,7/100.5) “...desinatis dicere malum esse terram per immensum profundam et longam...”

212.12 **Hic infinitae tenebrae ex eadem manantes natura inaestimabiles** This is the first of the five natures of the Land of Darkness. It should be noted that the Land of Darkness is described from the outside to the inside (Darkness, Waters, Winds, Fire and then Smoke where the Chief Prince resides (see 229.4)). This same order is mentioned in *Mor.* II 9.14 (CSEL 90,7/100.6-8) “...malum esse quinque antra elementorum, aliud tenebris, aliud aquis,

aliud uentis, aliud igni, aliud fumo plenum” and *Mor.* II 9.17 (CSEL 90,7/102.18-19). But in *Haer.* 46.7 (CCL 46/314.43-46) he lists a totally different order from both his earlier texts as well as those found in other Manichaean writings: “Quinque enim elementa quae genuerunt principes proprios genti tribuunt tenebrarum, eaque elementa hi nominibus nuncupant: fumum, tenebras, ignem, aquam, uentum.” This order is not the same order found in the *PB* II 9.17-21, which lists the five storehouses as Smoke, Fire, Wind, Water and Darkness. It is possible that he had misquoted from memory his list found in *Haer.*

212.13 **cum propriis fetibus** The particular offspring are not named in the *Contra ep. fund.*, but Augustine had given them in *Mor.* II 9.14 (CSEL 90,7/100.9) and again in *Mor.* II 9.16 and 9.17 (CSEL 90,7/102.1). Augustine is probably referring to *Mor.* II when he later states in *Contra ep. fund.* 28 (229.12) there there are other texts with the names of the animals. This also gives more weight to Augustine’s comments that the *Ep. fund.* was more of a general statement on cosmogony as opposed to something more specific (224.24). Cf. also *C. Faust.* 21.10 (CSEL 25,1/580.24-25) “...repebant, ambulabant, natabant, uolabant quaeque pro genere suo”; *Haer.* 46.7 (CCL 46/314.47) “...in tenebris serpentina...”

212.14 **ultra quas erant aquae caenosae ac turbidae cum suis inhabitatoribus** Next is the nature of the waters. These are also mentioned in *Mor.* II 9.14 (CSEL 90,7/100.7,9) “aliud aquis...natantia in aquis.” Cf. also *Haer.* 46.7 (CCL 46/314.45,47) “aquam...in aquis natatilia.” *PB* II 9.19 only mentions the waters and not their inhabitants, and *Keph.* 6 (33.25-32), which has a description of the King of the Waters. See also *Keph.* 23 (68.15 and 69.11).

212.15 **quarum interius uenti horribiles ac uehementes cum suo principe et genitoribus** See also *Mor.* II 9.14 (CSEL 90,7/100.8,10) “aliud uentis...uolatilia in uentis”; *Haer.* 46.7 (CCL 46/314.45,48) “uentum...in uento uolatilia”; *PB* II 9.19. There is a fuller description of the King of the world of wind in *Keph.* 6 (33.18-24). See also *Keph.* 23 (68.15 and 69.11).

212.17 **Rursum regio ignea et corruptibilis cum suis ducibus et nationibus** See *Mor.* II 9.14 (CSEL 90,7/100.8,10) “aliud igni...quadrupedia in igne” and *Haer.* 46.7 (CCL

46/314.47). As with the other descriptions, the *Keph.* gives more details. See *Keph.* 6 (33.9-17), *Keph.* 23 (68.15), and *Keph.* 27 (77.29).

212.18 **Pari more introrsum gens caliginis ac fumi plena** Note here that this is describing a race and not a place that is full of smoke. Cf. *Mor.* II 9.14 (CSEL 90,7/100.8,10) “aliud fumo plenum...bipedia in fumo”; *Haer.* 46.7 (CCL 46/314.46) “In fumo nata animalia bipedia.” See also *Keph.* 6 (33.33-34.1-5), *Keph.* 6 (33.2), and *Keph.* 23 (68.15).

212.19 **in qua morabatur inmanis princeps omnium et dux** This prince of all of them is also called Satan, or *hyle* in *C. Faust.* 20.3 (CSEL 25,1/537.3) and the best examination of the King of Darkness is still Puech (1948, repr. 1951). Cf. also *Keph.* 6 (30.25) “The King of the world of Smoke [...] who came up from the depth of [darkness; this is he who is] the head of all wickedness, and [all] mal[ignity]. The beginning of the spread of the war occurred [thr]ough him; all the battl[es], fights, quarrelling, dan[ger]s, destructions, fl[i]ghts, wrestling-contests! That is the o[ne who fir]st [made] arise [dan]ger and war, with his worl[ds and his] powers. Af[te]rwards, also, he waged war with the light. H[e pitched] a battle wi[th] the exalted kingdom.” Gardner (1995, 34) has pointed out that this *kephalaion* may show some corruption in the tradition, since it makes the supreme ruler reside in the world of Smoke. If there is a corruption, then there is also the same corruption in the *Ep. fund.* On this *keph.* and this passage, see Feldmann (1987, 44).

212.23 **Si aerium vel etiam aetherium corpus diceret esse naturam dei, profecto** From a discussion of the Land of Darkness Augustine immediately brings up the nature of God. This may seem like an abrupt change, but after describing the fantasies of the Manichaeans, Augustine must now describe God in the correct fashion, by means of an ascent. On this ascent and its importance to this text, see Chapter Five of the dissertation. Suffice it to say here that this ascent has gone unnoticed, but I believe that it is one of his most important descriptions of it in his early writings. The rest of this chapter will also set the groundwork for the rest of the work.

212.24 **qui sapientiae veritatisque naturam** This is Christ. In this work Christ is described many times as the Wisdom of God (200.6, 200.9, 200.19, 200.22, and 201.11) as well as the Truth (202.20, 241.18). Augustine also describes Him in this manner in other works. For example, see *ep.* 14.4 (CSEL 34/34.13-15) “Item quaeris, utrum summa illa ueritas et summa sapientia, forma rerum, per quam facta sunt omnia, quem filium dei unicum sacra nostra profitentur...” and especially *Uera rel.* 40.110 (CCL 32/257.58-66) where Christ is referred to as the one unchangeable Wisdom and Truth “...sed ab una incommutabili sapientia et ueritate.”

212.25 **per nulla spatia locorum distentam atque diffusam** Here begins Augustine’s definition of immateriality. Augustine, through Ambrose, learned that the Catholic Church taught this (Burns 1988, 11). Moon (1955, 128) is certainly correct to state that what identifies the corporeal world is its spatial extent, found *Nat. b.* 3. See also *ep.* 166.2.4 (CSEL 44/550.10-553.8); *ep.* 187.4.14 (CSEL 57/92.14-21) “Sed sic est Deus per cuncta diffusus, ut non sit qualitas mundi, sed substantia creatrix mundi, sine labore regens, et sine onere continens mundum. Non tamen per spatia locorum, quasi mole diffusa...” For an excellent overview on the pre-Augustinian sources on matter, see Grabowski (1954, 25-49) and Paulsen (1990, 105-15). For Augustine’s positive (as opposed to negative as found here) views, see (among many) *Uera rel.* 3.3 (CCL 32/188.15-16); *Conf.* 7.1.1 (CCL 27/92.1-27) and *Nat. b.* 3 (CSEL 25,2/856.22). Augustine owes this ground-breaking idea to the Platonists; see *Conf.* 7.20.26 (CCL 27/109.1-8) “Sed tunc lectis Platoniorum illis libris posteaquam inde admonitus quaerere incorpoream ueritatem inuisibilia tua per ea quae facta sunt intellecta conspexi et repulsus sensi...” These books of the Platonists have generated a large amount of scholarship and for an overview, see O’Donnell (1992, vol. II, 421).

212.26 **sine ulla mole magnam et magnificam** On the immensity of God in Augustine, see Grabowski (1954, 33). For earlier Christian references to this idea, see especially Clement of

Rome's, *First Letter to the Cor.* 10; Tertullian, *Apologeticus* (CSEL 69); and St. Hilary, *De trin.* 2.6 (PL 10/54) (Grabowski 1954, 33 n. 49, 50, and 51).

212.28 **sed ubique integram, ubique praesentem** Augustine is also indebted to the Platonists for this idea: see du Roy (1966, 470) and Evans (1993, 34). Coyle (1978, 339) however, is not totally convinced of this. O'Donnell (1992, vol. 2, 22) lists this passage in the *Contra ep. fund.* as well as an extensive list where it is found in other works of Augustine. See also O'Connell (1968, 32-64) and especially Grabowski (1954). In Augustine's work, cf. *S. Dom. mon.* 2.9.32 (CCL 35/121.682-688) "Quaerunt enim ab imperitis hominibus talia intellegere nequaquam ualentibus, quomodo satanas cum deo loqui potuerit, non intuentes—non enim possunt, cum superstitione et contentione caecati sunt—deum non loci spatium mole corporis occupare et sic alibi esse alibi non esse, aut certe hic partem habere aliam et alibi aliam, sed maiestate ubique praesto esse, non per partes diuisum sed ubique perfectum" and *Gn. adu. Man.* 2.8.10 (CSLE 91/129.6-7).

Chapter Sixteen

213.3 **Sed quid dicam de ueritate atque sapientia, quae omnes potentias animae superat** Augustine's Neoplatonic teaching comes out in this chapter. At the beginning, Augustine will begin his ascent to God, not by beginning his teaching at a high level intellectually (with that of the Truth and Wisdom), but starts at a lower level and discuss the nature of matter. For more details, see Chapter Five of the dissertation.

213.4 **cum ipsius animae natura, quae mutabilis inuenitur** He had already stated that the soul was changeable at the very beginning of this work (chapter one (193.19-21)). See also *Imm. an.* 5.7 (CSEL 89,1/108.10-17). In two earlier works against the Manichaeans Augustine will use this line of reasoning to help them raise their thoughts to God. In *Gn. adu. Man.* 2.4.5 (CSEL 91/123.1-124.3) Augustine uses Genesis to argue that the soul is mutable and God is immutable. See also 2.6.7 (CSEL 91/126.1-127.21), as well as *Uera rel.* 10.18 (CCL 32/199.7-12) where he states that anyone can see that the body is changeable in both

space and time while the soul is changeable, not in space but in time. He also tries to show this to Secundinus in *C. Sec.* 8 (CSEL 25,2/917.16-25).

Ambrose states the same in *Isaac* 2.5 (PL 14/504-505) “Anima igitur secundum sui naturam optima est: sed plurimumque per irrationabile sui obnoxia fit corruptioni, ut inclinetur ad uoluptates corporis, et ad petulantiam, dum mensuram rerum non tenet aut fallitur opinione, atque inclinata ad materiam agglutinatur corpori. Sic inuisibile eius impeditur, et malitia repletur; quia dum intendit malitiae, eius se uitii replet, et fit defectu bonitatis intemperantior.”

213.5 **nullo modo locorum spatia quadam mole sua occupet?** Bourke (1945, 101-102) is certainly correct when he states that “Dimensive quantity measures the spread of a body in space, with regard to length, width, and thickness. Augustine thinks that such quantity is not found in the human soul.” This idea he received from Plotinus. See *Enneads* 4.2.1 “The nature, at once divisible and indivisible, which we affirm to be soul has not the unity of an extended thing: it does not consist of separate sections; its divisibility lies in its presence at every point of the recipient, but it is indivisible as dwelling entire in the total and entire in any part.” Augustine will continue with this definition of the soul in 213.28. The idea that the soul has no dimension is a common theme throughout Augustine’s writings, especially from his earlier years when he was concentrating on the nature of the soul. See *Imm. an.* 14.23 (CSEL 89,1/158.9-14) “Itaque illud potius adtende, unde ambigitur nunc, utrum quantitas et quasi, ut ita dicam, locale spatium animo ullum sit. Nam profecto, quia corpus non est--neque enim aliter incorporea ulla cernere ualeret, ut superior ratio demonstrabat--procul dubio caret spatio, quo corpora metiuntur...” See also *Quant.* 3.4 (CSEL 89,1/135.4-8), 32.69 (CSEL 89,1/216.21-23) and *C. Faust.* 25.2 (CSEL 25,1/727.2-12).

213.6 **Quidquid enim qualibet crassitudine est, non potest nisi minui per partes** Because the soul cannot be divided, it is superior to the body. In Plotinus’s *Enneads* 4.2.1 (MacKenna, 139) the same idea is found “There are, we hold, things primarily apt to partition, tending by

sheer nature towards separate existence: they are things in which no part is identical either with another part or with the whole, while, also their part is necessarily less than the total and whole: these are magnitudes of the realm of sense, masses, each of which has a station of its own so that none can be identically present in entirety at more than one point at one time.”

For parallel statements in Augustine, see *Imm. an.* 7.12 (CSEL 89,1/113.22-114.2) “Omnis enim pars, quae remanet, corpus est, et quicquid hoc est, quantolibet spatio locum occupat. Neque id posset, nisi haberet partes, in quas identidem caederetur” and *Uera rel.* 30.55 (CCL 32/223.30-41). Here Augustine does not discuss the infinite division which matter can have as he does in earlier works, especially *ep.* 3.2 (CSEL 34/6.13-15) “quare cum corpus nullum esse minimum sinitur, quo pacto esse sinamus amplissimum, quo amplius esse non posset” and *Uera rel.* 43.80 (CCL 32/240.14-20). See also Hölscher (1986, 13-21), who gives the best description of the difference between the body and the soul.

213.8 Minor est enim digitus Here Augustine begins to break down his statement that all matter can be broken down into parts. He begins with parts of the body, progresses to the earth (213.11), then water (213.12), air (213.14) and to light (213.17). In each case he is trying to show that material objects have pieces and each piece must be in its own space. The soul, as he will discuss next, is not broken or divided like material objects.

213.25 Animae uero natura, etiamsi non illa eius potentia consideretur, qua intellegit ueritatem I.e., the soul cannot be cut and therefore is not material. For an earlier discussion of this, see *Quant.* especially 23.41 (CSEL 89,1/181.11).

213.26 sed illa inferior, qua continet corpus The superiority of the soul was another idea that Augustine received from the Platonists (Rist 1994, 93). Here Augustine breaks down the functions of the soul, the first of which deal directly with the body. He speaks many times about this “inferior aspect” of the soul. See *Quant.* 14.23 (CSEL 89,1/159.17-22) “...quid mirum, si anima neque corporea sit neque ulla aut longitudine porrecta aut latitudine diffusa aut altitudine solidata et tamen tantum ualeat in corpore, ut penes eam sit regimen omnium

membrorum et quasi cardo quidam in agendo cunctarum corporalium motionum?” and 33.70 (CSEL 89,1/218.5-11).

213.27 **sentit in corpore** This idea is an old one and can be found in Plato’s *Republic* (5.462D1-5). But it is not clear whether Augustine gets this idea from Cicero or from Plato (Rist 1994, 108). See also Miles (1979, 14-39).

213.27 **nullo modo inuenitur locorum spatiis aliqua mole distendi** As opposed to a body, as stated in *Contra ep. fund.* 213.23-24. See also *Quant.* 21.35 (CSEL 89,1/174.13) “quod per totum spatium corporis tactus sentitur ab anima”; *Imm. an.* 16.25 (CSEL 89,1/127.20-22) “...sed amittendo fieri posset et propterea fieri non potest, nisi forte loco anima continetur et localiter corpori iungitur.”

213.28 **Nam singulis sui corporis particulis tota praesto est, cum tota sentit in singulis** For a good overview of the following passages from the *Contra ep. fund.*, see Torchia (1999, 138). Rist (1994, p. 96, n. 9) mentions this passage as one of Augustine’s favorite examples for the omnipresence of God. He also lists *ep.* 166.2.4; *Trin.* 6.6.8. This example can also be found in *Enneads* 4.7.6-7 (Rist 1994, p. 96). Cf. also *Imm. an.* 16.25 (CSEL 89,1/128.3-7) “Anima uero non modo uniuersae moli corporis sui, sed etiam unicuique particulae illius tota simul adest. Partis enim corporis passionem tota sentit, nec in toto tamen corpore. Cum enim quid dolet in pede, aduertitur oculus, lingua loquitur, admouetur manus” and *Quant.* 21.35 (CSEL 89,1/174.13-15).

214.1 **nec minor pars eius in digito est et maior in brachio, sicut ipse digitus brachio minor est, sed ubique tanta est, quia ubique tota est...** Here is another example taken from Plotinus’s *Enneads*. In 4.3.2 Plotinus states “If it (the soul) had the nature of body it would consist of isolated members each unaware of the conditions of every other; there would be a particular say—say a soul of the finger—answering as a distinct and independent entity to every local experience...” Because the soul is everywhere, it is non-corporeal. In regard to this specific passage in the *Contra ep. fund.*, Torchia (1999, 139 n. 31) also notes *Quant.* 5.7

and 23.41-44. Gregory of Nyssa had a similar idea in *De hominis opificio* 12.1-8 and 13.3 in which the mind is found all over the body (Torchia 1999, 139, n. 31). It is not clear whether Augustine had read this specific work, but there is evidence that he had read some of the Cappadocian's works in translation (TeSelle, 1970, 116, 149 and 294-6).

214.5 **non latet** For a similar statement, see *Quant.* 23.41 (CSEL 89,1/182.3-4) "Adtende ergo. Nam sensum puto esse non latere animam quod patitur corpus" and 25.48 (CSEL 89,1/192.20-21) "Sensus est certe omnis passio corporis non latens animam."

214.13 **sed sufficiens exhibere se singulis locis simul totam** This is a summary of the chapter. He states the same in *Imm. an.* 16.25 (CSEL 89,1/128.14-17) "Tota igitur singulis partibus simul adest, quae tota simul sentit in singulis. Nec tamen hoc modo adest tota, ut candor uel alia huiuscemodi qualitas in unaquaque parte corporis tota est."

214.14 **Quoniam tota sentit in singulis satis ostendit se locorum spatiis non teneri** See *Commentary* 213.28 above.

Chapter Seventeen

214.16 **Si eius memoriam cogitemus non rerum intellegibilium** I.e., truth and wisdom. See *Commentary* 213.3. The memory is a vital part used to understand God since it can recall any knowledge learned as quickly as it wishes (*Conf.* 10.24.35-10.26.37 and Colish 1983, 36). To discuss the memory after discussing matter is the natural progression that Augustine makes on his journey to God. See Augustine's comments in *Conf.* 10.8.12 (CCL 27/161.1-4) "Transibo ergo et istam naturae meae, gradibus ascendens ad eum, qui fecit me, et uenio in campos et lata praetoria memoriae, ubi sunt thesauri innumberabilium imaginum de cuiuscemodi rebus sensus inuectarum." There are a number of important studies on the memory and Augustine. For a good overview of his theory, see Teske (2001, 148-158) as well as Maurant (1979) and O'Daly (1987).

214.17 **sed harum corporearum quam et bestiae habere sentiuntur** Augustine did not go directly to the upper level of memory, but instead looks at the lower stage: the memory which

both humans and animals share. Augustine had said the same thing in *Quant.* 33.72 (CSEL 89,1/219.20-25) “Rebus, inter quas corpus agit et quibus corpus sustentat, consuetudine sese innectit et ab eis quasi membris aegre separatur; quae consuetudinis uis etiam seiunctione rerum ipsarum atque interuallo temporis non discissa memoria uocatur. Sed haec rursus omnia posse animam etiam in bestiis nemo negat.” See also next for another example of animals using memory as well as *Conf.* 10.17.26 (CCL 27/168.13-11.18).

214.19 **canes dominorum suorum corpora recognoscunt** Evodius uses this example in his discussion of memory in *Quant.* 26.50 (CSEL 89,1/195.1-2) “Sciebat enim, ut opinor, dominus suum canis, quem post uiginti annos recognouisse perhibetur...” where he is making reference to the *Odyssey* 17. See also *Quant.* 28.54 (CSEL 89,1/200.8).

214.23 **quis digne cogitet, ubi capiantur istae imagines, ubi gestentur uel ubi formentur?** He later asks a similar question in *Conf.* 10.8.13 (CCL 27/162.29-30) “Quae quomodo fabricatae sint, quis dicit, cum appareat, quibus sensibus raptae sint interiusque reconditae?”

214.28 **Nunc uero cum perexiguam terrae partem occupet corpus, immensarum regionum et caeli ac terrae imagines animus uoluit, quibus cateruatim discedentibus et succedentibus non fit angustus** This corresponds to what Augustine called the “third degree of the soul” in which he examines the nature of memory by which it is “the recorder and compiler of facts without number.” See *Quant.* 33.72 (CSEL 89,1/220.3-4) “sed animaduersione atque signis commendatarum ac retentorum rerum innumerabilium.” Cf. also *Quant.* 14.23 and *Conf.* 10.8.12 (CCL 27/161.1-4) “Transibo ergo et istam naturae meae, gradibus ascendens ad eum, qui fecit me, et uenio in campos et lata praetoria memoriae, ubi sunt thesauri innumerabilium imaginum de cuiuscemodi rebus sensus inuectarum.”

215.4 **ui potentiaque ineffabili** For more on this power of the soul to manipulate images, see 215.12. Moon (1955, 129) notes that “Ineffabilis ...Because of its intensive character, became exceedingly frequent in ecclesiastical writers, especially Augustine.”

215.3 sed ui potentiaque ineffabili, qua licet eis et addere quodlibet et detrahere et in angustum eas contrahere et per immensa expandere et ordinare, ut uelit Once again there is another parallel to *Conf.* 10.8.12 (CCL 27/161.4-7) “Tibi reconditum est, quidquid etiam cogitamus, uel augendo uel minuendo uel utcumque uariando ea quae sensus attigerit, et si quid aliud commendatum et repositum est, quod nondum absorbit et sepeliuit obliuio.”

Chapter Eighteen

215.8 Quid iam de illa loquar potentia, qua intellegitur ueritas For this power of determining the truth, see *Conf.* 10.10.17.

215.9 quae de corporis sensu haustae figurantur, imaginibus sese pro ueritate obponentibus magna uiuacitate resistitur This is the biggest danger of all for mankind: when one takes an object of the imagination as truth. Here again he is directing his comments to Mani. For similar comments, see *Quant. an.* 33.76 (CSEL 89,1/224.5-11) “Uanitas enim est fallacia, uanitantes autem uel falsi uel fallentes uel utrique intelleguntur. Licet tamen dinoscere, quantum inter haec et ea, quae uere sunt, distet et quemadmodum tamen etiam ista omnia deo auctore creata sint et in illorum comparatione nulla sint, per se autem considerata mira atque pulchra”; *Gn. adu. Man.* 2.20.30 (CSEL 91/152.19-153.1) and especially *Uera rel.* 20.40 (CCL 32/212.53-72). Ambrose also discussed this in *Isaac* 2.5 “...or else it (the soul) is deceived by the imagination, turns to matter, and is glued to the body.”

215.12 aliam, quam cogitans fingit et pro suo arbitrio tota facilitate conmutat Another danger is that the mind can change the images it receives from the senses. It can take a normal, physical object and create something else by means of the imagination. This object of the imagination then can take on the false form of truth if one does not realize what the truth really is. His clearest statement on this comes from *Mor.* I 21.38 (CSEL 90,7/42.19-43.2...43.8-44.1) “Est item aliud quod de corporibus per imaginationes quasdam concipit anima, et eam uocat rerum scientiam. Quamobrem recte etiam curiosi esse prohibemur, quod magnum temperantiae munus est...”; see also *ep.* 7.4 (CSEL 34/15.4-9) written to Nebridius,

“Omnes has imagines, quas phantasias cum multis uocas in tria genera commodissime ac uerissime distribui uideo, quorum est unum sensis rebus inpressum, alterum putatis tertium ratis”; *Conf.* 10.35.54 (CCL 27/184.1-7) and *C. Faust.* 20.7 (CSEL 25,1/541.4-27).

Augustine now gives two of his favorite examples, that of the innumerable worlds of Epicurus (see below) and Mani’s description of the Land of Light and Darkness.

215.13 innumerabiles mundos, in quibus Epicuri cogitatio innumerabiliter peregrinata est Augustine had little regard for Epicurus, nor did Cicero (e.g. *Tusc. disp.* 2.3 and *nat. deo.* 1.52-4). On this, see Foley (1999, 59 n. 62). On Augustine’s dislike, see *ep.* 3.2 (CSEL 34/6.3-4) “Sed ubi est ista beata uita? Ubi? Ubinam? O si ipsa esset repellere atomos Epicuri!” The imagination was the cause of Epicurus’s idea that there were innumerable worlds. He mentions these worlds a number of times. See *C. Acad.* 3.10.23 (CCL 29/48.42-45); *Uera rel.* 49.96 (CCL 32/249.34-250.47) “Itaque alii per innumerabiles mundo uaga cogitatione uolutati sunt” and *Ciu. Dei.* 11.5 (CCL 48/325.5-11).

215.15 ex eadem uenire facilitate For emphasis, he repeats the same phrase used in 215.13.

215.16 istam terram lucis This is the first time in this work where he has called this area the Land of Light. The *Ep. fund.* calls it the “*luminis quidem imperium*” (209.13).

215.16 per spatia infinita diffusam He makes the point that the mind is not diffused through space in 215.1-2 and in 216.18 he once again states that all natural things are diffused through space and cannot be entire everywhere. Therefore how can this land of light be diffused through space? If it is, then it must be material. And if it is material, then it came from Mani’s imagination.

215.17 et quinque antra gentis tenebrarum cum habitatoribus suis This is also the first place that he has mentioned the “caves” of the race of darkness even though the *Ep. fund.* does not specifically mentioning these caves. They are called the “*naturae quinque terrae pestiferae*” (212.22). Augustine must be taking this from another text or from his memory of his time as an auditor. More than likely it is the same source he was using in *Mor.* II. 9.14:

“Haec dixi, ut si fieri potest tandem dicere desinatis malum esse terram per immensum profundam et longam, malum esse mentem per terram uagantem, malum esse quinque *antra* elementorum...” (emphasis mine). He also mentions these five caves in *ep.* 7.4 (CSEL 34/15.20-25) “...et quinque antra gentis tenebrarum...” And in *Conf.* 3.6.11 (CCL 27/32.46-50) he states that there are also five elements which have different colors (*quinque elementa uarie fucata*), which correspond to the five caves of Darkness (*quinque antra tenebrarum*). Stroumsa and Stroumsa (1988, 47 and n. 49) are therefore incorrect when they state that these five colors are found only in the Arabic anti-Manichaean writings, since Augustine clearly knew about them.

215.18 **Manichaei phantasmata ueritatis sibi nomen ausa sunt usurpare** Mani has made the serious mistake of thinking that what he creates in his imagination is the real thing, not only in his description of the Land of Darkness, but also for the Land of Light. For *phantasmata*, see *Commentary* 194.16. See also *C. Fel.* 2.3 (CSEL 25,2/831.7-25) “inani phantasmate.” In 215.10 it was shown that the mind needs to resist the images of the senses so that the truth can be understood. Augustine warns of this danger early on in his writings; see *ep.* 7.4 (CSEL 34/12-18), where he warns Nebridius.

215.19 **Quid est ergo haec potentia, quae ista discernit?** Augustine states something similar in *Conf.* 10.8.15 (CCL 27/162.58-60) “Magna ista uis est memoriae, magna nimis, deus meus, penetrabile amplum et infinitum. Quis ad fundum eius peruenit? Et uis est haec animi mei atque ad meam naturam pertinet...”

215.20 **Profecto quantacumque sit, et his omnibus maior est et sine ulla tali rerum imaginatione cogitatur** The power of the mind is greater in the scale of created things than objects of the senses and the things that the imagination creates from these material objects. He once again repeats that material objects can be divided into pieces, but this power of the mind cannot (215.21-26). Therefore the mind is greater than these things (see below). See also *ep.* 7.5 (CSEL 34/16.20-23) “Nam illa quae putamus et credimus siue fingimus, et ex

omni parte omnino falsa sunt et certe longe, ut cernis, ueriores [esse], quae uidemus atque sentimus” and *Commentary* 215.9.

215.26 Illud autem ipsum, quo ista iudicas, cernis esse supra ista, non loci altitudine, sed potentiae dignitate Augustine’s ascent is not a vertical ascent but is an ascent of power. See also *Quant.* 32.69 (CSEL 89,1/216.21-23) “Nunc accipe a me, si uoles, uel potius recognosce per me, quanta sit anima non spatio loci ac temporis, sed ui ac potentia” and *Uera rel.* 30.56 (CCL 32/224.75-76) “...satis apparet supra mentem nostram esse legem, quae ueritas dicitur.”

Chapter Nineteen

216.1 Quare si animam totiens mutabilem siue uariarum uoluntatum turba The soul/mind, which is eternal and yet can change was discussed in *Imm. an.* 5.7 (CSEL 89/108.1-17). The mind is changed because of its own passions (desire, joy, fear, worry, zeal and study) or by the passions of the body (age, sickness, pain, work, injury and carnal desire). At the beginning of the *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine had discussed these changes.

216.6 sed omnia talia spatia potentiae uiuacitate superare The soul, although changeable because of the emotions, is not diffused in space and is still not the highest point of the ascent, for God created the mind and therefore He must be the highest. For his comments on the power of the soul/mind, cf. *Quant.* 14.23 (CSEL 89,1/159.17-22) “...quid mirum, si anima neque corporea sit neque ulla aut longitudine porrecta aut latitudine diffusa aut altitudine solidata et tamen tantum ualeat in corpore, ut penes eam sit regimen omnium membrorum et quasi cardo quidam in agendo cunctarum corporalium motionum?”, 32.69 (CSEL 89,1/216.21-23) “Nunc accipe a me, si uoles, uel potius recognosce per me, quanta sit anima non spatio loci ac temporis, sed ui ac potentia”; and *Uera rel.* 41.77 (CCL 32/238.23-27).

216.7 quid de ipso deo cogitandum aut existimandum est Here we reach the pinnacle of what Augustine is trying to reach for the Manichaeans: God. This is the “seventh degree of the soul” as found in *Quant.* 33.76 (CSEL 89,1/223.24) where he states “Illud plane nunc ego audeo tibi dicere, nos si cursum, quem nobis deus imperat et quem tenendum suscepimus,

constantissime tenuerimus, peruenturos per uirtutem dei atque sapientiam ad summam illam causam uel summum auctorem uel summum principium rerum omnium uel si quo alio modo res tanta congruentius adpellari potest.”

216.8 qui supra omnes rationales mentes inconcussus atque incommutabilis Augustine is undoubtedly thinking of the description of the Manichaean God, who “...ut a nullo umquam aut moueri aut concuti possint” (209.28) when he states here that God is “unshakeable and unchangeable.” Cf. also (among others) *Mor.* I 10.17 (CSEL 90,7/20.23) which states that God is inviolable and unchangeable (inuiolabilem atque incommutabilem), 13.23 (CSEL 90,7/27.12-28.10) and *Uera rel.* 31.57(CCL 32/224.1-4) “Nec iam illud ambigendum est incommutabilem naturam, quae supra rationalem animam sit, deum esse et ibi esse primam uitam et primam essentiam, ubi est prima sapientia” (emphasis mine).

216.9 manens tribuit One of Augustine’s favorite phrases when discussing God is *manens in se* (Teske 1986, 265 n. 32). While God gives life to everything, He remains always the same.

216.13 locorum ex una parte determinato, ex aliis inmenso spatio tenderetur The Manichaean God is limited by the space of the Land of Darkness, but the God of the Catholics is not; see *Conf.* 6.3.4 (CCL 27/76.41-50). That God is not contained in space is also found in the *Ennead* 3.9.3 and 5.5.8-9. Augustine is preparing his readers for what follows since up to this point he has not described the “area” of either of the lands. This is something that he will begin to discuss in chapter twenty through chapter twenty-seven.

216.14 quantaelibet in eo particulae et innumerabilia frusta alia maiora, alia minora He is taking another swipe at the Manichaean belief about the particles of God being “trapped” and divided in material objects. For these “particles of God,” cf. *Gn. adu. Man.* I.3.6 (CSEL 91/72.5-73.18) with regard to the sun being a particle of God; *Uera rel.* 9.16 (CCL 32/198.18) with the good soul being a particle of God; *Conf.* 3.10.18 (CCL 27/37.1-13) with regard to the particles of God found in food; and *C. Faust.* 2.5 (CSEL 25,1/258.17-

259.10) in which he mentions the particles of Christ which will be forever locked away at the end of time. Cf. also *C. Faust.* 20.17 (CSEL 25,1/556.25) and 22.15 (CSEL 25,1/614.26).

Chapter Twenty

216.22 **carnalibus animis** Those with carnal minds are those who are given over to bodily sense and unable to see the truth with the mind: *Uera rel.* 16.30 (CCL 32/205.4-206.14). In the last three chapters Augustine began and finished his ascent teaching, but now he realizes that it might not have been the right way to go about teaching the Manichaeans since they are so tied to material images formed in the imagination. Now he descends (see below) and here begins his ascent teaching based on examples taken from the *Ep. fund.*

216.23 **Descendamus** Here Augustine must “descend” from the height of God to those who are yet to think about spiritual realities or who are not yet able to do so (below). He repeats this again in 217.1 and begins to look at the *Ep. fund.* There are penalties for those who do descend from the higher to the lower as if those lower things are more important than the higher, as seen in *S. Dom. mon.* 1.12.34 (CCL 35/37.804-809) “Non enim cogit qui suadet. Et omnes naturae in ordine suo gradibus suis pulchrae sunt; sed de superioribus, in quibus rationalis animus ordinatus est, ad inferiora non est declinandum. Nec quisquam hoc facere cogitur; et ideo si fecerit, iusta dei lege punitur; non enim hoc committit inuitus.” He also tells Secundinus (*C. Sec.* 15 [CSEL 25,2/927.26-27]) that sin occurs when the soul descends towards things below: “Nec tamen omnem defectum esse culpabilem, sed solum uoluntarium, quo anima rationalis ad ea, quae infra illam sunt condita, conditore suo deserto declinat, adfectum; hoc est enim, quod peccatum uocatur.”

216.24 **qui naturam incorpoream et spiritalem cogitando persequi non audent uel nondum ualent** The Manichaeans either refuse or are unable to think about incorporeal nature. This of course was not just a Manichaean problem, but a problem for many Christians including those in other congregations, as he states in *B. uita.* 1.4 (CCL 29/67.91-94) “Animaduerti enim et saepe in sacerdotis nostri et aliquando in sermonibus tuis, cum de

deo cogitaretur, nihil omnino corporis esse cogitandum, neque cum de anima; nam id est est unum in rebus proximum deo” (emphasis mine). In *Quant.* 6.10 (CSEL 89,1/143.13-14)

Augustine begins to teach Evodius about the nature of incorporeality: “Incorporeum est enim, quod te nunc intellegere cupio; nam sola longitudo non nisi intellegi animo potest, in corpore inueniri non potest.” For the idea of a corporeal deity in Christianity up until the late fourth century, see Paulsen (1990, 105-116), especially p. 114. This was not the case for the East. Origen argued for the incorporeality of God as well as others before him, including some Gnostic groups and this debate took center stage in Late Antique thought (Stroumsa, 1983, 345-358).

217.2 iuxta quam partem aut iuxta quod latus, sicut Manichaeus dicit, inlustris illius ac sanctae terrae This question will now take Augustine’s attention for the next two chapters. Augustine will also read this sentence of the *Ep. fund.* to Felix in *C. Fel.* 1.19 (CSEL 25,2/824.16-17).

217.4 nec dicit, quam partem uel quod latus, dextrum an sinistrum Inherent in the idea of materiality is that whatever is material must also have sides. Cf. *Lib. arb.* II.8.22 (CCL 29/251.47-59) “Sed ut minutas quasque minusque articulatas non persequar, quantulumcumque illud corpusculum sit, habet certe aliam partem dexteram aliam sinistram, aliam superiorem aliam inferiorem aut aliam ulteriorem aliam citeriorem aut alias finales aliam mediam.” The *Ep. fund.* does not say on what side, but in *C. Fel.* I.19 (CSEL 25,2/824.16-18) Augustine also asks Felix on what side was the Kingdom of Darkness, left or right (CSEL 25,1/824.17-18) “Et cum legeret, interrogauit: Quod latus? Dextrum aut sinistrum?” From the *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine knows that the *Ep. fund.* does not contain the answer. Felix also knows this and he answers (CSEL 25,2/824.19-21): “Hanc tibi ego non possum interpretari scripturam et exponere, quod ibi non est; ipsa sibi interpret est. Ego non possum dicere, ne forte incurram in peccatum.” Augustine must have been disappointed that Felix did not take the bait since Augustine does not quiz him further about this.

Secundinus, however, does have an explanation for the two natures based on Mt. 25 and it is possible that Secundinus is responding to the *Contra ep. fund.* He first tells Augustine that he cannot explain why there are two natures in the first place, because “divine reason is beyond the hearts of men.” He then tries to help Augustine understand the battle between the Light and Dark and states (CSEL 25,2/900.19-901.2) “*Saluator autem, cui totum facile est, duo haec dextrum uocat ac laeuum, intus ac foris, uenite ac recedite* (Mt. 25). *Tu autem conuersum facis et pedem ponis, ut est orbis, uita, salus, lumen, lex, ordo, potestas, si uocalem dicis et mutam, longam uocas breuem. Quae naturae hae non sonant, duo pro certo significant et ab inuicem separata.*” Augustine does not accept this explanation and he responds (in *C. Sec.* 20 [CSEL 25,2/938,1-12]) that Christ was not using the terms “right and left” to signify something physical, and he was only discussing the “blessedness or the misery” of each person. He asks how the Manichaeans will ever be able to understand that God is incorporeal if they cannot understand that God cannot be divided.

Augustine was not the only one who had problems with this issue. Ephraim, in his Address to Hypatius (63 ll.32-45) “Look, therefore, at the fabricated system of deceit, for in all this the Pleasantness of the Light is in contact with the darkness, as they say. If it is after the fashion of a park, the one side which bordered on the Sons of the Darkness was entirely akin to the Darkness - for it is with them” (Mitchell, vol. 1, p lx).

217.6 **illud certe manifestum est non dici unum latus, nisi ubi est alterum latus**

Augustine will remark at the end of this chapter that perhaps Mani meant one side as the only side there is (see *Commentary* 217.26). Here, however, he takes the Manichaeans through a number of different examples of why having one side means that there are other sides as well.

217.12 **Non dicunt; sed cum premuntur** Here there is a Manichaean explanation for what is not found in the *Ep. fund.* As shown above, Augustine presses (*premet*) this question not only here, but with Felix as well. It is a favorite question of Augustine’s as he also brings it up in his reply to Secundinus.

217.14 **id est per infinita spatia distendi et nullo fine cohiberi** He had already stated this in 215.16 “*istam terram lucis per spatia infinita diffusam*” and he comes back to it now. This infinite space is mentioned in his earlier works. See *Uera rel.* 20.40 (CCL 32/212.62-64) and *Mor.* I 10.17 (CSEL 90,7/20.12-14) “*nam et credere deum loco aliquo quamuis infinito per quantitatis quaeumque spatia contineri.*” Augustine used to believe this about God. See *Conf.* 3.7.12 (CCL 27/33.10-13) “*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 si infinita sit, minor est in aliqua parte certo spatio definita quam per infinitum,*” 7.5.7 (CCL 27/96.8-18) and 7.14.20 (CCL 27/106.6-7) “*Et inde rediens fecerat sibi deum per infinita spatia locorum omnium.*”

217.25 **doctis et ab indoctis ridebimur** There are many things in Manichaean cosmogony which makes men laugh (according to Augustine). In *Ord.* 2.17.46 (CCL 29/132.42-45) it is the Manichaean idea that evil is antagonistic to God. See also *Agon.* 4.4 (CSEL 41/106.6-16); *C. Faust.* 2.6 (CSEL 25,1/260.27-261.18) and *C. Sec.* 20 (CSEL 25,2/938.2-3).

217.26 **Sed non te uerbis premo; fortassis enim unum quasi unicum appellare uoluisti** This is a concession to the Manichaeans that he would not give to Felix. It is, however, a minor concession, since a side implies a constriction and in this case the constriction is on God.

Chapter Twenty-One

218.2 **De ista terra saltem concedis, quod corporea erat** This is the core of Manichaean cosmogony. The Kingdom of Darkness is matter and when the Darkness is defeated, the Living Spirit uses its bodies to create the universe. This includes the human body (see *Keph.* 38 (95.10-97.24). Matter is pre-existing because Darkness is. Augustine also mentions this materiality in *C. Faust.* 6.8 (CSEL 25,1/296.16-28) “*...Hinc esse dicunt originem carnum omnium, quae mouentur in terra, in aqua, in aere.*” See also *Haer.* 46.4 (CCL 46/313.15-18). This is also found in other Manichaean writings. See for example *PB II* 4.22 “They arose],

they that belong to Matter (), the children of Error” and *PB II* 57.18 “Matter is the mother of the Enemy.” In the *Keph.* 2 (22.32) the Tree of Darkness (which is equivalent to the Kingdom of Darkness) is referred to as matter. *Keph.* 4 (26.11) states that Matter is the sculptress who fashioned the World of Darkness. See also *Keph.* 6. There is confusion, however, on the relationship between the Kingdom of Darkness and that of Matter. Gardner (1995, 34) notes that Matter seems to have existed before the Kingdom of Darkness. See also Puech (1948). Other anti-Manichaean writings mention this as well. See for example, Titus of Bostra *Adu. Man.* 12.1.

218.3 *Necesse est te hoc dicere, quandoquidem omnia corpora inde adseris originem ducere* In an allusion to the *Ep. fund.* Augustine states the same thing in his opening comments to Fortunatus (*C. Fort.* 1.1 [CSEL 25, 1/83.18-84.7]) “Dicitis enim aliam nescio quam gentem tenebrarum aduersus Dei regnum rebellasse: Deum autem omnipotentem, cum videret quanta labes et uastitas immineret regnis suis, nisi aliquid aduersae genti opponeret, et ei resisteret, misisse hanc uirtutem, *de cuius commixtione cum malo et tenebrarum gente mundus sit fabricatus...*” He repeats this again in 235.8 as well as in his *Haer.* 46.7 (CCL 46/314.46-47) “In fumo nata animalia bipedia, unde homines ducere originem censent.” See also *Mor.* II 9.18 (CSEL 90,7/104.3); *Agon.* 4.4 (CSEL 41/105.4-9); *C. Faust.* 20.11 (CSEL 25,1/551.2-5), 21.14 (CSEL 25,1/586.13-17) and *C. Sec.* 24 (CSEL 25,2/942.27).

218.6 *quod lateribus sibi iungi utraque ista terra non possit, nisi esset utraque corporea* If the Land of Darkness is material, then the Kingdom of Light must be as well in order for them to touch. His point is that to “join together” means that one must be material (218.12-14). But this is not a very good argument to take with the Manichaeans, since the *Ep. fund.* only says that the lands were near (*iuxta*) to each other. There is also a void between the two (218.19-20).

218.10 **incorpoream et spiritalem credi oportere** Here it is clear that the Manichaeans must have had some type of idea of immateriality. But whatever they imagine it to be, Augustine will teach them that what they believe to be immaterial is not.

218.12 **admoniti** This is sometimes a technical term that Augustine sometimes uses when an outside effect triggers an internal effect (Stock, 72 and n. 252). He also “admonishes” them again in 233.1.

218.17 **timent enim, ne deo uideatur aequalis** The Land of Darkness is not equal to the Land of Light, in terms of size. In 218.21 he will state that the two sides of the Land of Darkness are narrowed: *angustant eam a duobus etiam lateribus*. This description was not taken from the *Ep. fund.*, but told to him (see *Commentary* 218.18). Cf. *Conf.* 5.10.20 (CCL 27/68.49-52) “constituebam ex aduerso sibi duas moles, utramque infinitam, sed malam angustius, bonam grandius, et ex hoc initio pestilentioso me cetera sacrilegia sequebantur.” Al-Nadim remarks that although the Good was the first, it was the same size as the Evil (*Fihrist* 9.1 in Dodge 1970, 777), as noted in Koenen (1990, 23).

218.18 **Dicunt** The plural indicates what Augustine claims is from the Manichaeans, and not from the *Ep. fund.*

218.18 **profundum inmensam et per longum** *Profundus* is word denoting “a frightening depth” (O’Donnell, 1992, vol. 2, 138). See here for a detailed list of other uses for this word in Augustine’s work, including using it to describe the awe of God.

218.18 **supra illam spatia infinitae inanitatis adfirmant** This is the first time that Augustine has discussed this infinite empty space above the Land of Darkness. This description is not found in the *Ep. fund.* He states at the end of this chapter that this explanation was only given to “those who listen intensely and investigate eagerly” (219.4-6).

218.22 **Tamquam si unus panis--sic enim, quod dicitur, facilius uideri potest** It is not clear whether this example of the bread was told to Augustine or whether this was something that he created to explain the shape of the Land of Light and Darkness. I would be inclined to

say this is how he imagined it to be and that the Manichaeans did not use this example. He was just told about the shape of the Darkness and Augustine filled in the rest of the details.

219.4 opinantur esse terram tenebrarum There is a distinction here between what is *creditur* (219.2) about the Land of Light, as opposed to what is *opinantur* about the Land of Darkness.

219.5 studiose inquirentibus Augustine reveals a highly kept secret and betrays his former friends. In other texts Augustine also discusses his own zeal when he was a Manichaean. See *Util. cred.* 1.3 (CSEL 25,1/6.11-12) “Haec enim omnia, quod te non latet, cum studiose illos audirem” and *Conf.* 5.7.13 (CCL 27/63.22-24).

Chapter Twenty-Two

219.9 Certe This carries a note of sarcasm here.

219.11 foeda figura Augustine will use this description again in 221.25, 223.23 and at 224.19.

219.11 fissa ungula nigro quodam cuneo subter artato This is not the first time that Augustine has described the two lands in this fashion. See *Uera rel.* 49.96 (CCL 32/249.34-250.47) “Itaque alii per innumerabiles mundo uaga cogitatione uolutati sunt, alii deum esse non posse nisi corpus igneum putauerunt, alii candorem lucis immensae per infinita spatia usquequaque porrectum ex una tamen parte quasi nigro quodam cuneo fissum” and *C. Faust.* 4.2 (CSEL 25,1/270.27-271.3) “Terram enim Chananaeorum, quae manifesta erat et manifeste illo populo data est, contemnere uos et fastidire gloriamini, quasi non ita terram luminis describatis ex una parte a terra gentis tenebrarum, tamquam cuneo coartato discissam.” For this wedge, see Solignac (vol. 1, 1962, 674).

219.12 inani This void, as mentioned above (*Commentary* 218.18) is not found in the description of the Land of Darkness in the *Ep. fund.*

219.19 multitudini partium quam unitati Materiality can be divided, whereas God cannot and although he doesn’t state it here, Augustine is referring to the unity of God. On this

unity, see *Mor.* I. 14.24 (CSEL 90,7/28.7-11) “Deum ergo diligere debemus trinam quandam unitatem, patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum, quod nihil aliud dicam esse nisi idipsum esse. Est enim uere summeque deus, ex quo omnia, per quem omnia, in quo omnia; haec uerba Pauli sunt. Quid deinde subiecit? *Ipsi Gloria*”; *Gn. litt. imp.* I.2 PL 34, 221) “Deum Patrem omnipotentem uniuersam creaturam fecisse atque constituisse per filium suum unigenitum, id est Sapientiam et Uirtutem suam consubstantiali sibi et coaeternam, in unitate Spiritus sancti, et ipsius consubstantialis et coeterni. Hanc ergo Trinitatem dici unum Deum, eumque fecisse et creasse omnia quae sunt, in quantum sunt...” and *Conf.* 4.15.24 (CCL 27/52.1). This unity is a Plotinian concept; see *Ennead* 2.9.1. On the division of material objects, see *Commentary* 213.6.

219.22 **Tali enim figura etsi conmixtam negant, penetratam tamen negare non possunt** Augustine is correct on the first point: there is no commixture of light and darkness in the First Time, as stated in the *Ep. fund.* 13 (CSEL 25,1/209.11-12) “Haec quippe, inquit, in exordio fuerunt duae substantiae a se diuisae.” He states this again in *C. Faust.* 22.22 (CSEL 25,1/616.21-617.3) “Proinde nulla causa est, cur quaerentes, unde sit malum, intrueritis in huius erroris tam magnum malum, ut naturam tot bonis abundantem naturam mali diceretis et in natura summi boni *ante commixtionem* naturae mali horrendum necessitatis malum poneretis...” and *C. Sec.* 10 (CSEL 25,1/919.11-16) “Sed hoc interest inter uestram opinionem et nostram fidem, quia uos eosdem principes ex sua propria quadam natura exortos, quam deus nec genuerit nec fecerit, sed habuerit aeterna uicinitate contiguam, aduersus deum belligerasse arbitramini eique intulisse *ante commixtionem* boni et mali magnum primo necessitatis malum” (emphasis mine). The second point is controversial. The Manichaeans would indeed deny that God is penetrated, although in their description of the two lands as given by Augustine it would appear that God is constricted by the Land of Darkness, especially if the shape is narrowed on two sides. On a related matter, Faustus believed that God was finite because evil, which cannot come from God, opposes Him. To

Faustus, God stops where evil begins (*C. Faust.* 25.1 (CSEL 25,1/725.1-727.2). But he never gives the shape of these two lands. For Augustine it is the logical conclusion.

Chapter Twenty-Three

219.25 **spiritalis catholicae fidei uiros** For these *spiritalis* see *Commentary* 196.5.

Augustine now examines how the Catholics and the Manichaeans imagine God to be. On the Catholic description, see *Gn. adu. Man.* 1.17.28 (CSEL 91/95.1-4) “Sed tamen nouerint in catholica disciplina spiritalis fideles non credere deum forma corporea definitum et, quod homo ad imaginem dei factus dicitur, secundum interiorem hominem dici, ubi est ratio et intellectus,” and *Conf.* 6.3.4. CCL 27/76.41-50, where he states he learned that God is not contained in space from the Platonists.

219.26 **animus potest, cernit substantiam naturamque diuinam...figurari** Surprisingly Augustine does not equate the divine substance with the soul, as he does in many other anti-Manichaean writings. For example, see *Gn. adu. Man.* II.8.11 (CSEL 91/130.1-11...131.27-29) “...ergo natura dei errat et misera est et uitiorum labe corrumpitur et peccat aut etiam, ut uos dicitis, naturae contrariae sordibus inquinatur, et cetera talia quae de natura dei nefas est credere?”

219.28 **caruales paruulos nostros** These “little ones” were those of the simple faith, nurtured with the milk of the Catholic Church and despite the fact that they held a belief that God had a shape of a body, nevertheless they were safe in thinking this if they were in the Catholic Church (Teske 1986, 256 and 257 n. 12). For these little ones, see *Quant.* 33.76 (CSEL 89,1/224.11-20) “Tunc agnoscemus, quam uera nobis credenda imperata sint quamque optime ac saluberrime apud matrem ecclesiam nutriti fuerimus quaeue sit utilitas lactis illius, quod apostolus Paulus paruulis se potum dedisse praedicauit...”; *S. Dom. mon.* 1.14.40 (CCL 35/43.935) “animum paruulorum”; *Doc. chr.* 2.12.17 (CCL 32/43.25) “Ergo, quoniam intellectus in specie sempiterna est, fides uero in rerum temporalium quibusdam

cunabulis quasi lacte alit paruulos”; *Conf.* 1.10.16 (CCL 27/9.10-11) “ut hoc paene omnes optent paruulis suis” and 3.5.9 (CCL 27/30.38).

220.1 **allegoria** Allegory was one method to understand not what is written in the text, but what it means figuratively. See *Util. cred.* 3.5 (CSEL 25,1/7.26) “Omnis igitur scriptura, quae testamentum uetus uocatur, diligenter eam nosse cupientibus quadrifariam traditur: secundum historiam, secundum aetiologiam, secundum analogiam, secundum allegoriam...Secundum allegoriam, cum docetur non ad litteram esse accipienda quaedam, quae scripta sunt, sed figurate intellegenda”; *Gn. litt. imp.* 2.2.5 (PL 34, 264-265). In *Uera rel.* 50.99 (CCL 32/251.12-17) he will discuss allegory and like this passage in *Contra ep. fund.*, he will then discuss the “body parts” of God. For an excellent discussion of the four techniques that Augustine uses in his exegesis, and especially in his anti-Manichaean works, see Stock (1996, 165-169). For an extensive list of Augustine’s use of this word, see Mayer (vol. 2, 1974, 463) and his article in *Aug. Lex.* (1994, 233-9). Augustine will also state that Mani had come to explain the allegories and parables to his followers, but that he did not teach using them. See *Commentary* 221.6.

220.3 **solent deum sibi libertate phantasmatis corporis humani specie figurare**

Augustine has accused Mani many times of using his imagination in order to create his cosmogony and now he accuses his followers of doing the same. See *Commentary* 194.16 and 215.18 and *S. Dom. mon.* 2.5.18 (CCL 35/108.391-394). The difference here is that those using their imagination are Catholic. Origen will also complain that there are some Christians who believe that God has a body (*Peri Archon* 1.1.1). On Origen and this matter, see Stroumsa (1983, 345-358).

220.4 **specie** *Species* is interchangeable with *forma* (O’Donnell, vol. 2, 1992, 47).

220.5 **intentis et curiosis hominibus quasi magna secreta describere** Here is another secret of the Manichaeans that he reveals (for another, see *Commentary* 219.5). The secrets described here are also *magna*. In similar language Augustine described his own Manichaean

past: (195.10) “quaesiui curiose et adtente audiui et temere credidi.” For an overview of *curiositas* in Augustine’s earlier writings, see Torchia (1988). He states that Augustine’s use of *curiositas* stems from his condemnation of Manichaean materialism (116) and discusses its use in *Mor. I* and *II*, *Gn. adu. Man.*, *Mus.* and *Uera rel.* Torchia’s findings are consistent with what is found in *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine was also the third Latin writer to make extensive use of the term (Peters 1986, 51).

220.7 utrum ii, qui eum forma humana summa dignitate in suo genere praedita cogitant

Although not a perfect belief about God, the little ones who cannot think spiritually are better off thinking about God as the most perfect body rather than the Manichaeans and their wedged-in God. This anthropomorphism is due mostly to the language of the scriptures (Paulsen 1990, 107). For a similar statement in Augustine, see *Mor. I*, especially 10.17 where Augustine is stating that the Catholic church teaches the right belief about God (CSEL 90,7/20.19-21) “Ita fit ut apud nos inueniantur pueri quidam, qui humana forma deum cogitent atque ita se habere suspicentur, qua opinione nihil est abiectius sed inueniuntur item multi senes, qui eius maiestatem non solum super humanum corpus, sed etiam super ipsam mentem manere inuiolabilem atque incommutabilem eadem ipsa mente conspiciant.” See also *Lib. arb.* 1.2.5 (CCL 29/213.23-28); *Doc. Chr.* 1.7.7 (CCL 32/10.1-4; 9-13; 16-22) and *Conf.* 6.9.18 (CCL 27/86.17-20) “Magna spes oborta est: non docet catholica fides, quod putabamus et uani accusabamus. Nefas habent docti eius credere deum figura humani corporis terminatum.”

220.13 Ecce, ego tecum derideo carnales homines, qui nondum possunt spiritalia

cogitare humana forma deum existimantes The Manichaeans did not picture God in human form. For earlier comments, see *Mor. I* 10.17 (CSEL 90,7/21.2-5) “Apud uos autem nemo quidem reperitur qui dei substantiam humani corporis figuratione describat, sed rursus nemo qui ab humani erroris labe seiungat”; *Gn. adu. Man.* I.17.27 (CSEL 91/94.5-11...95.22); and especially *Conf.* 5.10.19 (CCL 27/68.29-43). See Paulsen (1990, 116) and

McCool (1959, 62-81) on the influence of Ambrose and through Ambrose, the influence of Clement and Origen.

220.19 **si ecclesiae catholicae gremio contenti cum lacte nutriendi sunt** For this milk, see 1 Cor. 3.2, Heb. 5.12-13, 1 Peter 2.2. This is a common scriptural image that Augustine uses throughout his writings. See *Quant.* 33.76 (CSEL 89,1/224.11); *Mor.* I 10.17 (CSEL 90,7/21.5-8); *Doc. Chr.* 2.12.17 (CCL 32/43.25); and *C. Faust.* 12.46 (CSEL 25,1/375.8-17).

220.29 **figurae illius imaginationem** For this *imaginatio*, see *Commentary* 195.3.

221.1 **Manichaei esse non poterunt** This whole passage (from 220.19) is reminiscent of *Gn. adu. Man.* II.2.3 (CSEL 91/120.1-8) “Haec secreta uerborum si non reprehendentes et accusantes, sed quaerentes et reuerentes Manichaei mallent discutere, *non essent utique Manichaei*, sed daretur petentibus et quaerentes inuenirent et pulsantibus aperiretur” (emphasis mine). To stop being a Manichaean they must also distinguish between the creator and the created; see *C. Sec.* 7 (CSEL 25,2/915.19).

221.4 **qui ultimus uenturus erat... neminem doctorem diuinitus esse uenturum** This is a common claim in Manichaean writings. See *Keph.* 1 (14) “When the church of the saviour was raised to the heights, my apostolate began, which you asked me about! From that time on was sent the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth; the one who has come to you in this last generation.” See also *Keph.* 73 (179).

221.6 **quia nihil iste per figuras et allegorias dixerit** Augustine seems unaware of the teaching methods of Mani as found in other Manichaean texts, since there is plenty of evidence in Manichaean texts to show that Mani frequently taught with parables (Gardner 1995, 77). This was also a complaint of the sixth century philosopher Simplicius who had stated that a Manichaean had told him that he did not think it right to understand anything allegorically (Lieu 1985, 23). But there are many Manichaean texts that show otherwise. See *Keph.* 18 (59.3-18) where Mani makes a parable on the Third Messenger; *Keph.* 55 (133.4-137.11), and *Keph.* 83 (200.9-204.23). For non-Western evidence or the use of Parables, see

M 6, Parthian: MM III, pp.865-67; “Parables and Stories on the Hearers” (in Andreas and Henning 1924, 27, 848-912); *M* 5794 (T II D 126 I), Middle Persian in Klimkeit (1993, 216): “The religion which I have chosen is greater and better than the other religions of the ancients in ten ways: ...Fourth, this revelation of the two principles and my living scriptures, my wisdom and my knowledge, are more encompassing and better than those of the former religions. *Fifth, as all scriptures (all) wisdom and (all) parables of the former religions [have been added] to my religion...*”(emphasis mine), and *M* 47 II, Middle Persian, lines 1705-1739 titled “On the Parable of the Hearer Khybra” (Sundermann 1973, 5).

221.7 cum et antiquorum, quae talia fuerant, aperiret et sua enodate manifesteque monstraret He repeats this claim in *C. Faust.* 15.6 (CSEL 25,1/427.3-428.3) “Tu uero praecipue Manichaeum ob hoc praedicas, quod non ad talia dicenda, sed potius ad soluenda ultimus uenerit, ut et *figuris antiquorum* apertis et *suis narrationibus ac disputationibus euidenti luce prolatis nullo se occultaret aenigmate*. Addis eam praesumptionis huius causam, quod uidelicet antiqui, ut *figuras huiusmodi uel uiderent uel agerent uel dicerent, sciebant istum postea uenturum...*” (emphasis mine).

221.19 per sensus corporeos memoria fixas gero These are memories and not things that are sensed at the present; see *Mag.* 12.39 (CCL 29/197.17-20) “Cum uero non de his, quae coram sentimus, sed de his, quae aliquando sensimus, quaeritur, non iam res ipsas, sed imagines ab eis impressas memoriaeque mandatas loquimur...”; *Uera rel.* 3.3 (CCL 32/188.6-17) “...cum sibi ab illo persuaderetur non corporeis oculis, sed pura mente ueritatem uideri, cui quaecumque anima inhaesisset, eam beatam fieri atque perfectam, ad quam percipiendam nihil imagis impedire quam uitam libidinibus deditam et falsas imagines rerum sensibilibus, quae nobis ab hoc sensibili mundo per corpus impressae uarias opiniones erroresque generarent...” and 36.67. On the memory in Augustine’s work, see Maurant (1979) and K. Winkler (1954, 511-19).

Chapter Twenty-Four

221.27 supra lucidam beatamque terram fundata regna eius For this passage in other works, see *C. Fel.* 1.17 (CSEL 25,2/820.10-12) and *Nat. b.* 42 (CSEL 25,2/877.18-20). See also *Commentary* 223.23 below for Augustine's discussion of this very topic with Felix.

221.27 utrum unius et eiusdem substantiae atque naturae sint et pater et regna eius et terra Here Augustine is asking whether all three are of the same substance and nature. Later with Felix he begins his argument slightly differently. In *C. Fel.* I.17 (CSEL 25,2/820.9-12) this passage from the *Ep. fund.* was read and he then asks Felix: "Terram istam quam dicit, unde habebat? Fecit eam, an genuit eam, an aequalis et coaeterna illi erat? Istam dico terram, lucidam et beatam quam dicit" (CSEL 25,2/820.13-15). Augustine also has a variation of this in *C. Sec.* 3 (CSEL 25,2/908.6-909.1) and the related *C. Sec.* 5 (CSEL 25,2/911.6-19).

222.2 regna eius et terra In *C. Faust.* 15.5 (CSEL 25,1/425.20) Augustine states that the Manichaean God and everything surrounding him was produced by His substance "Quem quomodo inmensum faciatis, quem sic circumdatum dicitis, numquam inuenire potuistis. Adiungis etiam innumerabiles regnicolas et deorum agmina et angelorum cohortes: Quae omnia non condidisse dicis deum, sed de sua substantia genuisse."

222.7 fugite taliumque phantasmatum sacrilegia He repeats his pleading to flee from this in 222.26. True religion should not be based on the imagination because truth is always better than anything the mind can produce (*Uera rel.* 55.108 [CCL 32/295.13-15]). The idea to flee the body and material things was an early idea found in Augustine's writings, although here the emphasis is on fleeing the images that were created in Mani's imagination. He also tells Secundinus to flee the Manichaeans in *C. Sec.* 25 (CSEL 25,2/944.25-945.1) "Fuge itaque, amice, tantam pestem, ne te, quod fieri non potest, fallendo uelit fidelem facere Manichaeus, qualem uult uideri a Christo esse factum illum discipulum cui dixit: mitte digitos in latus meum et noli esse incredulus, sed fidelis." Cf. also *C. Sec.* 26 (CSEL 25,1/945.12). For *sacrilegia* see *Commentary* 200.13.

222.10 **non unius eiusdemque naturae illa tria esse, sed alterius patrem, alterius regna, alterius terram** Augustine now begins a series of hypothetical questions and the answers of which will lead him to his conclusion: God is equal to the Land of Light and therefore is cut asunder. He gave a minor variation of this argument earlier in *Mor.* II 12.26 (CSEL 90,7/110.23-111.11) where there were three natures, one violable, a second inviolable, and the third one doing the violating. Cf. also *Conf.* 8.10.23 (CCL 27/127.21) “Nam si tot sunt contrariae naturae, quot uoluntates sibi resistunt, non iam duae, sed plures erunt. Si deliberet quisquam, utrum ad conuenticulum eorum pergat an ad theatrum, clamant isti: ‘Ecce duae naturae, una bona hac ducit, altera mala illac reducit...’”

This argument is also found in other anti-Manichaean texts. Ephraim, in his *Address to Hypatius* 71 11-28 states “And because he was compelled he named two Roots; and because again he was plainly exposed, he produced many Natures from the midst of two Natures” (Mitchell, vol. I, p lxiii).

222.13 **sed quattuor naturas Manichaeus praedicare debuerat** He also states this in *Conf.* 8.10.24 (CCL 27/128.38-129.66) where he uses an example to show that when a person can make four decisions, there are four wills. He then states that the Manichaeans do not believe that there are at least that many substances. For a similar argument, see *C. Faust.* 20.7 (CSEL 25,1/541.4-542.16). Here he claims the four natures are the inaccessible light for the Father, the sun and the moon for the Son, and the air for the Holy Spirit.

222.20 **Aut si propterea pertinet, quia uicina est, pertineat et terra tenebrarum, terram lucis non modo uicinitate contingit, sed etiam penetratione dissulcat** See again *C. Fel.* I.18 (CSEL 25,2/823.18-21) “Si nec genuit illam nec fecit illam, quomodo ad eum pertineat nisi sola uicinitate, non uideo, quomodo si habeat aliquis uicinum bonum; et duae iam erunt res ambae ingenitae: terra et pater.”

222.23 **Si autem genuit eam, non eam credi oportet diuersam habere naturam** In *C. Fel.* I.17 (CSEL 25,2/821.13-16) Augustine asks Felix to answer his question of whether the land

was made or generated by God by asking him to point this out in one of the Manichaeian texts. Felix then answers (*C. Fel.* 1.18 [CSEL 25,2/822.6-12]) that this land was co-eternal with God and that he did not create or generate this land. This will leave Felix in an unfortunate position, since then he must account for the presence of this land which was not created or generated.

222.24 Quod enim genuit deus, hoc oportet credi esse, quod deus est, sicut de unigenito filio in catholica creditur If something is generated by God then it is also Himself, as Christ is. This is a common topic in Augustine's writings since the issue of the oneness of God was a confusing topic for many. See *Lib. arb.* 1.2.5 (CCL 29/213.30-32) "de se autem non creavit, sed genuerit quod sibi par esset, quem filium dei unicum dicimus"; *Nat. b.* 1 (CSEL 25,2/855.12-13) "Quia uero et iustus est, ei, quod de se genuit, ea, quae de nihilo fecit, non aequauit" and *C. Sec.* 3 (CSEL 25,2/908.6-15).

222.26 turpitudinem See also *Nat. b.* 44 (CSEL 25,2/881.10-12) "hoc genus nefandissimi erroris quam sacrilegas et incredibiles turpitudines eis suadeat, etiamsi non persuadeat, horribile est dicere." This word also occurs six times in *Haer.* in his description of the Manichaeians.

223.2 Quodsi non genuit, sed fecit eam deus, quaero, unde fecerit? This is another crucial question and this line of argument will lead Augustine to *creatio de nihilo* (see below, 223.11). Augustine also asks Felix this exact question in *C. Fel.* 1.17 (CSEL 25,2/820.13-15) "Terram istam quam dicit, unde habebat? Fecit eam, an genuit eam, an aequalis et coaeterna illi erat? Istam dico terram lucidam et beatam quam dicit." Felix answers that God created two earths as well as heaven (CSEL 25,2/820.16-21). This was not such an unusual idea. Philo and other Jewish thinkers believed that "In the beginning God created heaven and earth" does not refer to our heaven and earth, but their ideas; see Van Winden (1963, 118-119).

223.3 Si de se ipso, quid aliud est genuisse See *Commentary* 222.24 above and the passage from *C. Sec.* in *Commentary* 223.3 below.

223.3-223.10 **Si de aliena aliqua natura, quaero, utrum bona an mala. Si bona, erat ergo aliqua natura bona, quae non pertinebat ad deum...** The question of evil was a driving force in the thought of Augustine (Burns 1988, 9). It forced him to think about his Manichaean religion and allowed him to join the Catholic Church, which believed that evil was absolutely nothing (see *Commentary* 223.10). The argument here in *Contra ep. fund.* is very similar to what Augustine will say to Secundinus (*C. Sec.* 4 [CSEL 25,2/910.12-911.5]). He states that if God generated the matter which he used in creation, then He would be using Himself as the building material, but this cannot be. He could not have gotten this material from something that He Himself did not create, since that would mean that there was another nature existing that was good. This cannot be, either. The only logical conclusion is that this material is something the God made.

223.10 **de nihilo fecerit** The idea that everything which exists, made by God from nothing, is a keystone for Augustine and is a unique idea for the Church in general (Maker 1986, 156). This is another pinnacle in this writing and it will begin a whole new line of attack on the *Ep. fund.* The Manichaeans believed in pre-existing matter since whatever is material came from the eternal Land of Light. This creation from nothing also gave Augustine the ability to understand the nature of evil (Moon 1955, 117). For an overview of the history of this doctrine and its implications in Augustine's anti-Manichaean argument, see Torchia (1999). This phrase (*creatio de nihilo*) has little scriptural backing (O'Donnell 1992, vol. 3, 308). The Muslims also pushed for creation from nothing in their arguments against the Manichaeans (Stroumsa and Stroumsa 1988, 45). See Alexander of Lycopolis *C. Manich. opin.* (Van der Horst/Mansfield 1974, 19-23). For Augustine's usage, see (among others) *Lib. arb.* 1.2.5 (CCL 29/213.30) "Ex quo fit ut de nihilo creauerit omnia"; *Gn. adu. Man.* I.6.10 (CSEL 91/76.1-3) "Et ideo deus rectissime creditur omnia de nihilo fecisse, quia, etiamsi omnia formata de ista materia facta sunt, haec impa tamen materia de omnino nihilo facta est", II.29.43 (CSEL 91/170.1); *C. Fort.* I.13 (CSEL 25, 1/90.25-91.2); *Diu. qu.* 78 (CCL

44A/223.1); *C. Fel.* II.18 (CSEL 25,2/847.1-848.24); and *C. Sec.* 4 (CSEL 25,2/910.12-911.5), 8 (CSEL 25,2/ 916.3-9). Another variation, “*ex nihilo*” is interchangeable with *de nihilo*. See *Conf.* 12.17.25 (CCL 27/228.27).

Chapter Twenty-Five

223.12 **Quare si uobis iam persuadetur posse aliquid boni omnipotentem deum de nihilo facere** The knowledge that God has created everything from nothing leads Augustine to the following belief: God made all these things with their own order. It is very clear that this is the lesson which Augustine wants to impart to his Manichaean readers since he mentions *creatio de nihilo* six times in this chapter alone. For *omnipotens*, see *Commentary* 193.4.

223.14 **omnes naturas, quas fecit et condidit deus** Cf. Isa. 45.7. In *Mor.* II 7.9 (CSEL 90,7/95.5) Augustine states that some copies of the Old Testament also have “Ego facio bona et creo mala” while he seems to prefer “Ego facio bona et condo mala” (see Chapter Four for a discussion of his passage). He then proceeds to define *creare*, *facere* and *condere*. *Creare* is to form and arrange; *facere* is to use things that have not existed before; and *condo* is to arrange what already has an existence. Therefore in this passage from the *Contra ep. fund.* God makes all natures from nothing and then gives them order. See also *C. Faust.* 26.3 (CSEL 25,1/731.4-7) “Deus autem creator et conditor omnium naturarum nihil contra naturam facit; id enim erit cuique rei naturale, quod ille fecerit, a quo est omnis modus, numerus, ordo naturae”; and *C. Sec.* 7 (CSEL 25,2/915.26). For a New Testament link, see Mk 13.19; Eph. 2.15 and Col. 1.15-16.

223.14 **excellendae gradibus ordinatas a summis usque ad infimas** These grades are often a marker in Augustine’s writings for his ascent teaching (O’Donnell 1992, vol. 2, 183). They allowed him to argue against the “stark Manichaean dichotomy of good and evil” (Russell 1990, 701). If the Manichaeans could understand this order, they would see that their Darkness is not an evil by nature. Once again there is a parallel in *Nat. b.* 5 (CSEL 25,2/857.9-10) “natura quae modo et specie naturali excellentius ordinata est...” On

understanding order, see *Ord.* 1.1 (CCL 29/89.1-4) “*Ordinem rerum, Zenobi, cum sequi ac tenere cuique proprium tum uero uniuersitatis, quo cohercetur hic mundus et regitur, uel uidere uel pandere difficillimum hominibus atque rarissimum est*”; *Quant.* 36.80 (CSEL 89,1/229.6-15); *Gn. adu. Man.* II.29.43 (CSEL 91/171.25-32); *S. Dom. mon.* 1.12.34 (CCL 35/37.804). Moon (1955, 140) notes that this passage is similar to *Nat. b.* 8 (CSEL 25,2/858.19) “*sic ordinata sunt, ut cedant infirmiora firmioribus...*” For the best definition of order in Augustine’s later works, see *Ciu. Dei* 19.13 (CCL 48/678.1-679.32)) “...Order is the assignment of equal and unequal things to their proper places...”

223.17 **deus artifex** For God the *artifex*, see *Heb.* 11:10 “*expectabat enim fundamenta habentem civitatem cuius artifex et conditor Deus.*” Augustine uses this title many times in his works. For example, see *Gn. adu. Man.* I.16.25 (CSEL 91/91.5-12), I.16.26 (CSEL 91/93.26-94.31); *Uera rel.* 36.67 (CCL 32/231.32); *Diu. qu.* 78 (CCL 44A/223.1-5) “*Ars illa summa omnipotentis dei, per quam ex nihilo facta sunt omnia, quae etiam sapientia eius dicitur, ipsa operatur etiam per artifices, ut pulchra et congruentia faciant, quamuis non de nihilo...*”; *Lib. arb.* 2.20.54 (CCL 29/273.13-16) and *Simp.* 1.2.18 (CCL 44/45.542-552). This is also a common image for God in antiquity. See Seneca *Ep.* 65 (Loeb, 447) “*Statua et materiam habuit, quae pateretur artificem, et artificem, qui materiae daret faciem.*”

223.17 **per sapientiam** I.e., Christ. See *Commentary* 200.6.

223.18 **quod non erat** This is the equivalent to *nihil*.

223.18 **in quantum esset, bonum esset** If anything exists at all, then it is good: this is a crucial argument for Augustine, since he will later show that there is good in the Land of Evil. See also *Gn. adu. Man.* I.2.4 (CSEL 91/70.9-14) “*Sicut omnia quae fecit deus bona sunt ualde, sed non sic bona sunt, quomodo bonus est deus, quia ille fecit, haec autem facta sunt; nec ea genuit de seipso, ut hoc essent quod ipse est, sed ea fecit de nihilo, ut non essent aequalia nec ei a quo facta sunt nec filio eius per quem facta sunt; iustum est enim*”; *Uera rel.* 18.36 (CCL 32/209.24-31) and *Nat. b.* 2 (CSEL 25,2/856.1-3).

223.19 **in quantum autem deficeret** This lack means that natures which are created from nothing are not the total and absolute good, which God alone is. See *Mor.* II 7.10 (CSEL 90,7/96.6-11) “Satis est, inquam, ut uideatis nullum esse de bono et malo religiosae disputationis exitum, nisi quicquid est, in quantum est, ex deo sit, in quantum autem ab essentia deficit, non sit ex deo, sed tamen diuina prouidentia semper, sicut uniuersitate congruit, ordinetur.”

223.19 **de deo genitum sed ab ipso de nihilo factum** Augustine is trying to teach the Manichaeans what is generated from God, which is Christ and the Holy Spirit, and what is made by him. He will continue to teach them at *C. Fel.* 2.17-21 and *Nat. b.* 1. Cf. also *Uera rel.* 14.28 (CCL 32/204.22) “Quod autem ad eo genitum est, id ipsum est, quia non est factum, sed genitum.”

At this point in the *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine begins listing a series of either/or, neither/nor statements that will eventually lead (he hopes) the Manichaeans to see that the Land of Light was created from nothing. The Manichaeans refuse to believe this (224.2). Because of their refusal, they can only believe that God was penetrated by the Land of Darkness (224.20). He gives the Manichaeans every available option to save God from this horrible thing. He finally ends by stating that the Manichaeans have no choice but to believe that God made the Land of Light from nothing (224.2). The next 12 lines are a re-phrasing of what Augustine just described in the previous chapter.

224.2 **Quodsi magnum aliquod bonum, quod tamen illo ipso esset inferius** This is also a restatement of the beginning of this chapter. In 213.26 Augustine stated that the body is inferior to the soul and everything which God made is inferior to Him. At this point in the *Contra ep. fund.* Augustine is once again showing the Manichaeans the natural order of things, this time by means of a descent from God. Since God can create one thing that is very good, but not as good as Himself, from nothing, then he can make something good that is not as good as the first, but good nevertheless.

224.4 **quia bonus est et nulli bono inuidet** It is possible that Augustine got this idea from the works of Plato since in one of the letters of Seneca (*ep.* 65), Seneca claims that Plato stated the same thing: “Exemplar, scilicet, ad quod deus hanc magnitudinem operis pulcherrimi fecit. Propositum, propter quod fecit. Quaeris, quod sit propositum deo? Bonitas. Ita certe Plato ait: “Quae deo faciendi mundum fuit causa? *Bonus est; bono nulla cuiusquam boni inuidia est.* Fecit itaque quam optimam potuit.”

224.11 **tantas turpitudines et tam sacrilegas opiniones** These are popular adjectives for Augustine to use against the Manichaeans. Cf. *Nat. b.* 44 (CSEL 25,2/881.10-12) where Augustine comments on the idea that God is mixed in all matter: “hoc genus nefandissimi erroris quam sacrilegas et incredibiles turpitudines eis suadeat, etiamsi non persuadeat, horribile est dicere” and *Nat. b.* 47 (CSEL 25,2/887.21-25). See also *Commentary* 200.13 for other examples.

224.12 **quoniam liberum est carnali cogitationi phantasmata qualia libuerit opinari** This of course is the root of the Manichaean problem for Augustine: they cannot think in anything but corporal images. See *Commentary* 194.16.

224.14 **coniunctioni** This is the first time in this work that he has called the border between the Land of Light and Darkness a junction (see also 226.13). This junction implies a physical touching of the two, which is something that the *Ep. fund.* does not state. It only says that the Land of Darkness was near the Land of Light. In *C. Faust.* 19.24 (CSEL 25,1/524.10) Augustine states “Illa quippe, sicut delirant, uicinam sibi lucem atque contiguam...” Cf. also *C. Sec.* 20 (CSEL 25,2/938.1-12) “Si autem uel terris uel regionibus sibimet uicinitate contiguis regni lucis et gentis tenebrarum—quae ab hominibus prudenter intellegentibus ridenda Manichaeus narrat.” Epiphanius, who had read Titus of Bostra (See *Panarion*, Book 5.21,1 in Williams, 1987-1994, p. 241) also mentions the problems with the two borders (see 5.14,8). Augustine’s arguments are similar to both these authors.

224.24 **non dico alias, quibus expressius ista descripsit** These *alias* must be other cosmogonical texts. This is a very important passage. As mentioned in Commentary 212.9, Bennett (2001, 78) believes this other work might have been Mani's *Living Gospel*. But here Augustine is referring to more than one work. In *Mor.* II Augustine also describes some Manichaean cosmogony in relation to the specific animals found in the Land of Darkness. The *Ep. fund.* does not mention these specific animals and Augustine states, in chapter 28 of *Contra ep. fund.* (229.12-16) that these are found in other works: "Diuersa fuisse respondent et de aliis libris ita docent, quod tenebrae serpentes habuerunt..." See also *Commentary* 229.12. This passage from the *Ep. fund.* also makes it clear that it was not a detailed text as is found in other Manichaean material that Augustine might have had access to.

224.25 **paucioribus notae sunt** These few men are probably the Elect, but could also have included some Hearers (see *Commentary* 224.27 below). That Augustine does not discuss these texts is an indicator that he probably doesn't know their contents very well.

224.27 **quae fere omnibus, qui apud uos inluminati uocantur** Those who are illuminated are both the Elect and some of the Hearers, since in *Util. cred.* 1.3 (CSEL 25,1/6.2-20) Augustine states that he was no longer considered to be "illuminated" after he left the Manichaeans: "Quare desinant dicere illud, quod in ore habent quasi necessarium cum eos quisque deseruerit, qui diutius audisset: *lumen per illum transitum fecit*... Non enim uereor, ne me arbitreris *inhabitatum lumine*... Sed modo *me dicere desertum lumine*, cum ab his omnibus umbris rerum me auerterim soloque uictu ad uoletudinem corporis necessario contentus esse decreuerim, *inlustratum autem atque fulgentem fuisse*..." (emphasis mine). Brown (1969, 47) states "This 'illumination' was the first, the basic, religious experience of a Manichee: he was a man who had become acutely aware of his own state..." See also *Commentary* 197.8.

Chapter Twenty-Six

225.3-226.6 **...aut recto latere adiungebatur...aut curuo aut tortuoso** Here follows another long set of hypothetical statements about the possible shape of the border between the Land of Light and Darkness. A large part of this chapter is taken up with these questions and thus it will be useful to summarize his arguments. From this point until 226.2 Augustine will give the Manichaeans three choices on their border: it can be twisted, and if that is the case, then the Land of Light must have a twisted border as well (225.2). But if the Land of Light still has a straight line and the Land of Darkness is twisted, then there will be gaps at certain points and therefore there would not be a void above the Land of Darkness. But there is a void (225.9) and therefore the border cannot be twisted. He then remarks how nice it would be for a void to exist, since that would mean that any wickedness trying to get into the Land of Light would fall for eternity and never cause any harm (225.20). There are three possible examples of a curved side. In all three the Land of Light would then also have a curved border, either receiving the curve of the Land of Darkness (225.1), or bulging into the Land of Darkness (225.24) or finally, if the Land of Darkness is curved and the Land of Light straight, then we find ourselves back to the idea that there were gaps in which the wicked things would fall (226.2). The last possibility is that it is straight on both sides (226.2).

226.5 **ut maior coniunctio esse non possit** In *Quant.* 10.16 (CSEL 89,1/150.17-18) Augustine sets out to teach Evodius how to think about incorporeal reality and part of that teaching is to understand the greatness of a straight line: “Ego aliud sentio; nam recta linea donec ueniat ad angulos, summa aequalitate praedita est...” He is trying to teach the Manichaeans the same thing.

226.5 **concordiam** Concordance is an important principle for Augustine, not only for immaterial ideas such as these lines, but also in material objects. Moon (1955, 151) states that Augustine appeals to Paul in 1Cor. 12.20-21 for this idea. Cf. also *C. Faust.* 21.10 (CSEL 25,1/580.18-23).

226.8 **per infinitum spatium loci et ab infinita aeternitate iuncturam?** Parallel lines would stretch off into infinity and the fact that they would not join is, in and of itself, very good. On the infinity of a straight line, see *Quant.* 6.11 (CSEL 89,1/144.1-3) “Sed linea ista, quam iam, ut opinor, bene intellegis, si porrigatur siue ex una siue ex utraque parte, qua in longum porrigi potest, cernis nullum esse finem.”

226.15 **accedit ista coniunctio, quid concordius et pacatius hac utraque terra? Quid uero etiam ipsa copulatione duorum rectorum laterum pulchrius dici aut cogitari possit? Non inuenio.** This is a point that Augustine will return to in chapter 27. If the Land of Darkness, which is supposedly the absolute evil, has a straight line, and if a straight line is a very great good, then there is something that is good in the Manichaean Land of Darkness. But for Augustine, that cannot be. As seen from above, there are many parallels to his argumentation in *Quant.* Augustine is reaching back to those ideas and trying to teach the Manichaeans the proper way to think about God.

Chapter Twenty-Seven

226.18 **Quid faciam cum errore peruersis et consuetudine implicatis miserrimis animis**

Here Augustine begins to address not the Manichaeans but his other audience. These are common adjectives that Augustine uses to describe the Manichaeans. For example, see *Mor.* I. 25.47 (CSEL 90,7/52.11-14) “Quamobrem uidete quam sint peruersi atque praeposteri, qui sese arbitrantur dei cognitionem tradere, ut perfecti simus, cum perfectorum ipsa sit praemium”; *Agon.* 23 (CSEL 41/170.2-9); *C. Faust.* 9.2 (CSEL 25,1/309.16). In *Simp.* I.2.8 (CCL 44/45.550-552), Augustine states that sin is perversity and a lack of order: “Est autem peccatum hominis inordinatio atque peruersitas, id est a praestantiore conditore auersio.” The use of *peruerus* also has biblical antecedents. See Job 34.30 (used by Augustine in *Nat. b.* 32) “Qui regnare facit, inquit, hominem hypocritam propter peruersitatem populi” (*Vulgate* reads “qui regnare facit hominem hypocritam propter peccata populi”) and *Mt.* 17.17 (among

others) “Respondens autem Iesus ait: ‘O generatio incredula et peruersa...’” For *consuetudine inplacatis*, see *Commentary* 195.9.

226.20 **non enim attendunt** Augustine has previously tried to get them to pay attention in 197.13 and 218.12.

226.21 **Rogo** He now addresses the Manichaeans.

226.22 **nisi qui diuinam misericordiam expertus non est, ut careret erroribus** Augustine may be thinking of his statement to Honoratus in *Util. cred.* 1.2, (CSEL 25,1/4.10-14) where he states that the *Manichaeans* set people free from all errors: “Nosti enim, Honorate, non aliam ob causam nos in tales homines incidisse, nisi quod se dicebant terribili auctoritate separata mera et simplici ratione eos, qui se audire uellent, introducturos ad deum et errore omni liberaturos.”

226.25 **omnes homines sumus** He stated this previously in 222.7. He reminds the Manichaeans that they are rational men capable of thinking of these things in the correct way, as opposed to unrational beasts.

226.26 **Non nos, sed errores et falsitates oderimus** This is reminiscent of his comment in *Quant.* 34.78 (CSEL 89,1/227.16) “Neque uitii oppressos, sed ipsa uitia, neque peccantes, sed ipsa peccata oderimus.”

226.26 **quaeso** This has the same emotional feel as *rogo*.

226.26 **Deus misericordiarum** Here Augustine breaks away from his address to the Manichaeans and begs God to help the Manichaeans see their inner light (Christ) as he does at the very beginning of the work at 193.4, 212.4 and the very last line of the work at 248.23. For God’s title, cf. 2 *Cor.* 1:3 “benedictus Deus et Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi Pater misericordiarum et Deus totius consolationis.” He also uses this title in *Conf.* 5.9.17 (CCL 27/66.27).

227.1 **rectum melius esse quam prauum** Augustine is probably making a play on words. *Rectus* can mean either correct, proper, right as well as straight. *Prauus* can mean wrong as

well as crooked. He undoubtedly means here the combination of straight/crooked, but the alternative meaning was probably not lost on the Manichaeans (and the others reading this work).

227.2 placide modesteque He is addressing the Manichaeans as a group again. There are a number of places in Augustine's work where he would like the Manichaeans whom he is addressing to listen calmly and mildly. For example, see *Util. cred.* 3.7 (CSEL 25,1/10.4-6) "Se nimirum illud est, quod mihi uidetur, quod peto placidissimo et serenissimo iudicio mecum consideres" and *C. Sec.* 6 (CSEL 25,2/913.12-14) "Leni animum tuum et placabilem te redde considerandae sine pertinacia ueritati."

227.5 non solum ei, si deprauetur, pulchritudinem auferri The taking away of beauty is also the taking away of substance (227.10) and if something had the power to turn the straight line of the Land of Darkness crooked, then it would go from being very good to less than this good. This would also take away its harmony and agreement (227.8-9). Following this line of reasoning, Augustine will state that a substance cannot be evil (see *Commentary* 227.10), but a change from more good to less good is an evil. See also his comments in *Imm. an.* 8.13 (CSEL 89,1/114.12-18) "Quod si non id, quod est in mole corporis, sed id, quod in specie, facit corpus esse, quae sententia inuictiore ratione adprobatur – tanto enim magis est corpus, quanto speciosius est atque pulchrius, tantoque minus est, quanto foedius ac deformius, quae defectio non praecisione molis, de qua iam satis actum est, sed speciei priuatione contingit" and *Nat. b.* 15 (CSEL 25,2/861.4-5) "Quod si potest, ut foedius fiat, quid minuit nisi pulchritudinis bonum?" The idea of evil as a deprivation or a reduction of the good probably came to Augustine from Ambrose, who got it from Plotinus (Courcelle, 1968,124).

227.10 discite non substantiam malum esse Augustine is making a direct attack against the *Ep. fund.* when Mani states "Haec quippe in exordio fuerunt duae substantiae a se diuisae" (*Contra ep. fund.* 13 [CSEL 25,1/209.11-12]). A substance cannot be evil because God created all substances and these substances are good (*Conf.* 12.11.11 (CCL 27/221.7)).

Because of its importance, it is a commonly repeated argument in the works of Augustine. See *Uera rel.* 16 (CCL 32/207.46) “Quibus perfectis non solum nulla substantia malum est, quod fieri numquam potest...”; *Lib. arb.* 3.13.36 (CCL 29/297.15-19) “Omnis autem natura aut corruptibilis est aut incorruptibilis. Omnis ergo natura bona est. Naturam uoco quae et substantia dici solet; omnis igitur substantia aut deus aut ex deo, quia omne bonum aut deus aut ex deo”; *Enn. Ps.* 68.2.5 (CCL 39/905.9-11). This is an idea found in both the *Enneads* and in the writings of Ambrose. See his *Hex.* where he states the same thing: 1.8.28 (PL 14/158) “cum utique non substantialis, sed accidens sit malitiae, quae a naturae bonitate deflexit.” and *Hex.* 1.8.31 (PL 14/140-1). From here Augustine will begin to attack the substances of the Land of Darkness (see 228.13).

227.11 in corpore commutatione formae in deterius amitti speciem uel potius minui et foedum dici, quod pulchrum antea dicebatur On *species* see *Commentary* 231.6. The more ugly something becomes, the more the form is made worse. He had stated in *Imm. an.* 8.13 (CSEL 89,1/114.12-18) that this change in form does not occur because some mass is taken away, but because some of the form is taken away: “Quod si non id, quod est in mole corporis, sed id, quod in specie, facit corpus esse, quae sententia inuictiore ratione adprobatur – tanto enim magis est corpus, quanto speciosius est atque pulchrius, tantoque minus est, quanto foedius ac deformius, quae defectio non praecisione molis, de qua iam satis actum est, sed speciei priuatione contingit.” In *Nat. b.* 15 (CSEL 25,2/861.1-5) Augustine will make this more clear by stating that the more ugly something becomes the more the good which it naturally has is diminished: “Sed, ut quod dicimus intellegatur et nimium tardis satis fiat, uel etiam pertinaces et apertissime ueritati repugnantes cogantur quod uerum est confiteri, interrogentur, utrum corpori simiae possit nocere corruptio. *Quod si potest, ut foedius fiat, quid minuit nisi pulchritudinis bonum?*” This idea is also found in *Enn.* 1.8.29 where Plotinus states “Ugliness is but matter not mastered by Ideal-Form...”

227.16 **animam miseram...nulla addita detractaue substantia** The soul, however, despite the fact that it does change, does not lose some of its substance. On the soul and its ability to change and the punishments of this sin, see *Commentary* 193.16.

227.25 **a quo esse omne bonum, quod in quacumque natura est** Mani is trying to have a good in the Land of Darkness (the straightness of its border) which would mean that this good could not have come from God. This is impossible because, as he has stated many times, God creates everything. See also *Lib. arb.* 3.13.36 (CCL 29/297.11) “Quapropter, quod uerissime dicitur, omnis natura in quantum natura est bona est.”

228.3 **auctori bonorum omnium** This is the first time in this work that Augustine has called God the creator of all good things. After this, however, he uses it six more times (Chapter 29 (2X), 31, 33, 34 and 38). See also (among many) *Quant.* 33.76 (CSEL 89,1/223.24); *Mor.* I 2.3 (CSEL 90,7/90.4) “Quocirca cum in catholica dicitur omnium naturarum atque substantiarum esse auctorem deum...”; *Uera rel.* 18.36 (CCL 32/209.25-26); and *Nat. b.* 13 (CSEL 25,2/860.4). Ambrose also uses this phrase. For example, see *de Isaac* 7.61 (PL 14/525-6).

228.6 **Quomodo est igitur summum malum, quo potest aliquid cogitari deterius** This is a key phrase in Augustine’s arguments against the Manichaeans. The mind cannot think of something without that something being good. Even if the border was the highest evil, but straight, it is possible to imagine this straight line becoming curved or twisted. Therefore one can think of something even worse than the supreme evil, and this is impossible.

228.7 **Deinde necesse est aliquid boni sit, quo carendo fit res quaecumque deterior** Every created substance is good by virtue of it being created by God and for this substance to become worse, the form must be decreased. Inherent in this argument is the idea that anything that can become worse must have had some good in it in the first place. Therefore this evil border in the Land of Darkness has some good, despite what Mani has to say. Of course Augustine does not believe that this border exists, but he is using it to make the point

to Mani and the Manichaeans that their ideas are all images created in the mind. See also *Nat. b.* 6 (CSEL 25,2/857.28-858.2) “Omnis autem natura, quae corrumpi potest, etiam ipsa aliquod bonum est; non enim posset ei nocere corruptio nisi adimendo et minuendo quod bonum est.”

228.9 **dices...tu contuleris** Here Augustine switches to the singular again and is addressing Mani.

228.11 **a quo siue magna siue parua, omnia tamen bona esse fateamur** Cf. *Nat. b.* 1 (CSEL 25,2/855.10-12 and especially 855.13-14). As Moon (1955, 119) notes, because God has made all things and some things are better than others, these lesser goods are certainly not evil because they are lesser. Moon also points to *C. Sec.* 21 (CSEL 25,2/938.13); *C. Faust.* 14.11 (CSEL 25,1/411.10) and *Ep.* 118.3.15 (CSEL 34/679.12-680.25).

Chapter Twenty-Eight

As noted by Ries (1995, 545) “Après cette longue discussion destinée à montrer l’absurdité des “phantasmes manichéens” Augustin annonce une autre façon de procéder. Pour l’introduire, il procède à une nouvelle transcription de l’essentiel du text sur le Royaume des Ténèbres.” Augustine now turns his attention to the creatures found in the Land of Darkness. A large part of this chapter is verbatim of the *Ep. fund.*, as found in 212.12 and thus the reader is directed to previous statements in the *Commentary*.

228.14 **Cum dicit habitabant, animata utique atque uiuentia uult intellegi** Augustine is beginning to set up his argument. After having reminded the Manichaeans that all natures are good and everything that exists is a nature, Augustine will now begin to examine the natures of the Land of Darkness. Just using the term ‘natures’ sets the Manichaeans up for a fall.

228.18 **Hic infinitae...naturae quinque terrae pestiferae** Augustine brings the reader back to the *Ep. fund.*, which he quoted from 212.12-212.22. He gives the entire passage again in order that his readers can see the text that he will now spend the next seven chapters arguing against. See *Commentary* 212.12 for this passage.

229.5 **ut exteriores ceteris sint tenebrae a quibus numerare incipit** As mentioned in *Commentary* 212.12, Augustine is consistent with listing the five natures from the darkness to the smoke, but reverses his listing order in *Haer.*

229.12 **respondent** Since this answer is not found in the *Ep. fund.* because it did not contain specific examples of the inhabitants, Augustine refers to other sources (see below).

229.12 **aliis libris** Augustine does not give the source of these other books but in *Mor.* II 9.14 (CSEL 90,7/100.9) he lists the particular animals found in the Land of Darkness (see *Commentary* 212.12). The *Psalm Book* II and the source for Theodore Bar Konai do not contain the specific list of animals. Ries (1995, 546) suggests Keph. 46.30-34.

Chapter Twenty-Nine

229.17 **Quis igitur ista ordinavit? Quis distribuit atque distinxit? Quis numerum, qualitatem, formas, uitam dedit?** These are all extremely important words in Augustine's Christian cosmogony because it can only be God who gives these things, not the Land of Darkness. He makes this point very clear in a long passage from *Nat. bon.* 41 (CSEL 25,2/874.21-876.7) in which he lists the good things that are found in the Land of Darkness:

"...ut non uideant et in eo, quod dicunt naturam summi mali, ponere se tanta bona, ubi ponunt uitam, potentiam, salutem, memoriam, intellectum, temperiem, uirtutem, copiam, sensum, lumen, suauitatem, mensuras, numeros, pacem, modum, speciem, ordinem: in eo autem, quod dicunt summum bonum, tanta mala: mortem, aegritudinem, obliuinem, insipientiam, perturbationem, inpotentiam, egestatem, stoliditatem, caecitatem, dolorem, iniquitatem, dedecus, bellum, inmoderationem, deformitatem, peruersitatem." Moon (1955, 147) has a very useful table comparing both the good things made by God, the good things that the Manichaeans attribute to evil and the evils attributed by the Manichaeans to the good God, as found in Chapters 13 and 41 in *Nat. b.*

229.18 **numerum, qualitatem, formas, uitam** For discussions on number, see du Roy (1966, 279-81), and for a discussion on measure, number and order as reflecting the

Trinitarian structure of created being, see Roche (1941). In Augustine's works, see *Ord.* 2.16.42 (CCL 29/265.23-266.28) where he states that all things have forms, and all have forms because of numbers. If these numbers are taken away, then they will cease to exist: "Intuere caelum et terram et mare et quaecumque in eis uel desuper fulgent uel deorsum repunt uel uolant uel natant. Formas habent quia numeros habent; adime illis haec, nihil erunt. A quo ergo sunt nisi a quo numerus? Quandoquidem in tantum illis est esse in quantum numerosa esse." In *Ord.* 2.17.48 (CCL 29/133.21-27) he even equates reason with number. And finally, in 2.20.54 (CCL 29/273.13-16) he states that only God can give measure, number and order and when these things are taken away, nothing at all remains: "Ita enim nulla natura occurrit quae non sit ex deo. Omnem quippe rem, ubi mensuram et numerum et ordinem uideris, deo artifici tribuere ne cuncteris. Unde autem ista penitus detraxeris, nihil omnino remanebit." See also *Gn. adu. Man.* I.16.26 (CSEL 91/92.28-93.9); I.16.26 (CSEL 91/93.26-94.31), I.21.32 (CSEL 91/100.5); *Lib. arb.* II.20 (CCL 29/273.10-25); *C. Faust.* 20.7 (CSEL 25,1/542.6-7), 21.6 (CSEL 25,1/575.3-16) and *C. Sec.* 5 (CSEL 25,2/912.26-913.6).

229.21 **chaos** This *chaos* is usually described by Augustine to be the confused and formless matter that God uses to make the world (after he had created it from nothing): see *Gn. adu. Man.* I.5.9 (CSEL 91/76.13) "Primo ergo materia facta est confusa et informis, unde omnia fierent quae distincta atque formata sunt, quod credo a Graecis chaos appellari. Sic enim et alio loco legimus dictum in laudibus die: qui fecisti mundum de materia informi, quod aliqui codices habent 'de material inuisa'" and *Gn. litt. imp.* 4.12 (PL 34, 224).

229.23 **sine qualitate, sine mensuris, sine numero et pondere** God arranged all things by measure, number and weight (Wisdom 11.20) and this verse played an important part in the theology of creation (Bovon 2001, 275-276 and n. 91 on its importance for Augustine).

O'Donnell (1992, vol. II, 46) lists this passage from *Contra ep. fund.* and he is correct when he states that the Trinity of God, as seen in these three words found here, becomes "a central

idea of the anti-Manichaean *Nat. b.* of 398 (*Nat. b.* 3).” O’Donnell also mentions *C. ep. fund.* 30.33, 31.34, 33.36, 41.47. See also the important comments by Williams (1999, 252) who states “*Mensura* is interpreted in terms of ‘limit’ – to be a created thing is to have a fixed, not an indefinite, range of possibilities. *Numerus* is form and harmony or proportion; to be created is to possess the potential for stability and equilibrium through time, to be capable of adjusting stably to diverse circumstances. *Pondus* or *ordo* (the latter word is what Augustine uses in his earlier discussions, as, for example, in *Gn. adu. Man.* 1.16.26 and 21.32) is what pulls us toward appropriate goals, toward what we are made for.”

229.25 **quidam doctores graeci ἡτοιον uocant** Alexander of Lycopolis also argues against this idea (*C. Manich. opin.* 2, Van der Horst, 52). Alexander specifically states that the Manichaeans do not equate this matter with that found in the descriptions of Plato or Aristotle. Although Augustine does not state it here in this work, ἡτοιον is also equated with *hyle*, as found in *C. Faust.* 20.14 (CSEL 25,1/554.1) “*Hylen namque Graeci cum de natura disserunt, materiem quandam rerum definiunt nullo prorsus modo formatam, sed omnium corporalium formarum capacem, quae quidem in corporum mutabilitate utcumque cognoscitur; nam per se ipsam nec sentiri nec intellegi potest*” and 21.14 (CSEL 25,1/572.25) “*Si enim materies informis coporalium formarum capax ab eis hyle appellaretur, quae appellata est ab antiquis...*” According to Alexander, this matter in Manichaeism is random motion. For a discussion of this passage in Alexander, see Van Oort (1989, 385-6).

Augustine now lists all the things which the Manichaeans do in their description of the Land of Darkness. They *adiungunt atque conliniant* (230.2), *numerant, distingunt, ordinant* (230.3), *suis inhabitatoribus conplent* (230.5), *adtribuunt* (230.6), and finally they give them *uitam* (230.7). All these are from God, the author of all good things (230.8).

230.8 **in rebus agnoscere tantum ordinis bonum nec in se tantum erroris malum** This great error is caused by not understanding the proper order of things and not accepting that all good things come from God. See Lacey (1916, 30).

Chapter Thirty

In this chapter Augustine begins to show the Manichaeans all of the good that is found in their supreme evil and he really seems to want the Manichaeans to agree with him. There are similar arguments against these five natures in *Mor. II*, and in *C. Faustum*, although in *C. ep. fund.* Augustine has greatly expanded the argument and has filled it full of examples.

230.13 **ego tecum uitupero...lauda tu mecum** This pairing of *uitupero* with *lauda* occurs seven times in this chapter. Augustine is clearly trying to get the Manichaeans to agree that what Mani has described as being the supreme evil really contains some good things, and therefore cannot be the supreme evil (see 230.15).

230.15 **uidebis bona malis permixta te uelle constituere pro summo et extremo malo** This is the prime problem with the Manichaean cosmogony and the goal of this passage is to get the Manichaeans to see that in their description of the Land of Darkness there is a mixture of good and evil. He had discussed this before in *Mor. II* 9.16 (CSEL 90,7/102.13-14) where he looks at the animals found in the Land of Darkness. He asks “Tanta ne malis elementis commixtione boni accessit immanitas?” He also returns to this very issue in *C. Faust.* 21.14 (CSEL 25,1/585.13-587.7) and 22.22 (CSEL 25,1/616.21-26) “Proinde nulla causa est, cur quaerentes, unde sit malum, inrueritis in huius erroris tam magnum malum, ut naturam tot bonis abundantem naturam mali diceretis et in natura summi boni ante commixtionem naturae mali horrendum necessitatis malum poneretis.”

230.17 **lauda ibi mecum salutem; non enim genera illa uel gigni uel nutriri uel inhabitare illam terram sine aliqua salute potuissent** He asks this again in *C. Faust.* 21.12 (CSEL 25,1/583.8-14) “Itane in illa gente non erat sanitas corporum, in qua et nasci et crescere, gignere et ita perdurare potuerunt illa animalia, ut quibusdam eorum grauidis, sicut desipiunt, captis et in caelo conligatis nec saltem pleni temporis, sed abortiui fetus electam excelso in terram cadentes et uiuere pauerint et crescere et ista carnum, quae nunc sunt

innumerabilia, genera propagare?” and 21.14 (CSEL 25,1/585.18-20). See also *Nat. b.* 41 (CSEL 25,2/874.27).

230.19 **lauda ibi mecum fecunditatem** Augustine also praises the fertility of the smoke in 231.17. See also *Mor.* II 9.14 (CSEL 90,7/100.22-23) “Si sterilitas malum est, erat ibi filios procreandi magna fecunditas”; *C. Faust.* 21.10 (CSEL 25,1/580.18-582.3), 21.12 (CSEL 25,1/583.14-20) and 21.14 (CSEL 25,1/585.13-22).

230.21 **Quamquam tenebrae non sunt corporeae totumque hoc nomen lucis absentia est sicut nuditas carere uestitu et inanitas uacare corporis plenitudine** Augustine also uses, in *B. uita.* 4.29 (CCL 29/81.137-146), the example of nakedness to explain what darkness really is. See also *Gn. adu. Man.* I.4.7 (CSEL 91/73.1) where he uses both nakedness as well as emptiness “Et dixit deus: fiat lux, quia ubi lux non est, tenebrae sunt, non quia aliquid sunt tenebrae, sed ipsa *lucis absentia* tenebrae dicuntur, sicut silentium non aliqua res est, sed ubi sonus non est silentium dicitur, et *nuditas* non aliqua res est, sed in corpore ubi tegumentum non est nuditas dicitur, et *inanitas* non est aliquid, sed locus ubi corpus non est inanis dicitur; sic tenebrae non aliquid sunt, sed ubi lux non est tenebrae dicuntur”; *En. Ps.* 7.19 (CCL 38/48.31-42) and *Ciu. Dei* 11.10 (CCL 48/331.63-67).

Augustine is not the only one to use this teaching to explain what darkness is.

Gregory of Nyssa, in his *Catechetical Oration* 5 states the same thing: “...The existence of evil did not have its origin in the divine will...It has its origin in free will, when the soul withdraws from the good. For as sight is an activity of nature and blindness is a privation of natural activity, so virtue is in this way opposed to vice. Just as darkness follows the removal of light and disappears in its presence, so, as long as goodness is present in a nature, evil is something nonexistent” It is not certain whether or not Augustine had read this work in translation at this point in time (Greer 1996, 474) but the similarities cannot be denied.

231.1 **quaedam concordia numerosa ordinat atque** In *Sol.* 1.1.4 (CSEL 89/7.14-19) God is described as the ultimate *concordia*: “Quicquid a me dictum est, unus Deus tu, tu ueni mihi in

auxilium, una aeterna uera substantia, ubi nulla discrepantia, nulla confusio, nulla transitio, nulla indigentia, nulla mors, ubi summa concordia, summa euidencia, summa constantia, summa plenitudo, summa uita, ubi nihil deest, nihil redundat, ubi qui gignit et quem gignit unum est.”

231.3 moderationis pace congruentia *Congruentia* is an important term for Augustine, and is a sure sign for him that whatever has this, is made by God. O'Donnell (1992, vol. 2, 131) states that *congruentia* is at the “heart of Augustine’s notions of beauty and the attractions that arise therefrom.” He points the reader to Cicero’s *fin.* 3.6.21. For a similar argument of Augustine, see *Diu. qu.* 78 (CCL 44A/223.1) “Ars illa summa omnipotentis dei, per quam ex nihilo facta sunt omnia, quae etiam sapientia eius dicitur, ipsa operatur etiam per artifices, ut pulchra et congruentia faciant, quamius non de nihilo...” and *C. Faust.* 21.5 (CSEL 25,1/573.29-575.5).

231.6 lauda ibi mecum et ipsam speciem For Augustine, *species* is the outward appearance and the “intrinsic structure by which the unformed matter is made into a created thing” (O'Donnell 1992, vol. 2, 47). It is diametrically opposed to corruption. And one must understand what species is in order to understand the soul and ultimately God. See *Ord.* 2.16.44 (CCL 29/131.6-18). In *Ord.* 2.16.44 (CCL 29/131.6-18) Augustine makes it clear that one must understand what *species* is to know one’s own soul and ultimately God. See also *Duab. an.* 2 (CSEL 25,1/53.16-21) where he stated that if he had understood what form and shape were, then he wouldn’t have had so many problems later; *Imm. an.* 8.13 (CSEL 89,1/114.12-18); *Uera rel.* 18.35 (CCL 32/208.1); *Diu. qu.* 10 (CCL 44A/18.1-5) and especially *Nat. b.* 3 (CSEL 25,2/856.10) whereby he states that God gives *species* to all things, whether large or small: “Nos enim catholici christiani deum colimus, a quo omnia bona sunt seu magna seu parua; a quo est omnis modus, siue magnus siue paruus; a quo omnis species, siue magna siue parua.”

231.14 **auferre non potes, quia si abstuleris, nullum erit corpus** A body means materiality; materiality means that it was created by God; and being created by God, it comes from nothing. If the form is taken away (see *Commentary* 231.6), then there will be nothing left.

231.15 **si es homo, sentis esse laudanda...** This sentence, through to 231.22, is a repeat of what Augustine just said and what he will continue to say.

231.21 **concordiae** The *partium concordia* is the “harmonious functioning of the constitutive parts of an entity” (Moon 1955, 201). See *Nat. b.* 41 (CSEL 25,2/875.20).

231.25 **conuenientia partium** Here he uses a new word in this text (*conuenientia*), whereas he uses *concordia* 231.2, *similitudino* in 231.13, *congruentia* and *modus* in 232.12. He is covering all aspects of harmony so that the Manichaeans cannot come back later to bring up something that Augustine had not covered. For similar statements on *conuenientia*, see *Mor.* II 6.8 (CSEL 90, 7/94.14-21) “Ordo enim ad conuenientiam quandam quod ordinat redigit. Nihil est autem esse, quam unum esse. Itaque in quantum quidque unitatem adipiscitur, in tantum est. Unitatis est enim operatio, conuenientia et concordia, qua sunt in quantum sunt ea quae composita sunt, nam simplicia per se sunt, quia una sunt; quae autem non sunt simplicia, concordia partium imitantur unitatem et in tantum sunt in quantum assequuntur”; *Uera rel.* 30.55 (CCL 32/223.30-41) and *C. Faust.* 21.6 (CSEL 25,1/575.3-8).

232.1 **unde uelint et quo uelint transitus** The desire to move implies a soul. See *Quant.* 22.38 (CSEL 89,1/178.3-7) “Nam corpora omnium animalium quis negat suo pondere praedita? Quod pondus nutu animae actum, quo inclinauerit, multum ualet magnitudine propria. Sed nutus animae ad mouendum corporis pondus neruis quasi tormentis utitur.”

232.3 **Lauda ibi mecum genitabilem ignem** For Augustine, even the eternal fire is not evil because it has measure, form and order. See *Nat. b.* 38 (CSEL 25,2/873.20-24) “Nam nec ipse ignis aeternus, qui cruciaturus est impios, mala natura est habens modum et speciem et

ordinem suum nulla iniquitate deprauatum; sed cruciatus est damnatis malum, quorum peccatis est debitus. Neque enim et lux ista, quia lippos cruciat, mala natura est.”

232.12 **congruentium** On his comments on this passage, Moon (1955, 201) notes that “*partium congruentia* is the appropriate disposition of the parts, whereby a being is maintained as a unity, its unity being the source of its beauty.”

232.13 **modum** This *modus* is the manner of being and O'Donnell (1992, vol. 2, 47) believes that this is Augustine's “unique synthesis of Platonic and Ciceronian ideas from the first works at Cassiciacum.” See du Roy (1966, 152-8).

232.13 **quadam unitate sit quod est** To have unity means to have existence. See *Mor.* II 6.8 (CSEL 90,7/94.16-17) “Itaque in quantum quidque unitatem adipiscitur, in tantum est. Unitatis est enim operatio, conuenientia et concordia, qua sunt in quantum sunt ea quae composita sunt, nam simplicia per se sunt, quia una sunt.”

Chapter Thirty-One

Augustine continues his argument from the last chapter. He is continually stressing the fact that he is finding good things in the land of absolute evil. Here he takes off from where he left chapter thirty: the Prince of Smoke. He is the best example since he, of all the things in the Land of Darkness, is the most evil.

232.21 **Habebat enim animam et corpus, illam uiuificantem, hoc uita inspiratum; cum illa regeret, hoc obtemperaret...** These are the functions of the soul. See once again *Quant. an.* 33.70 (CSEL 89/217.18-218.15). Augustine also discusses the good things found with the Prince of Darkness (and the other princes) in *Nat. b.* 41 (CSEL 25,2/875.7) “Principes enim tenebrarum et uixisse in sua natura dicunt et in suo regno saluos fuisse et meminisse et intellexisse...et habuisse temperiem animo et corpori suo congruam et uirtute potentiae regnasse et copias elementorum suorum ac fecunditatis habuisse et sensisse se inuicem ac sibi uicinum lumen et oculos habuisse, quibus illud longe conspicerent; qui utique oculi sine

aliquo lumine lumen uidere non poterant, unde recte etiam lumina nominantur; et suauitate suae uoluptatis esse perfruitos et dimensis membris atque habitationibus determinatos fuisse.”

232.29 **Quae si vel admonitus intuetur atque considerat...temere credidit** This is Augustine speaking of his own personal experience: he believed blindly. See lines 193.11, 197.16, 206.10, 210.4, 210.17. Moon (1955, 149) compares this passage (up to 233.10) with *Nat. b.* 14 (CSEL 25,2/860.21-28).

233.4 **est deus una trinitas** For Augustine, the Trinity, being God in Three, is the highest and uncreated and this runs throughout the history of his writings. Cf. (among others) *Mor. I* 14.24 (CSEL 90,7/28.7-11) “Deum ergo diligere debemus trinam quandam unitatem, patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum, quod nihil aliud dicam esse nisi idipsum esse. Est enim uere summeque deus, ex quo omnia, per quem omnia, in quo omnia”; *Uera rel.* 18.35 (CCL 32/208.1-209.10); *Agon.* 13.15 (CSEL 41/118.18-21) “Haec aeterna sunt et incommutabilia, id est unus deus, unius substantiae trinitas aeterna, deus, ex quo omnia, per quem omnia, in quo omnia”; *Doctr. chr.* I.V.5 (CCL 32/9.4-7); *Conf.* 12.7.7 (CCL 27/219.1-16); *C. Sec.* 8 (CSEL 25,2/916.21) and *Trin.* I.6.12 (CCL 50/41.80-42.106).

233.5 **angeli sancti et beatissimae potestates** Cf. *I Pet.* 3:22 “qui est in dextera Dei profectus in caelum subiectis sibi angelis et potestatibus et virtutibus.” He states this again in *Ciu. Dei* 11.15 (CCL 48/336.25-26) and 11.16 (CCL 48/336.7-9).

233.6 **infimis** Herein lies the problem with the Manichaeans which Augustine has been stressing over and over. The things that Mani believed were in the Land of Darkness are nothing but the material things found in his imagination. Because of this what he described is not evil but is in fact good.

233.10 **eiusdem boni absentia mali nomen tenet** Augustine shows here that he does not believe that evil is “illusory” but that it is a defect of the good (Cress 1989, 113). This is the first time in this work that he has stated that the absence of good is evil. For an illustrated example of this, see *Mor. II* 8.11 (CSEL 90,7/96.14-19...97.5-22) where Augustine tells the

story of a Manichaean who was trying to prove that a scorpion itself was evil. This idea is Plotinian in origin. See *Enn.* I.8.5 “Evil is not in any and every lack; it is in absolute lack. What falls in some degree short of the Good is not Evil; considered in its own kind it might even be perfect, but where there is utter dearth, there we have Essential Evil, void of all share in Good; this is the case with Matter...” For evidence that Augustine had read *Ennead* 5.8, see O’Connell (1963b, 9, 18-20). See also Garvey (1939, 143) and Courcelle (1968, 107). Ambrose also used this; see *De Isaac* 7.60 (PL 14/525) “Quid ergo est malitia, nisi boni indigentia? ... Ex bonis igitur mala orta sunt; non enim mala sunt, nisi quae priuantur bonis. Per mala tamen factum est, ut bona emerent...”

233.17 **tenebris...sicut silentium auribus non audiendo** Augustine is fond of these examples and used them repeatedly before and after this work. For more detail on silence, see *Commentary* 247.6. For the same argument, see also *Gn. adu. Man.* 1.4.7 (CSEL 91/73.1-74.21) “Et dixit deus: fiat lux, quia ubi lux non est, tenebrae sunt, non quia aliquid sunt tenebrae, sed ipsa lucis absentia tenebrae dicuntur, sicut silentium non aliqua res est, sed ubi sonus non est silentium dicitur, et nuditas non aliqua res est, sed in corpore ubi tegumentum non est nuditas dicitur, et inanitas non est aliquid, sed locus ubi corpus non est inanis dicitur; sic tenebrae non aliquid sunt, sed ubi lux non est tenebrae dicuntur...”; *Conf.* 5.10.20; *Nat. b.* 15 (CSEL 25,2/861.11, 15-16) and *Gn. litt. imp.* 5.23 (PL 34, 228).

Chapter Thirty-Two

234.17 **et ad illa transferre phantasmate** This is a recurring theme in this work: Mani had taken what he had seen from natural things and transferred them from his memory to create his cosmogony.

234.22 **Hanc enim solent rationem reddere, quod quadrupedes edaces sint et in concubitum multum ferueant** The use of the plural here indicates that this is not part of the *Ep. fund.*, but a Manichaean exegesis of the *Ep. fund.* or, more likely, some other cosmogonical text (as is found in *Mor. II*) that discusses these animals.

235.8 **Hinc enim homines trahere originem dicunt** See *Commentary* 218.3.

235.13 **non tamen, ut ideo bipedes animantes in fumo et de fumo nati esse credantur** It is impossible that living things could live and breathe in this Land of Smoke. He stated this earlier in *Mor. II* 9.16 (CSEL 90,7/101.22) “fumus in illa gente bipedibus animalibus non nocebat.”

235.21 **hominem mentientem** Augustine accuses Mani of being a liar when he gave his description of the Land of Darkness and this certainly is not the only place he accuses the Manichaeans of being liars. For example, see *Gn. adu. Man. II*.27.41(CSEL 91/167.6-168.29) where Augustine discusses the lies, deceit and error of the Manichaeans and in *C. Faust.* 2.3 (CSEL 25,1/256.3) he refers to the lies that Faustus tells regarding the story of the First Man.

236.4 **quae uidentur in mundo, sed minus diligenti minusque sollerti carnali sensu concepta** As seen above, Mani took what he saw with his senses and created the Land of Darkness (see *Commentary* 234.17). A careful way to understand material things would have been to understand them as being all from God.

236.5 **phantasmatis** See *Commentary* 194.16.

236.6 **edita atque conscripta** The use of the verb *edo* indicates that the *Ep. fund.* was circulated, although it could also carry the meaning of “disclosed by words.” The latter meaning would agree with Augustine’s earlier statements that the *Ep. fund.* was read out to him (197.9).

236.6 **haereticorum numerum auxisse** The *Ep. fund.* must have played an important role in increasing the number of Manichaean followers, as he indicates here. The Manichaean religion was still a powerful draw for many people during this time in Augustine’s life. The Donatists must have also been worried about this, since it was through their instigation that Augustine had his debate with Fortunatus just four years earlier; see Possidius, *Sancti Augustini Uita*, 6 in *FOTC*, vol 15). The Manichaeans are also called heretics in 203.10. See also *Commentary* 193.6.

Chapter Thirty-Three

Although this chapter is long in terms of word count, it contains a great deal of material that Augustine had already dealt with earlier in this work.

236.7 magis urgendi sunt, ut intellegant Once again Augustine really wants to help the Manichaeans understand where natural things come from, and especially the natural things that they have described in the Land of Darkness. A similar statement is found in *Nat. b. 2* (CSEL 25,2/856.1-9) although here it appears without the *si*: “Propter eos autem, qui, cum intellegere non possunt omnem naturam, id est omnem spiritum et omne corpus naturaliter bonum esse.”

236.7 in catholica dicatur omnium naturarum esse auctorem deum See *Commentary* 228.3.

236.9 Quo de genere superius agebam, cum dicerem As he states, he has already covered the material found from 236.10-236.18 and there is no reason to repeat this material here.

236.16 similitudinem concordiamque partium See *Commentary* 226.5. See also *Nat. b. 14* (CSEL 25,2/860.26-27) “pariliatem ex utroque latere membrorum, concordiam partium...” and *Ciu. Dei* 19.13.1 (CCL 48/679.6) and *Gn adu. Man.* 1.21.32 (CSEL 91/100.9-26).

236.19 et bona et mala se miscere For this mixture, see *Commentary* 230.15.

236.21 Itaque, si tollantur illa, quae mala enumerata sunt, bona illa, quae laudata sunt, sine ulla uituperatione remanere. Si autem bona ipsa tollantur, nullam remanere naturam He repeats once again the idea that only good things can have something taken away from them, and if something could possibly take away all the goodness of something, then absolutely nothing at all will remain. On this issue, see Evans (1993, 75). This is a phrase that Augustine will repeat over and over, both before *Contra ep. fund.* and after. He also repeats it in 236.28. For example, see *Mor. II* 3.5 (CSEL 90,7/91.4); and especially in *Lib. arb.* 3.13.36 (CCL 29/297.1-13), a work written very close to the time of *Contra ep. fund.*: “Omnis natura quae minus bona fieri potest bona est, et omnis natura dum corrumpitur

minus bona fit. Aut enim non ei nocet corruptio et non corrumpitur, aut si corrumpitur nocet ei corruptio, et si nocet minuit aliquid de bono eius et eam minus bonam facit. Nam si penitus eam priuat omni bono quicquid eius remanebit iam corrumpi non poterit, quia nullum erit bonum cuius ademptione possit nocere corruptio; cui autem non potest nocere corruptio non corrumpitur. Porro natura quae non corrumpitur incorruptibilis est; erit ergo natura—quod absurdissimum est dicere--, corruptione facta incorruptibilis. Quapropter, quod uerissime dicitur, omnis natura in quantum natura est bona est.” See also *Conf.* 3.7.12 (CCL 27/33.7-8); *Nat. b.* 3 (CSEL 25,2/856.10-857.2), 6 (CSEL 25,2/857.25-858.2), 9 (CSEL 25,2/858.29-859.7), 13 (CSEL 25,1/860.4-20), 17 (CSEL 25,2/861.27), 20 (CSEL 25,2/863.12-864.7) and finally, *C. Iul* 3.206 (CSEL 85,1/501.12).

236.25 **omnem naturam, in quantum natura est, bonum esse** To be a nature inherently means that it is good. This phrase is repeated twice more in this work, at 237.15 and 237.28. He also repeats this phrase in *Nat. b.* 4 (CSEL 25,2/857.7-8) “in quantum natura est, bona est...” See also *Gn. adu. Man.* II.29.43 (CSEL 91/171.24-35 and *Nat. b.* 2 (CSEL 25,2/857.2) “Omnis ergo natura bona est.”

236.28 **natura nulla erit** See *Commentary* 236.21.

236.28 **Si autem tollantur ea, quae displicent, incorrupta natura remanebit** *Incorrupta* does not mean incorruptible (*incorruptibilis*), for only the Trinity is incorruptible. See *Contra ep. fund.* 240.14: “si uero etiam non posset omnino corrumpi, incorruptibile esset.” Cf. also *Nat. b.* 4 (CSEL 25,2/857.3-8) “Proinde cum quaeritur, unde sit malum, prius quaerendum est, quid sit malum. Quod nihil aliud est quam corruptio uel modi uel speciei uel ordinis naturalis. Mala itaque natura dicitur, quae corrupta est; nam incorrupta utique bona est. Sed etiam ipsa corrupta, in quantum natura est, bona est; in quantum corrupta est, mala est.” For something to be an incorrupt nature means that, although it is not incorruptible, it is still the highest on the scale of things, within its own group. For example in *Nat. b.* 5 (CSEL 25,2/857.9-24) Augustine gives a few examples: corrupt gold is better than uncorrupt silver,

because men rank it higher than pure silver; a corrupted soul is better than an incorrupt body, since the soul is higher on the scale of created natures.

237.1 **Tolle de aquis** In his first proof he revisits the five natures of the Land of Darkness. He will show that if one takes away what is evil in water, then only pure water will remain. But if the harmony found in this water is taken away, no water will remain. The same goes for the wind (237.7).

237.6 **Quod autem malum, non natura, sed contra naturam est** This is a very important phrase in Augustinian thought. Evil cannot be a nature because that would make it something and to be something means that it would be good. But evil is absolutely nothing, and therefore is contrary to nature, which is existence. See *Mor. II* 2.2 (CSEL 90,7/89.5), 8.11 (CSEL 90,7/97.14-15) “sed malum est quod contra naturam est; hoc enim et bestiae illi et nobis malum est, id est ipsa inconuenientia, quae sine dubio non est substantia, immo est inimica substantiae”; *C. Faust.* 18.7 (CSEL 25,1/496.1-3) “Nec bonum a contrario separare formidant, sed malum non esse naturam, quia contra naturam est, intellegunt” and *Ciu. Dei* 11.17 (CCL 48/336.1-9).

237.11 **Longum est persequi cetera** He must go through as many examples as he can think of to make sure that the Manichaeans cannot find a loophole in his argument. He will repeat this at 238.21 (et cetera, quae repetere iam piget) and 240.1 (Longum est et difficile et harum rerum). See also *Conf.* 10.35.55 (CCL 27/185.29-30) and *Nat. b.* 14 (CSEL 25,2/860.21-28).

237.14 **Quae cum trahimus, naturae meliores manent** Here he states the opposite to the statement that evil lessens the good. This is another way of saying “Si autem tollantur...” (236.28).

237.18 **principem inmanem... animae regentis et uegetantis...ordo et dispositio** See 232.9. This prince (singular) is the King of Darkness, as opposed to the plural, the princes who rule in the five kingdoms of Darkness. What follows is once again a repetition of what he has said before. It is clear that Augustine is trying his best to make the Manichaeans

understand that any living thing, including this Prince of Darkness, must have some good in it and therefore cannot be the utmost evil as Mani has described.

237.23 **nulla prorsus natura subsistet** And he repeats this again! Cf. *Nat. b.* 15 (CSEL 25,2/861.5-6) “Unde tamdiu aliquid remanebit, quamdiu corporis natura subsistit” and 41 (874.21-876.19) “Si autem species ibi non fuisset, nulla ibi qualitas naturalis subsisteret.”

Chapter Thirty-Four

As can be seen from the commentary on this chapter (like the preceding chapter) Augustine repeats a great deal of what he has said before. It is clear he is trying to get the Manichaeans and his non-Manichaean audience to understand what evil and good is.

237.26 **et ideo naturalia debere accipi** Here is a possible Manichaean objection: that this evil is natural and Augustine’s response is the same as before: anything natural must be good. For this same argument, see *Gn. adu. Man.* II.29.43 (CSEL 91/170.1) “Illi dicunt esse naturam mali, cui deus coactus est naturae suae partem dare cruciandam. Nos dicimus nullum esse malum naturale, sed omnes naturas bonas esse et ipsum deum summam esse naturam.”

238.3 **sine pace autem continuatarum partium** See Ambrose *Hex.* 2.5.21 (PL 14/156) “Illa est enim uera pulchritudo, et in singulis membris esse quod deceant, et in toto; ut in singulis gratia, in omnibus formae conuenientis plenitudo laudetur.”

238.3 **species** See *Commentary* 231.6.

238.7 **respondetur, quod et illa bona de naturis talibus non possunt auferri** As seen from *Commentary* 237.26.

238.12 **Restat, ut quaeratis -- nam ipsa solet esse uox ultima -- unde sint illa mala** Here Augustine states that the *very last thing* that the Manichaeans will ask when discussing the nature of evil is where it is from. Augustine, however, seems to have forgotten his earlier statements that one of the *first* question Manichaeans ask a potential follower is “where is evil from.” See *Mor.* II 2.2 (CSEL 90,7/89.5) “Saepe atque adeo paene semper, Manichaei, ab his quibus haeresim uestram persuadere molimini, requiritis unde sit malum” and *Agon.* 4.4

(CSEL 41/106.16-107.10). In *Duab. an.* 10 (CSEL 25,1/63.15-64.2) he goes further and states that those who ask the question in the wrong order are usually more ignorant of the topic. For more references on the Manichaeans asking this question, see *Util. cred.* 18.36 (CSEL 25,1/46.15-20); *Conf.* 3.7.12 (CCL 27/33.1-4). See also *Commentary* 241.5. It is probable that Augustine read of this same topic in Plotinus' *Enneads*, I.8.1, where Plotinus states the same thing: "Those enquiring whence Evil enters into beings, or rather into a certain order of beings, would be making the best beginning if they established, first of all, what precisely Evil is, what constitutes its Nature. At once we should know whence it comes, where it has its native seat and where it is present merely as an accident..."

238.14 Respondebo fortasse, si uos prius dixeritis, unde sint illa bona, quae uos quoque laudare cogimini This is the correct method of discussing evil as Augustine did with Evodius in *Lib. arb.* 1.2.4 (CCL 29/213.1-2) where Evodius asks "Age iam, quoniam satis cogis, ut fatear non nos discere male facere, dic mihi unde male faciamus" and Augustine answers in 1.3.6 (CCL 29/214.1-2) "Quaeris certe unde male faciamus; prius ergo discutiendum est, quid sit male facere." See also *Nat. b.* 4 (CSEL 25,2/857.3-8) "Proinde cum quaeritur, unde sit malum, prius quaerendum est, quid sit malum."

238.15 si absurdissimi cordis esse non uultis O'Donnell (1992, vol. II, 353) is correct when he states that the use of *absurdissima* refers to the irrationality of the Manichaean doctrines.

238.16 cum utrique fateamur omnia, quaecumque et quantacumque bona sunt, ab uno esse deo, qui summe bonus est? The Manichaeans believed that all good things also come from God, but not evil things, as can be seen from Fortunatus in *C. Fort.* II.20 (CSEL 25, 1/98.25-28) "De substantiis proposui, quod bonorum tantummodo Deus creator, ultor uero malorum habeatur, eo quod mala ex ipso non sint. Merito ergo hoc sentio, et ulcisci Deum mala, quia ex ipso non sunt." See also *Util. cred.* 18.36 (CSEL 25,1/46.24) where Augustine

is discussing the truths that the Manichaeans taught him, specifically that God is not the author of evil and *Nat. b.* 2 (CSEL 25,1/856.1).

238.18 **summum bonum** This is the first time in this work that Augustine has called God the highest good. It is an extremely important concept in Augustinian theology, since all good things (which is everything that exists) come from God and in the scale of things, God must be the highest Good of which nothing can be better. The concept of the highest good can also be found in Cicero's *De finibus* and *Tusc. Disp.* (Foley 1999, 62). Foley believes that Augustine's *B. uita* is a response to these works of Cicero. Augustine also begins his *Nat. b.* by stating (CSEL 25,2/8561f.) "Summum bonum, quo superius non est, deus est; ac per hoc incommutabile bonum est; ideo uere aeternum et uere immortale" which is used to show that the "Manichaean principle of evil cannot exist" (Moon, 1955, 114). See also *Duab. an.* 8.10 (CSEL 25,1/64.15-17) *Mor.* II 1.1 (CSEL 90,7/88.1); *Lib. arb.* 1.1.1 (CCL 29/212.8-15) and *Conf.* 1.4.4 (CCL 27/2.3).

238.18 **Resistite ergo uos ipsi Manichaeo** The plural signifies both the Manichaeans and his non-Manichaean audience who may be enticed by the religion.

239.6 **aliqua natura offendat ex aliquo et in totam nascatur odium** Mani has taken examples of what he feared or what offended him and converted these material objects into the story of the Land of Darkness. But what frightens or offends does not change the fact that these things are created and therefore are good. Earlier in *Mor.* II 8.11 (CSEL 90,7/96.14) Augustine describes the evilness of a scorpion in that it stings. But that does not make it evil in and of itself. See also *Gn. adu. Man.* 1.21.32 (CSEL 91/100.21-31) for the same argument.

239.8 **speciem** See *Commentary* 220.4.

239.17 **unum nomen** As will be shown in the next chapter, this category will be *corruptio*.

Chapter Thirty-Five

If one could name these separate chapters, this one would certainly have to be titled "On the Nature of Corruptibility." The topic of corruption is a common theme running

through Augustine's anti-Manichaean works, and *Contra ep. fund.* is no different. He repeats many things that he has said before, and will continue using the same arguments after this work, especially in *Nat. b.*, chapters four through six. Moon (1955, 131) states that these sections of *Nat. b.* are treated in *Conf.* 7.12.18, but it is clear that Augustine treated them even earlier here. See *Commentary* 240.25.

239.18 **malum nihil esse aliud quam corruptionem** Maker (1984, 154) sees in this idea that Augustine is taking a more radical step than both the Manichaeans and the Platonists in seeing evil as a corruption and non-being, since he must now explain the source of evil without making God the source. Earlier Augustine had stated the same in *Mor. II* 5.7 (CSEL 90,7/93.1) "Quaeram ergo tertio quid sit malum. Respondebitis fortasse: corruptio. Quis et hoc negauerit, generale malum esse? Nam hoc est contra naturam, hoc est quod nocet." The exact phrase can also be found in *Nat. b.* 4 (CSEL 25,2/857.3-5), but in this text he will put on an addition: "Proinde cum quaeritur, unde sit malum, prius quaerendum est, quid sit malum. Quod nihil aliud est quam corruptio uel *modi* uel *speciei* uel *ordinis naturalis*." *Modus*, *species* and *ordo* are the "three parameters which ensure and enable the exemplification of its Nature in every nature" (Schäfer 2000, 71). Although Augustine does not specifically state that evil is a corruption of these three things in *Contra ep. fund.*, he does imply that. For *modus*, see *Commentary* 232.13; for *species*, see *Commentary* 231.6 and for *ordo*, see *Commentary* 223.14.

239.22 **Sed corruptio peritae animae inperitia uocatur; corruptio prudentis inprudencia...** Here Augustine gives a long list of things that can be considered examples of corruption, which continues until 240.1, where he ends the list by stating that it is tedious and difficult to explain every corruption. He will state something similar in *Nat. b.* regarding the pain of the mind, which corresponds to its corruption: *Nat. b.* 20 (CSEL 25,2/863.17-18) "In animo ergo dolorem facit uoluntas resistens potestati maiori."

239.26 **Deinde in corpore animato corruptio sanitatis dolor et morbus...** Cf. *Nat. b.* 20

(CSEL 25,2/863.18-19) “in corpore dolorem facit sensus resistens corpori potentiori.”

239.29 **corruptio ordinis peruersitas** Cf. *Mor.* II 6.8 (CSEL 90,7/94.11-12) “Peruersio enim contraria est ordinationi.”

239.29 **corruptio integritatis discissio aut fractura aut diminutio** Cf. *Mor.* II 5.7 (CSEL 90,7/93.6-7) “quod enim corrumpitur, integritate et sinceritate priuatur.”

240.6 **Uerumtamen uidere iam facile est nihil nocere corruptionem nisi quod labefacit naturalem statum** I.e., the natural state is good, and anything that can be corrupted must have some good in it in the first place.

240.7 **non esse naturam, sed contra naturam** This is once again repeated. See *Commentary* 237.6 and well as 240.10 for the same statement.

240.8 **Quodsi non inuenitur in rebus malum nisi corruptio et corruptio non est natura** See above (*Commentary* 239.18) where everything that is evil is a corruption and because corruption weakens the natural state (*Commentary* 240.6), there must have been a natural state (i.e. something good) in the first place for corruption to occur. For a nature to exist, it must be good, and therefore corruption is not a nature since corruption fails to exist as a free-standing entity.

240.10 **Nulla utique natura malum est** The most amazing thing about this chapter is the number of times that Augustine will repeat the same thing over and over again, as if he were attempting to pound this idea into the head of his readers. For this same phrase, see (among others) *Mor.* II 2.2 (CSEL 90,7/89.5) and *Nat. b.* 17 (CSEL 25,2/861.27-862.5).

240.11 **illud adtendite, quod omne, quod corrumpitur, bono aliquo minuitur, quia si non corrumperetur, incorruptum esset** Augustine, just a year or two before writing *Contra ep. fund.* stated this in *Lib. arb.* 3.13.36 (CCL 29/297.1-13) and because of its similarity, the whole passage will be given: “Omnis natura quae minus bona fieri potest bona est, et omnis natura dum corrumpitur minus bona fit. Aut enim non ei nocet corruptio et non corrumpitur,

aut si corrumpitur nocet ei corruptio, et si nocet minuit aliquid de bono eius et eam minus bonam facit. Nam si penitus eam priuat omni bono quicquid eius remanebit iam corrumpi non poterit, quia nullum erit bonum cuius ademptione possit nocere corruptio; cui autem non potest nocere corruptio non corrumpitur. Porro natura quae non corrumpitur incorruptibilis est; erit ergo natura--quod absurdissimum est dicere--corruptione facta incorruptibilis.

Quapropter, quod uerissime dicitur, omnis natura in quantum natura est bona est.” He will also say this again in *Nat. b.* 6 (CSEL 25,2/857.27-28) “ac per hoc omnis natura quae corrumpi non potest summum bonum est...”

240.13 **Si uero etiam non posset omnino corrumpi, incorruptibile esset** The use of *incorruptibilis* is found only in Christian authors (Mahoney 1935, 28 and 51). When Augustine uses *incorruptibilis*, it only has one meaning: that of the Trinity. Only God can be incorruptible. As he states below (240.29) “Si non corrumpebantur, incorruptae erant, quod uidemus dici sine magna laude non posse.” See also *Commentary* 240.16. The works of Ambrose contain this idea (Coyle 1978, 344), but Augustine gets this idea from Plotinus (see *Conf.* 7.20.26). See Coyle (1978, 334).

240.14 **Necesse est autem, ut siue incorruptio siue incorruptibilitas bonum sit, si malum est corruptio** Once again there is a strong link with *Lib. arb.* 3.13.36 (CCL 29/297.15-19): “Omnis autem natura aut corruptibilis est aut incorruptibilis. Omnis ergo natura bona est. Naturam uoco quae et substantia dici solet; omnis igitur substantia aut deus aut ex deo, quia omne bonum aut deus aut ex deo.”

240.16 **Sed nunc de incorruptibili natura nulla quaestio est de his agitur...** See his earlier comments in *Mor.* II 1.1 (CSEL 90,7/10-14) “Hoc enim maxime esse dicendum est, quod semper eodem modo sese habet, quod omnimodo sui simile est, quod nulla ex parte corrumpi ac mutari potest, quod non subiacet tempori, quod aliter nunc se habere quam habebat antea non potest” and 6.8 (CSEL 90,7/93.19-23). The Manichaeans also believe that God is *incorruptibilis*: see Fortunatus’ statements at *C. Fort.* I.3 (CSEL 25, 1/85.16f.) “Fortunatus

dixit: Et nostra professio ipsa est, quod incorruptibilis sit Deus, quod lucidus, quod inadibilis, intenibilis, impassibilis” and I.6 (CSEL 25, 1/86.26-87.5).

240.25 Quapropter naturae illae, quas in terra tenebrarum fuisse confingit, aut poterant corrumpi aut non poterant... si minuebantur quo bono, habebant bonum, quo minuerentur... et omnis Manichaei fabula falsa est His main point here is that if he can show that the Land of Darkness has something in it that can be corrupted, then it has some good, no matter how small, that allows this corruption. This means that this so-called greatest evil is not the greatest evil after all, since something else in it can be worse. This is an argument that he had used before in *Mor.* II 5.7 (CSEL 90,7/93.1-18). This phrase is also very similar to what he will write in his *Conf.* 7.12.18 (CCL 27/104.1-105.21) which was written soon after *Contra ep. fund.*: “Et manifestatum est mihi, quoniam bona sunt, quae corrumpuntur, quae neque si summa bona essent, neque nisi bona essent, corrumpi possent, quia, si summa bona essent, incorruptibilia essent, si autem nulla bona essent, quid in eis corrumperetur, non esset. Nocet enim corruptio et, nisi bonum minueret, non noceret. Aut igitur nihil nocet corruptio, quod fieri non potest, aut, quod certissimum est, omnia, quae corrumpuntur, priuantur bono. Si autem omni bono priuabuntur, omnino non erunt.” He will also visit this again in *Nat. b.* 6 (CSEL 25,2/857.25-858.2). This argument was a very important one against the Manichaeans, as shown by his repeated use throughout his anti-Manichaean writings.

Chapter Thirty-Six

241.5 consequenter quaerendum est, unde sit. Quod ille si fecisset, minus fortasse in has tanti erroris angustias laberetur Now that Augustine has shown what evil is, the next question to ask is where is this evil from. Augustine has on many occasions stated that to ask where evil is from is the wrong question to ask first (see *Commentary* 238.12). In *Lib. arb.* I.1 (CCL 29/212.46) Augustine explains (in slight deviation to the text in *Contra Ep. fund.*) to Evodius that evil is a turning away from learning “Ex quo male facere nihil est nisi a

disciplina deuiare” and Evodius then asks Augustine to explain what the source of our evil-doing is (I.2 [CCL 29/213.1-2]). Augustine tells him that this question nearly drove him crazy and into the arms of the Manichaeans (CCL 29/213.3-8 and *Conf.* 3.7.12 [CCL 27/33.1-4] and 7.7.11 [CCL 27/99.1-100.11]). The important part of this is that he tells Evodius in 1.3.6 (CCL 29/214.1-2) that one must understand what evil is before asking for the cause of evil-doing. He also ends his first book by stating that doing evil is nothing other than neglecting the eternal things which are perceived by the body (I.16.34 (CCL 29/234.13-235.21)).

241.10 **uana phantasmata** See *Commentary* 194.16.

241.16 **signis uerborum** For an excellent discussion of signs in Augustine’s work, see Stock (1996), as well as Markus (1972, 61-91) and Jackson (1972, 92-147). Augustine was obsessed with signs and language. Here he reminds the Manichaeans and his other audience members that anyone can say anything, but as will be shown in the next phrase, only Christ is the true teacher and is therefore the only one that people should trust and listen to. He repeats a similar phrase in *Conf.* 11.6.8 (CCL 27/198.1).

241.18 **solus magister interior** See *Mag.* 11.38 (CCL 29/196.46-51); *Lib. arb.* II.2.4 (CCL 29/237.9-10) and *Uera rel.* 55.113 (CCL 32/259.122-124) “Religet ergo nos religio uni omnipotenti deo, quia inter mentem nostram, qua illum intellegimus patrem et ueritatem, id est lucem interiorem.”

241.24 **...unde corruptio est...non de deo genitae, sed ab illo de nihilo factae sunt** Here he once again repeats what he has said many times before. See *Commentary* 223.10. The idea that everything is created by God from nothing is the overriding theme in this work. See *Gn. adu. Man.* I.2.4 (CSEL 91/70.9-14) for the same statement: “Sicut omnia quae fecit deus bona sunt ualde, sed non sic bona sunt, quomodo bonus est deus, quia ille fecit, haec autem facta sunt; nec ea genuit de seipso, ut hoc essent quod ipse est, sed ea fecit de nihilo, ut non essent aequalia nec ei a quo facta sunt nec filio eius per quem facta sunt; iustum est enim.”

242.1 **non fecisset deus bona** Cf. *Mor. II* 4.6 (CSEL 90,7/92.19-21) “Ita et deus summum bonum est, et ea quae fecit bona sunt omnia, quamuis non sint tam bona, quam est ille ipse qui fecit.”

242.2 **summum bonum ipsum esse** See *Commentary* 238.18.

Chapter Thirty-Seven

This chapter is one large lesson that wraps up everything he had previously stated. He directs his comments to the rational soul.

242.5 **deo patre summo bono** See *Commentary* 238.18. He repeats this title again in 242.8.

242.8 **Quod ergo de illo est, meminerimus natum de illo esse, non ab eo factum de nihilo**

Augustine has already stated this and here it is almost word for word. See *Commentary*

223.19 where he stated “de deo genitum sed ab ipso de nihilo factum.”

242.15 **inperite atque inpie fratres quaeruntur, nisi ex eo, quod in homine adparere**

dignatus est There can be no brothers for someone that is One. That Jesus had brothers

through the assumption of His humanity by divine adoption is something that he will also

discuss with Secundinus (*C. Sec.* 5 [CSEL 25,2/911.6-19]). Here he states specifically that

the Manichaeans believed that Jesus Christ was first-born, not by his humanity, but “firstborn

through the very excellence of his divinity” (sed potius secundum ipsam diuinitatis

excellentiam uis eum primogenitum intellegi).

242.26 **Quaeso, patere, natura animae rationalis** Here Augustine directs his comments to

the soul and he pleads for the soul to understand the humbling nature of itself in respect of

God, while recognizing its important role in the scheme of creation. He continues to address

the soul until 244.27 (Chapter 39), where he then begins to address his non-Manichaean

audience.

242.27 **aliquanto minus te esse quam deus est, et tanto minus, ut post ipsum te melius**

aliquid non sit The soul is second in rank only to God. This is important to Augustine’s

sense of hierarchies in that the soul must look to what is above it (God) as opposed to

concentrating on what is below (material objects). And because of its importance he mentions it in numerous writings. See *B. uita.* 1.4 (CCL 29/67.91-94); *Imm. an.* 15.24 (CSEL 89,1/126.15-21); *Quant. an.* 36.80 (CSEL 89,1/229.6) “Deus igitur summus et uersus lege inuiolabili et incorrupta, qua omne quod condidit regit, subicit animae corpus, animam sibi et sic omnia sibi neque in ullo actu eam deserit siue poena siue praemio,” 34.77 (CSEL 89,1/225.20-22), 34.78 (CSEL 89,1/226.26); *Mor.* II 1.1 (CSEL 90,7/88.4f.) and *Uera rel.* 55.113 (CCL 32/259.122-124).

243.2 angustias poenales For the next four chapters Augustine will constantly remind his audience about the punishments and rewards given out by God. This is a common theme that runs through this work (see especially lines 193.12 and following) although its focus is primarily at the final punishment. What man calls evil is really the punishment of his sin. See *Gn. litt. imp.* 1.3 (PL 34, 221). For other references to these punishments, see lines 243.17, 243.21, 245.5 and 247.16. See also *C. Fel.* II.4 (CSEL 25,2/832.12-16) “Hoc ergo dominus dicens ‘aut facite illud aut facite illud’ ostendit esse in potestate quid facerent, ipse securus et certus in se tamquam deus, et quia si bonum eligerent, praemium eius acciperent, si malum eligerent, poenam eius sentirent; semper autem ille iustus est aut remunerator aut damnator.”

243.4 Superba es in deum The soul is proud because it loves itself more than God and does not recognize that God is higher than itself or that it rejects its lower status (Torchia 1987, 66). See *Conf.* 2.5.10 (CCL 27/22.1) where Augustine mourns the fact that the soul loves things more than it loves the ‘better and higher good.’ *Superbia* is one of the prime sins found in mankind (see *Commentary* 200.3 for greater detail).

243.6 magnum bonum esse te, ut solus sit ille praestantior With God being the highest Good, Augustine must show that humans must love only God and not material things. If they do love material things more than God, His punishment is due and fitting. He states this very clearly in *Lib. arb.* 1.15.33 (CCL 29/234.79-81) “Uides ergo etiam illud, quod poena non

esset, siue quae per iniuriam siue quae per talem uindictam infertur hominibus, si eas res quae inuito auferri possunt non amarent.”

243.12 **Nec mireris, quod nunc tibi non omni modo seruiunt** The punishment of disobedience to God is that things which mankind would normally rule over will now rule over mankind. Augustine used this same argument in his debate with Fortunatus in *C. Fort.* 1.5 (CSEL 25, 1/91.19-92.15). For this same idea, see also *Gn. adu. Man.* 1.16.25 (CSEL 91/91.1-92.5) and *Gn. litt. imp.* 1.3 (PL 34, 221).

243.20 **Hoc namque humana natura in Adam meruit** Evil comes from man’s inability to keep God’s law (see *Nat. b.* 34-36), which started from Adam. As O’Donnell (1992, vol. II, 62) notes, “to be reminded of Adamic descent is not a pleasant thing.” He also notes (vol. II, 310) *ICor.* 15:22 and *Rom.* 5.12-14 for biblical references on Adam and his relation to the human race. See also *Gn. litt.* 6.25 (PL 34, 354); *Ciu. Dei* 13.23 (CCL 48/408.112); G. Bonner, “Adam,” *AugLex*, 1:63-87.

243.20 **dominator iustus et iustis praemiis et iustis subpliciis adprobatur** For the same meaning, see *Lib. arb.* 3.18.51 (CCL 29/305.31-36) “Omnis autem poena si iusta est peccati poena est et supplicium nominatur; si autem iniusta poena est, quoniam poenam esse nemo ambigit, iniusto aliquo dominante homini imposita est; porro quia de omnipotentia dei et iustitia dubitare dementis est, iusta haec poena est et pro peccato aliquo penditur.”

This next section, from 243.20-22 is repeated in *Nat. b.* 7 (CSEL 25,2/858.10-14) “...tam magnum bonum est natura rationalis, ut nullum sit bonum quo beata sit nisi Deus. Peccantes igitur in suppliciis ordinantur: quae ordinatio quia eorum naturae non competit, idea poena est; sed quia culpae competit, idea iustitia est.”

243.20 **iustis praemiis et iustis subpliciis** This issue of rewards and punishments is a sub-theme of this entire work, which can be seen from the very beginning when Augustine was discussing the correction of men and the reward to gaining the correct knowledge of God (see

also *Commentary* 243.2). For similar statements, see *Sol.* 1.1.4 (CSEL 89/8.12-9.1) “[Deus], cuius legibus arbitrium animae liberum est bonisque praemia et malis poenae fixis per omnia necessitatibus distributae sunt. Deus, a quo manant usque ad nos omnia bona, a quo coercentur usque a nobis omnia mala. Deus, supra quem nihil, extra quem nihil, sine quo nihil est. Deus, sub quo totum, in quo totum, cum quo totum est”; *Quant. an.* 36.80 (CSEL 89,1/229.6-15; *Diu. qu.* 24 (CCL 44A/29.9-30.22); and *Exp. prop. Rom.*, especially sections 5 and 9 (CSEL 84).

243.21 beatitate recte uiuentium poenaeque peccantium See *Commentary* 193.16 for the various lists of punishments, both of the soul and of the body.

243.27 refugeres Augustine ends *Nat. b.* stating the same thing: *Nat. b.* 48 (CSEL 25,2/889.4) “ut nec de illis desperandum sit, quamdiu in hac terra per tuam patientiam uiuunt, qui etiam scientes, quantum malum sit talia de te sentire uel dicere, propter aliquam temporalis et terrenae commoditatis consuetudinem uel adeptionem in illa maligna professione detinentur, si ad tuam ineffabilem bonitatem saltem increpati tuis correptionibus fugiant et omnibus carnalis uitae inlecebris caelestem uitam aeternamque praeponant.”

Augustine attributes this fleeing to God to Plotinus; see *Ciu. Dei* 9.17 (CCL 47/265.5) “Ubi est illud Plotini, uit ait: ‘Fugiendum est igitur ad carissimam patriam, et ibi pater, et ibi omnia. Quae igitur, inquit, classis aut fuga? Similem Deo fieri.’” See *Enn.* I.6.8. For evidence of Augustine’s knowledge of this Ennead, see O’Connell (1963b, 8).

Chapter Thirty-Eight

This relatively short chapter is still part of the lesson started above, focusing on the idea of reward and punishment and in his usual fashion for this work, he repeats many things he had said before.

244.1 quamuis sit malum corruptio See *Commentary* 239.18.

244.1 quamuis non sit a conditore naturarum See *Commentary* 228.3.

244.2 de nihilo factae sunt See *Commentary* 223.10.

244.5 **ad subplicium damnatorum et exercitationem admonitionemque redeuntium** See *Commentary* 243.20.

244.9 **Neque illud dixeris non faceret deus naturas corruptibiles** In 244.15 Augustine tears apart these words to show that God only made natures, but did not make corruptibility “For there is no corruption from Him who alone is incorruptible” (see line 244.11).

244.10 **In quantum enim naturae sunt, deus fecit** See *Commentary* 223.14.

244.14 **illi qui lumen est mentis** This is Christ. See *Commentary* 194.18.

244.15 **dicitur natura corruptibilis... fecit de nihilo... naturam, ad deum pertineat, cum audis corruptibilem, ad nihilum** Here Augustine gives a clear explanation of how he wants his audience to understand these ideas. God should be associated with creating all natures and corruptible should be associated with absolute nothingness. These are all things that he has stated before in this work.

244.22 **praemium atque subplicium** See *Commentary* 243.20.

Chapter Thirty-Nine

245.5 **manifestissime** O’Donnell (1992, vol. II, 448) notes that in the *Conf.* the use of *manifestatum* is used always of truth and “usually of divine indication.” Here is certainly a similar use.

245.8 **Quod si in uetere lege dictum esset** Augustine, from personal experience, knows that the Manichaeans knew the contents of the Old Testament and used it in their arguments. For a good example of this knowledge, see *Gn. adu. Man.* (CSEL 91) and *C. Adim.* (CSEL 25,1)

245.10 **Quod uerbum metuentes multi latini interpretes** There were many Latin translations floating around, mostly because, as Augustine states, anyone who knew both languages felt as though they could “correct” the text. See Doc. Chr. 2.11 (CCL 32/42.1-26). Cf. also *S. Dom. mon.* 2.2.9 (CCL 35/100.217) as well as *C. Faust.* 11.6 (CSEL 25,1/321.27) for mention of various Latin translations of texts. See also Chapter Three of the dissertation for more details.

245.15 **Sed graecis exemplaribus conuincuntur** This is also not the first time that he has referred back to the Greek originals to clear up a translation problem. See *S. Dom. mon.* 2.2.9 (CCL 35/100.217-220) and *C. Faust.* 20.21 (CSEL 25,1/562.24). Ambrose also refers the reader back to the Greek in case there are problems with the different Latin versions of Scriptures (*On the Holy Spirit* II.5.46), but here Ambrose states that it is the heretics who are changing the texts.

245.20 **Quo animo si essent in ueterem legem...** Once again Augustine is earnestly desiring to make the Manichaeans understand the Old Testament. His battles with the Manichaeans on this topic took up a lot of space in his writings. See *Commentary* 245.8.

Chapter Forty

This relatively short chapter contains Augustine's last effort at trying to make the Manichaeans understand the meaning of existence/non-existence and therefore what evil really is. He could have easily used the example of nature/nothing once again, but maybe he thought that since he had covered that topic *ad infinitum*, a new example may help them move in the right direction. But despite this new example, he will be stating the same things that he has stated before in this work, especially when he begins to explain the example using the body of an animal.

245.24 **esse et non esse** Augustine had discussed previously the idea of existence and non-existence earlier in *B. uita* 4.30 and 4.31 (CCL 29/82.169) where he states they can also be explained by the words *nequitia* (for *non esse*) and *frugalitas* (for *esse*). Cf. also *Ord.* 2.16.44 (CCL 29/131.6-18). What follows (through 246.7) are his definitions of existence which he has gone over many times in this work.

245.24 **quasi ex diuersis partibus** This is a good example for him to give to the Manichaeans since they believe that the Good is opposite Evil. If the Manichaeans would attempt to apply this example, then they would be able to see that Mani's descriptions are taken from his imagination.

245.27 **formatur** See *Commentary* 229.18. From here until 246.3 Augustine has already covered this topics, especially in lines 230.26 and following.

246.7 **est esse** Augustine also covers some of this same ground in *Mor.* II 6.8 (CSEL 90, 7/94.9-95.2) when he discusses how something changes for the better and how perversion is the opposite of orderly arrangement.

246.8 **corrumpi** Now begins his examples on what corruption is and how corruption will lead to nothingness. For similar statements, see *Lib. arb.* III.13 (CCL 29/297.1-2) and especially *Nat. b.* 4 (CSEL 25,2/857.3-8) “Proinde cum quaeritur, unde sit malum, prius quaerendum est, quid sit malum. Quod nihil aliud est quam corruptio uel modi uel speciei uel ordinis naturalis. Mala itaque natura dicitur, quae corrupta est; nam incorrupta utique bona est. Sed etiam ipsa corrupta, in quantum natura est, bona est; in quantum corrupta est, mala est.”

246.13 **corrumpitur, tanto magis ad interitum tendere** This is also discussed in *Mor.* II 6.8 (CSEL 90, 7/93.23-94.5) “Si autem quaeritis quid sit, uidete quo conetur perducere quae corrumpit? Ex seipsa enim afficit ea quae corrumpuntur. Deficiunt autem omnia per corruptionem ab eo quod erant et non permanere coguntur, non esse coguntur. Esse enim ad manendum refertur.”

246.21 **Quid dubitas dicere** This is the crux of his argument: if the Manichaeans are not willing to state that corruption comes from *creatio de nihilo* and that corruption of any kind is a corruption of something that is good in the first place, then they will never get out of the quagmire that Mani has created in the cosmogonical story. He also repeats this question again in 246.26 for emphasis, hoping to show the Manichaeans how important it is to understand these ideas. Evodius in his *C. Manich.* 6 (CSEL 25,2/953.17) also uses this same style, “dubitatis...” when trying to teach the Manichaeans.

246.23 **corruptio contra naturam** See *Commentary* 237.6.

246.28 **Et quid quaeris deo naturam contrariam** See *Commentary* 209.11 for this contrary nature. See also *Nat. b.* 19 (CSEL 25,2/863.6-8) “Ei ergo, qui summe est, non potest esse contrarium nisi quod non est...”

Forty One

Moon (1955, 142) finds an “interesting verbal and notional parallel” with this chapter and that of *Nat. b.* 8 (CSEL 25,2/858.15-28). This is not surprising, since it appears that *Nat. b.* is almost a continuation of Augustine’s arguments which he began in *Contra ep. fund.*

247.4 **ubi ordinatissimum et iustissimum iudicat pro rerum gradibus** On the importance of this order and the grades of things, see *Commentary* 223.14. As has been shown, to understand this concept of order in relation to God is both difficult and yet very important; see *Ord.* 1.1 (CCL 29/89.1-4).

247.6 **species uocis emissae praeterit et silentio perimitur?** This is one of his favorite examples that he uses continually throughout his works to demonstrate that there is order and beauty in all things and in all of their parts, even in the silence that comes between. As Colish (1983, 36) points out, this is an ancient idea, originally developed by Aristoxenus and translated into Latin by Aristides Quintilianus, which was then used by Augustine in his *Mus.* It is also found in the death and birth of all things (see below). For other examples (out of many), see *Gn. adu. Man.* 1.21.32 (CSEL 91/100.5-101.31) “quia etiam in sermone aliquo ornato atque composito si consideremus singulas syllabas uel etiam singulas litteras, quae cum sonuerint statim transeunt, non in eis inuenimus quid delectet atque laudandum sit. Totus enim ille sermo non de singulis syllabis aut litteris, sed de omnibus pulcher est”; *Conf.* 4.10.15 (CCL 27/48.7-14); *Nat. b.* 8 (CSEL 25,2/858.22-28) and *C. Sec.* 15 (CSEL 25,2/928.2). See also *Commentary* 233.17.

247.10 **Ita sese habet etiam temporalium naturarum infima pulchritudo ut rerum transitu peragatur et distinguatur morte nascentium** This ebb and flow of life is the same as the sounds that are created and then pass away, allowing the whole to exist. This temporal

beauty is in contrast to the eternal beauty, which is the highest. For similar statements after *Contra ep. fund.*, see *Conf.* 11.11.13 (CCL 27/201.5-201.17); *Nat. b.* 8 (CSEL 25,2/858.15-28) and especially *C. Sec.* 15 (928.11-18) “Sic ortu et occasu, decessu atque successu rerum temporalium certis ac definitis tractibus, donec recurrat ad terminum praestitutum, temporalis pulchritudo contextitur. Quae non ideo mala est, quia in spiritualibus creaturis possumus intellegere mirarique meliora, sed habet proprium in suo genere decus atque insinuat bene uiuentibus summam dei sapientiam in alto secretam supra omnes temporum metas fabricatricem ac moderatricem suam.”

247.13 **sensus noster atque memoria** As shown, sense perception (see *Commentary* 215.9) and memory (see *Commentary* 214.16, 17 and 19), if used in the wrong way, can lead mankind to ruin or they can lead mankind to God. These two are necessary for mankind to understand God, but the intelligible world of God cannot be sensed with the senses. See *Sol.* 1.1.3 (CSEL 89/5.6-16) and 1.3.9 (CSEL 89/16.4-8).

247.13 **ut defectus, quibus distinguitur, nec corruptiones uocare auderemus** A corruption is a taking away of the form of something but here Augustine is only referring to nature which makes a thing a thing. It is defective only in that it is not what God is. He states this clearly in *Uera rel.* 18.35 (CCL 32/208.1) “Sed dicis mihi: Quare deficiunt? Quia mutabilia sunt. Quare mutabilia sunt? Quia non summe sunt. Quare non summe sunt? Quia inferiora sunt eo, a quo facta sunt.”

247.14 **cum nos fluentia deserunt temporalia** This is the main problem with the Manichaeans: they love the false images that Mani has created. The loving of temporal things meant that humans would not love the only object that should be loved: that of God. See (among many) *ep.* 2 (CSEL 34/3.16-19) “Horum itaque amorem perniciosissimum poenarumque plenissimum uera et diuina philosophia monet frenare atque sopire, ut se toto animus, etiam dum hoc corpus agit” and especially *Doct. Chr.* 1.38.42 (CCL 32/31.6-11) “Inter temporalia quippe atque aeterna hoc interest, quod temporale aliquid plus diligitur,

antequam habeatur, uilescit autem, cum aduenerit; non enim satiat animam, cui uera est et certa sedes aeternitas; aeternum autem ardentius diligitur adeptum quam desideratum.” This is an idea that is also found in the *Ennead* 5.8 and Augustine “has not missed it” (O’Connell, 1963a, 145).

Chapter Forty-Two

247.18 **Non ergo in hac pulchritudine quaeramus, quod non accepit; quae ideo infima est, quia quod quaerimus, non accepit** In *Uera rel.* 21.41 (CCL 32/213.20-21) Augustine states that corporeal beauty is the lowest is because “its parts cannot all exist simultaneously” (Nam ideo extrema est [corporum pulchritudo], quia simul non potest habere omnia).

247.20 **Et in eo, quod accepit, laudemus deum, quia tantum speciei bonum etiam huic quamuis infimae dedit** In 223.14 Augustine states that God has made everything, from the highest to the lowest. But because it is the lowest does not mean that it is defective in any way. See *Gn. litt. imp.* 4.18 (PL 34, 227).

247.25 **quod nec locis grassatur** On space see *Commentary* 212.25.

247.25 **nec tempore uoluitur** This is the first time in this work that he has explicitly stated that God is not extended in time. It is possible that he felt it necessary to state it here in order to make it very clear that God is out of time, since time began with the creation of material things (see *Commentary* 208.27).

247.25 **unde speciem formamque accipiunt omnes locales temporalesque naturae** God gives all of these things, but is not constrained by them (Tavard 1986, 204). See also *Nat. b.* 3 (CSEL 25,2/856.10-857-2) where Augustine gives a long list of things that God has given to his creation as well as *Imm. an.* 16.25 (CSEL 89,1/127.8-9) “Tradunt ergo speciem a summa pulchritudine acceptam potentiora infirmioribus naturali ordine.”

248.3 **quibus cernitur ista lux diffusa per locos** Here he refers to the beginning of this work where he makes a distinction between the light which the eyes can see and the Light which is Christ. For this light see *Commentary* 194.18.

248.4 **non ubique integra, sed aliam partem hic habens et alibi aliam** As shown earlier, this is the definition of materiality. See *Commentary* 213.6.

248.7 **iustum** On the justice of God see *Commentary* 194.3.

248.7 **pium** For his classic definition of piety, see *Lib. arb.* 1.2.5 (CCL 29/213.23-29)

“Optime namque de deo existimare uerissimum est pietatis exordium nec quisquam de illo optime existimat, qui non eum omnipotentem atque ex nulla particula commutabilem credit, bonorum etiam omnium creatorem, quibus est ipse praestantior, rectorem quoque iustissimum eorum omnium quae creauit, nec ulla adiutum esse natura in creando, quasi qui non sibi sufficeret.”

248.7 **sapientiae pulchritudo** Cf. Job 28.28. See also *Commentary* 212.24 and 212.25 for this wisdom.

Forty-Three

This is the last chapter of the *Contra ep. fund.* and it is written as a definite end to this part of the work. Augustine claims that he will again attack their *deliramenta* in another volume. Chapter forty-two has the feel of the end of the work and it seems as though forty-three was possibly an afterthought. But it is clear (as shown from the number of repetitions) that Augustine is indeed finishing this work.

The beginning of this chapter resembles that found in 236.3 “Ita ostenduntur ista mendacia animaduersione rerum, quae uidentur in mundo, sed minus diligenti minusque sollerti carnali sensu concepta et phantasmatis parturita et temeritate edita atque conscripta?”

248.11 **phantasmata** Near the beginning of this work (See *Commentary* 194.16) Augustine states how difficult it really is to overcome the fleshly fantasies and here he reminds the Manichaeans that their ideas on the nature of evil are in fact just fantasies. For some of his other comments on these fantasies, see also *Uera rel.* 10.18 (CCL 32/199.7-12) and 36.67 (CCL 32/231.26-34).

248.12 **carnali sensu** For the dangers of the senses (or their misuse) see *Commentary* 215.9 and 215.12.

248.12 **imaginariae cogitatio nostra uersat et continet** See also *Commentary* 215.9. This idea is also found in Plotinus' *Enn.* 6.4.13, who teaches that the reliance on the senses forces one to think of God in spatial terms (O'Connell, 1963a, 153).

248.13 **istam haeresim** He began this work (at 193.6) by calling the Manichaean religion a heresy.

248.14 **per locorum spatia** See *Commentary* 212.25.

248.15 **informem molem** See *Commentary* 212.26.

248.16 **locum malo** There are many places in this work where he discusses the space for evil. For example, see 219.7, 220.9, 225.1

248.17 **contra naturam** See *Commentary* 237.6.

249.18 **ipsum malum tanta specie et formis et pace partium in singulis naturis uigente decorauit** Augustine will now, once again, repeat why there cannot be an evil nature. He will continue this until the very last sentence of the work, where he states that he will continue to examine Mani's other *deliramenta* in other works.

248.19 **quia sine his bonis nullam poterat cogitare naturam** See *Commentary* 238.16.

248.22 **in ceteris cetera...arguentur** In his *Retr.* 2.2 (CCL 57/91.3-7) he states that he had made notes and had planned on refuting the rest of the work "...sed in ceteris illius partibus adnotationes ubi uidebatur adfixae sunt, quibus tota subuertitur et quibus commonerer, si quando contra totam scribere vacuisset." Although this is true, it appears that in a number of places Augustine follows up what he had to say here in the *Contra ep. fund.* in *Nat. b.*, where he ventures further into the *Ep. fund.* and discusses the End Time. He will also name the *Ep. fund.* in the rest of his anti-Manichaean works, such as *C. Faust.*, *C. Sec.*, and *C. Fel.*

248.22 **eius deliramenta** These can be described as "disordered acts of the intellect" (O'Donnell 1992, vol. 2, 406). In his last description of the Manichaean religion in this work

it is fitting that Augustine uses this word which he had not used in this work. He had, however, used it before and after *Contra ep. fund.* in relation to the Manichaeans. In *Duab. an.* 17 (CSEL 25,1/73.10-74.8) he used it to describe the Manichaean idea of the evil soul; in *C. Faust.* 2.4 (CSEL 25,1/256.25) he used it to describe the idea that the Primal Man changed his elements to fight in the Land of Darkness; and in 13.6 (CSEL 25,1/384.1) to describe the entire Manichaean religion. See also *Nat. b.* 25 (CSEL 25,1/866.20).

8 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, A. (ed.) *Texte zum Manichäismus*, Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, 175 (Berlin, 1954 repr. 1969).
- Aland, B., "Mani und Bardesanes. Zur Entstehung des manichäischen Systems," in A. Dietrich (ed.), *Synkretismus in syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet*, Bericht über ein Symposium in Reinhausen bei Göttingen in der Zeit vom 4. bis 8 Oktober 1971, (Göttingen, 1975), pp. 123-43.
- Aland, K., B. Aland (ed.), *Nouum Testamentum Latine* (Stuttgart, 1992).
- Allberry, C. R. C. (ed.), with a contribution by H. Ibscher, *A Manichaean Psalm-Book. Part II*, Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection, 2, (Stuttgart, 1938).
- _____, 'Das Manichäische Bema-Fest,' *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 37 (1938): 2-10.
- Alfaric, P., *Du Manichéisme au Néoplatonisme*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1918).
- _____, *Les Écritures manichéennes*, 2 vol. (Paris, 1918-1919).
- Allen, B., *Truth in Philosophy* (Cambridge, Mass, 1993).
- Andreas, F. C., W. B. Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaeica aus chinesisch-Turkestan I" *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 10 (Berlin, 1932), pp. 175-222.
- Apoc. John*, M. Waldstein, F. Wisse (trans.), in *The Coptic Gnostic Library: A Complete Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, J. M. Robinson, H. J. Klimkeit (ed.), Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, vol. 33 (1995).
- Armstrong, A. H., "Spiritual or Intelligible Matter in Plotinus and St. Augustine," in *Plotinian and Christian Studies* (London, 1979), pp. 277-283.
- _____, "The Theory of the Non-Existence of Matter in Plotinus and the Cappadocians," in *Plotinian and Christian Studies* (London, 1979), pp. 427-429.
- _____, "St. Augustine and Christian Platonism," *Plotinian and Christian Studies* (London, 1979), pp. 1-66.
- _____, "Dualism Platonic, Gnostic and Christian" in D. T. Runia (ed.), *Plotinus Amid Gnostics and Christians* (Amsterdam, 1984), pp. 29-52.
- Asiedu, F. B., "The Song of Songs and the Ascent of the Soul: Ambrose, Augustine, and the Language of Mysticism," *Vigiliae Christianae* 55 (2001): 299-317.
- Asmussen, J. P. (ed. and trans.), *Manichaean Literature: Representative Texts Chiefly from Middle Persian and Parthian Writings*, Persian Heritage Series 22, E. Yar-Shater (ed.), (New York, 1975).

- Attridge, H.W., E. H. Pagels (ed.) and trans., "The Tripartite Tractate" Codex 1,5:51.1-138.27" in M. Krause, J. M. Robinson, F. Wisse (ed.), *Nag Hammadi Studies* 22 (Leiden, 1985).
- Babcock, W. S., "Augustine on Sin and Moral Agency," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 16 (Spring 1988): 28-55.
- Bakker, A. H. A., *A Study of Codex Evang. Bobbiensis (k)* (Amsterdam, 1933).
- Baldwin, B., "Fulgentius and His Sources," *Traditio* 44 (1988): 37-57.
- Bammel, C. P., "Pauline Exegesis, Manichaeism and Philosophy in the Early Augustine," in L.R. Wickham and C.P. Bammel (ed.), *Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity: Essays in Tribute to Christopher Stead* (Leiden 1993), pp. 1-25.
- Bardy, G., "Les Révisions," *Oeuvres de saint Augustin*, vol. 12 (Paris, 1950).
- Barnes, T. D., "Augustine, Symmachus, and Ambrose," in J. McWilliam (ed.), *Augustine: From Rhetor to Theologian* (Waterloo, 1992), pp. 7-13.
- Barry, M. I., *St. Augustine, the Orator: A Study of the Rhetorical Qualities of St. Augustine's Sermones ad populum* (Washington, 1924).
- de Beausobre, I., *Histoire critique de Manichée et du Manichéisme* (Amsterdam, 1734-39; reprint, New York, 1984).
- BeDuhn, J. D., *The Manichaean Body in Discipline and Ritual* (Baltimore, 2000).
- BeDuhn, J., G. Harrison, "The Tebessa Codex: A Manichaean Treatise on Biblical Exegesis and Church Order," in P. Mirecki, J. BeDuhn (ed.), *Emerging From Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, vol. XLIII, (Leiden, 1997), pp. 33-87.
- _____, "The Authenticity and Doctrine of (Ps.?) Mani's *Letter to Menoch*," in Mirecki, P., BeDuhn, J. (ed.), *The Light and The Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 128-172.
- Bennett, B., "Iuxta Unum Latus Erat Terra Tenebrarum: The Division of Primordial Space in Anti-Manichaean Writers' Descriptions of the Manichaean Cosmogony" in P. Mirecki, J. BeDuhn (ed.), *The Light and The Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World* (Leiden, 2001) 68-78.
- Betz, H. D., "Paul in Mani Biography," in L. Cirillo (ed.), *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis* (Cosenza, 1986), pp. 215-234.
- Beskow, P., "The Theodosian Laws Against Manichaeism," in P. Bryder (ed.), *Manichaean Studies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism* (Lund, 1988), pp. 1-11.
- Blond, J. M., *Les conversions de saint Augustin* (Paris, 1950).

- Bogan, M. I. (trans.), "St. Augustine: The Retractions," in R. J. Deferrari (ed.), *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation* (Washington, 1968).
- Bonner, G., *St. Augustine of Hippo, Life and Controversies* (London, 1963, rev. ed. Norwich, 1986). All references are to the revised edition.
- Boulding, M. (trans.), *Expositions of the Psalms 51-72*, in J. E. Rotelle (ed.), *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, vol 3.17 (New York, 2001).
- Bourke, V. J., *Augustine's Quest of Wisdom: Life and Philosophy of the Bishop of Hippo* (Milwaukee, 1945).
- _____, "Augustine of Hippo: The Approach of the Soul to God," in E. R. Elder (ed.), *The Spirituality of Western Christendom* (Kalamazoo, 1976), pp. 1-12.
- _____, *Augustine's Love of Wisdom: An Introspective Philosophy* (Indiana, 1992).
- Bovon, F., "Names and Numbers in Early Christianity" *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001): 287-288.
- Boyce, M. (ed.), *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Leiden, 1975).
- Boyer, B. B., R. McKeon (ed.), *Peter Abailard, Sic et Non: A Critical Edition* (Chicago, 1976, 1977).
- Boyer, C., *La verité dans la philosophie de saint Augustin* (Paris, 1920).
- Boyer, Ch., "The Notion of Nature in St. Augustine," in K. Aland, F. L. Cross, (ed.), *Studia Patristica 2, Papers Presented to the Second International Conference on Patristic Studies* (1957): 75-186.
- Bright, P., (ed. and trans.), *Augustine and the Bible* (Notre Dame, Indiana 1999).
- Brinkmann, A. (ed.), *Alexandrii Lycopolitani contra Manichaei opiniones disputatio*, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, (Leipzig, 1895, reprint, Stuttgart, 1989).
- Brown, P., "St. Augustine's Attitude to Religious Coercion," in *Religion and Society in the Age of St. Augustine* (London, 1972), 260-278, originally published in *Journal of Roman Studies* 54 (1964): 107-16. Page numbers refer to the 1972 reprint.
- _____, "The Diffusion of Manichaeism in the Roman Empire," in *Religion and Society in the Age of St. Augustine* (London, 1972) 94-118, originally published in *Journal of Roman Studies* 59 (1969): 92-103. Page numbers refer to the 1972 reprint.
- _____, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (Berkeley, 1969).
- _____, *The World of Late Antiquity AD 150-750* (London, 1971).
- Brunner, J. C., "The Ontological Relation between Evil and Existents in Manichaean Texts and in Augustine's Interpretation of Manichaeism," in P. Morewedge (ed.), *Philosophies of Existence: Ancient and Medieval* (New York, 1982), pp. 78-95.

- Burkitt, F. C., *The Old Latin and the Itala, with Appendix containing the Text of the S. Gallen Palimpsest of Jeremiah* (Cambridge, 1896).
- Burkitt, F. C., C. Turner, "A New Collation of Codex Bobiensis," *Journal of Theological Studies* 5 (1903): 88-107.
- Burleigh, J. H. S. (trans.), *Augustine: Earlier Writings*, The Library of Christian Classics: Ichthus Edition (Philadelphia, 1953).
- Burnaby, J., "The <<Retractationes>> of Saint Augustine: Self-criticism or Apologia?" in *Augustinus Magister* 1 (Paris, 1954) pp 85-92
- Burns, J. P., "Augustine on the Origin and Progress of Evil," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 16 (1988): 9-27.
- Burns, J. P., "Ambrose Preaching to Augustine: The Shaping of Faith," in J. C. Schnaubelt, F. Van Fleteren (ed.), *Collectanea Augustiniana: Augustine – "Second Founder of the Faith"*, (New York, 1990), pp. 373-86.
- Burt, D. X., *Augustine's World: An Introduction to His Speculative Philosophy* (Lanham, Maryland, 1996).
- _____, *Friendship and Society: An Introduction to Augustine's Practical Philosophy* (Grand Rapids, 1999).
- Burton, P., *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language* (Oxford, 2000).
- Cameron, A., *The Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 1983).
- Cameron, M., "The Christological Substructure of Augustine's Figurative Exegesis," in Pamela Bright (ed. and trans.), *Augustine and the Bible* (Notre Dame, Indiana 1999), pp. 74-103.
- Cameron, R., A. J. Dewey (ed.), *The Cologne Mani Codex: 'Concerning the Origin of his Body'*, Early Christian Literature series, 3; Texts and Translations, Society of Biblical Literature 15 (Missoula, 1979).
- Casey, R. P., "The Patristic Evidence for the Text of the New Testament," in M. M. Parvis, A. P. Wikgren (ed.), *New Testament Manuscript Studies: The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus* (Chicago, 1950), pp. 69-80.
- Cavallera, F., "Saint Jérôme et la Vulgate des Actes, des Épîtres, et de l'Apocalypse," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* (1920): 269-292
- CETEDOC Library of Christian Latin Texts*, 4th ed., (Turnhout, 2000).
- Chadwick, H., *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church* (Oxford, 1976)
- _____, *Augustine* (Oxford, 1986).

- _____. (trans.), *Saint Augustine: Confessions* (Oxford, 1991).
- Chidester, D., "The Symmetry of Word and Light: Perceptual Categories in Augustine's Confessions," *Augustinian Studies* 17 (1986): 119-133.
- Christian, W. A., "Augustine on the Creation of the World," *Harvard Theological Review* XLVI (Jan 1953): 1-25.
- Clark, A. C., *The Acts of the Apostles: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes on Selected Passages* (Oxford, 1933).
- Cole-Turner, R., "Anti-Heretical Issues and the Debate over Galatians 2.11-14 in the Letters of St. Augustine to St. Jerome," *Augustinian Studies* 11 (1980): 155-166.
- Colish, M. L., *The Mirror of Language: A Study in the Medieval Theory of Knowledge* (Lincoln, 1983, rev. ed.).
- _____, *The Stoic Tradition From Antiquity To the Early Middle Age II: Stoicism in Christian Latin Thought through the Sixth Century* (Leiden, 1990).
- Cooper, J. C., "The Basic Philosophical and Theological Notions of St. Augustine," *Augustinian Studies* 15 (1984): 93-113.
- Corssen, P., *Der Cyprianische Text der Acta Apostolorum* (Berlin, 1892).
- Courcelle, P., *Recherches sur les Confessions de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1950; 2nd edition, Paris, 1968).
- _____, "Saint Augustin manichéen à Milan," *Orpheus* I (1954): 81-85.
- _____, Wedeck, H. E. (trans.), *Late Latin Writers and Their Greek Sources* (Cambridge, MA, 1969).
- Coyle, J. K., *Augustine's De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae: A Study of the Work, its Composition and its Sources* (Fribourg, 1978).
- _____, F. Decret, A. Clerici, E. L. Fortin, M. A. Vannier, P. Porro, and G. Balido, "De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum" "De quantitate animae" di Agostino d'Ippona (Palermo, 1991).
- _____, S.C. Muir (ed.) "Healing and the 'Physician' in Manichaeism", *Healing in Religion and Society, From Hippocrates to the Puritans*, (Lewiston, N.Y., 1999) pp. 135-58.
- _____, "Natura boni" in A. D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, 1999), p. 581.
- _____, "Revisiting the Adversary in Augustine's *Contra Aduersarium legis et prophetarum*," *Studia Patristica* 38 (2001): 56-63.
- _____, "What Did Augustine Know About Manichaeism When He Wrote His Two Treatises *De Moribus*?" in J. Van Oort, O. Wermelinger, G. Wurst (ed.), *Augustine*

and Manichaeism in the Latin West, Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeic Studies (IAMS) (Leiden, 2001), pp. 43-56.

_____, "Saint Augustine's Manichaeic Legacy," *Augustinian Studies* 34:1 (2003): 1-22.

Cress, D. A., "A Defense of Augustine's Privation Account of Evil," *Augustinian Studies* 20 (1989): 109-128.

Cumont, F., *Recherches sur le manichéisme*, 3 vol. (Brussels, 1908-1912).

_____, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, T. J. McCormack (trans.) from the 2d rev. French ed., (New York, 1956).

De Blois, F., "The Manichaeic Daily Prayers," in R. E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, P. Zieme (ed.), *Studia Manichaica: IV Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.-18. Juli 1997* (Berlin, 2000), pp. 49-54.

De Bruyne, D., "Saint Augustin reviseur de la Bible," *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 2 (1931): 544-78.

Decret, F., *Aspects du Manichéisme dans l'Afrique Romaine: Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Félix avec saint Augustin* (Paris, 1970).

_____, "Le "Globus Horribilis" dans l'Eschatologie Manichéenne d'après les Traités de Saint Augustin," in *Mélanges d'Histoire des Religions Offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris, 1974), pp. 487-492, reprinted in *Essais sur L'Église Manichéenne en Afrique du Nord et à Rome au temps de Saint Augustin, Recueil d'Études*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 47 (Rome, 1995) 7-13. All references are to the reprinted edition.

_____, *L'Afrique Manichéenne (IV-V siècles), Étude historique et doctrinale*, 2 vol. (Paris, 1978).

_____, "L'utilisation des Épîtres de Paul chez les manichéens d'Afrique," in J. Ries, F. Decret, W. H. C. Frend, and M. G. Mara, *Le Epistole Paoline nei manichei, i donatisti e il primo Agostino*, (Sussidi Patristici, 5) (Roma, 1989), pp. 29-83, repr. *Essais sur l'Église manichéenne en Afrique du Nord et à Rome au temps de Saint Augustin: Recueil d'études*, *Augustinianum* 47 (Roma, 1995), pp. 55-106.

_____, "Le traité d'Evodius Contre Les Manichéens: un compendium à l'usage du parfait controversiste," *Augustinianum* 31 (1991): 387-409.

_____, "Mani, 'L'Autre Paraclet,'" *Augustinianum* 32 (1992): 105-118.

_____, "La Christologie Manichéenne dans la Controverse d'Augustin avec Fortunatus," in *Essais sur l'Église manichéenne en Afrique du Nord et à Rome au temps de Saint Augustin, Recueil d'études*, *Augustinianum* 47 (Rome, 1995), pp. 443-455.

_____, "L'Utilisation des Épîtres de Paul chez les Manichéens d'Afrique," in *Essais Sur L'Église Manichéenne en Afrique du Nord et à Rome au Temps de Saint Augustin. Recueil d'Études*, *Augustinianum* 47 (Rome, 1995), pp. 55-106.

- Dodge, B. (ed. and trans.), *The Fihrist of al-Nadim: A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*, 2 vol. (New York, 1970).
- Dolbeau, F., *Augustin d'Hippone, Vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique*, Etudes Augustiniennes, Antiquité, vol. 147 (Paris, 1996).
- _____, "Un opusculé latin contre les Manichéens, placé sous le nom d'Augustin," *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 2 (2000): 232-54.
- Dudden, F. H., *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose*, 2 vol. (Oxford, 1935).
- Dunlop, D. M., *Arab Civilization to A.D. 1500* (New York, 1971).
- Du Roy, O. J. B., *L'intelligence de la foi en la trinité selon saint Augustin: Genèse de sa théologie trinitaire jusqu'en 391* (Paris, 1966).
- Eller, M. F., "The Retractationes of Saint Augustine," *Church History* 18 (1949): 172-183.
- Emillson, E., *Plotinus on Sense Perception* (Cambridge, 1988).
- Eno, R., "Doctrinal Authority in St. Augustine," *Augustinian Studies* 12 (1981): 133-72.
- _____, "Epistulae" in A. D. Fitzgerald, (ed.), *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, 1999).
- Evans, G. R., "Neither A Pelagian Nor a Manichee," *Vigiliae Christianae* 35 (1981): 232-244.
- _____, *Augustine on Evil* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Faul, D. O'B., "The Date of the 'De Continentia' of St. Augustine," *Studia Patristica* 6 (1962), 374-82.
- Feldmann, E., *Die Epistula Fundamenti der Nordafrikanischen Manichäer: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion* (Altenberge, 1987).
- Ferguson, E. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, Second Edition (New York, 1998).
- Ferrari, L. C., "Augustine's 'Nine Years' as a Manichee," *Augustiniana* 25 (1975): 210-216.
- _____, "The Peculiar Appendage of Augustine's 'Enarratio in Psalmum LXI,'" *Augustiniana* 28 (1978): 18-33.
- _____, *The Conversions of Saint Augustine* (Villanova, PA, 1984).
- _____, "Isaiah and the Early Augustine," in B. Bruning, M. Lamberigts, J. Van Houtem (ed.), *Collectanea Augustiniana: Mélanges T. J. Van Bavel*, vol. 2 (Leuven, 1990), pp. 739-756.
- Ferwerda, R., "Plotinus' Presence in Augustine," in J. den Boeft, J. van Oort (ed.), *Augustiniana Traiectina*, Communications Présentées au Colloque International d'Utrecht 13-14 Novembre 1986 (Paris, 1987), pp. 107-118.

- Fiedrowicz, M., *Psalmus Vox Totius Christi: Studien zu Augustins 'Ennarrationes in Psalmos'* (Frieburg, 1997).
- Fitzgerald, A. D. (ed.), *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, 1999).
- _____, Introduction to B. de Margerie, *An Introduction to the History of Exegesis: Saint Augustine*, vol 3, P. de Fontnouvelle (trans.), (Petersham, Mass., 1994).
- Flügel, G.: *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Manichäismus Aus dem Fihrist des Abû 'l-faradsch Muhammed ben Ishak al-Warrâk, bekannt unter dem Namen Ibn Abî Ja 'kûb an-Nadîm*, (Leipzig, 1862) (repr. Osnabrück, 1969).
- Foerster, R., *Libanii opera* 12 Vols (Leipzig, 1909-27).
- Foley, M. P., "Cicero, Augustine, and the Philosophical Roots of the Cassiciacum Dialogues," *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 45 (1999): 51-77.
- Franzmann, M., *Jesus in the Manichaean Writings* (London, 2003).
- _____, "Jesus in the Manichaean Writings—Work in Progress," in R. E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, P. Zieme (ed.), *Studia Manichaica, IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus*, (Berlin, 2000), pp. 220-246.
- Frede, H. J. (ed.), *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel*, vol. 25.1, *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum, Titum, Philemonem, Hebraeos* (Freiburg, 1975-1982).
- _____, *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Sigel* (Freiburg, 1995).
- Fredriksen, P., "Beyond the Body/Soul Dichotomy: Augustine on Paul against the Manichees and the Pelagians," *Recherches Augustiniennes* 23 (1988): 87-114.
- Frend, W. H. C., "Manichaeism in the Struggle between Saint Augustine and Petilian of Constantine," *Augustinus Magister* 2 (Paris, 1954), pp. 859-866.
- Funk, W.-P., "The Reconstruction of the Manichaean Kephalaia," in P. Mirecki, J. BeDuhn (ed.), *Emerging From Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources* (Leiden, 1997), pp. 143-159.
- Gardner, I. ed., *The Kephalaia of the Teacher: The Edited Coptic Manichaean Texts in Translation with Commentary* (Leiden, 1995).
- _____, A. Alcock, W-P. Funk (ed.), *Coptic Documentary Texts from Kellis*, vol. I (Oxbow Books, Oxford, 1999).
- _____, "The Reconstruction of Mani's Epistles from Three Coptic Codices," in P. Mirecki, J. BeDuhn (ed.), *The Light and The Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 93-104.
- Garvey, P. M., *St. Augustine: Christian or Neoplatonist, From his Retreat at Cassiciacum until his Ordination at Hippo* (Milwaukee, 1939).

- Gharib, B., "New Light on Two Words in the Sogdian Version of the "Realm of Light" in *Studia Manichaica, IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus*, R.E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, P. Zieme (ed.), (Berlin, 2000) 258-269.
- Gibb, J., W. Montgomery (ed. and trans.), *The Confessions of Augustine* (Cambridge, 1927).
- Gilson, E., *The Christian Philosophy of St. Augustine*, L. E. M. Lynch, (trans.) (New York, 1960).
- Giversen, S., *The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library, I. Kephalaia; Facsimile Edition*, Cahiers d'Orientalisme, 14 (Genève, 1986).
- _____, "Manichaean Literature and the Writings of Augustine," in E. Keck, S. Sondergaard, E. Wulff (ed.), *Living Waters*, Scandinavian Orientalistic Studies, Presented to Professor Dr. Frede Løkkegaard on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday, January 27th 1990, (København, 1990), pp. 63-74.
- Glare, P.G.W. (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (repr. Oxford, 1997).
- Grabowski, S.J., *The All-Present God: A Study in St. Augustine* (St. Louis, 1954).
- Greer, R.A., "Augustine's Transformation of the Free Will Defence," *Faith and Philosophy* 13, no. 4 (October 1996): 471-486.
- Gryson, R. (ed.), Weber, R., F. Fischer, H. I. Frede, H. F. D. Sparks and W. Thiele, *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (Stuttgart, 4th ed., 1994).
- Gryson, R. (ed.), *Vetus Latina: Die Reste Der Altlateinischen Bibel: Esaias*, vol. 12.2 (Freiburg, 1995).
- Haardt, R., J. F. Hendry (trans.), *Gnosis, Character and Testimony* (Leiden, 1971).
- Hadot, P., *Marius Victorinus: Recherches sur sa vie et ses oeuvres* (Paris, 1971).
- Hagendahl, H., *Augustine and the Latin Classics* (Göteborg, 1967).
- Haloun, G., W. B. Henning, "The Compendium of the Doctrines and Styles of the Teaching of Mani, the Buddha of Light," *Asia Major* n.s. 3 (1953): 184-212.
- Harbert, B., "Romans 5,12: Old Latin and Vulgate in the Pelagian Controversy," *Studia Patristica* 22 (1989): 261-264.
- Harmless, W., *Augustine and the Catechumenate* (Collegeville, Minn., 1995).
- Harnack, A., "Manichaeism," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1911, vol. 17, pp. 572-578, reprint from 1883 vol.15, pp. 481-487.
- Harrison, C., *Augustine: Christian Truth and Fractured Humanity* (Oxford, 2000).
- Hendry, J. F., Haardt, R., *Gnosis, Character and Testimony* (Leiden, 1971).

Henning, W. B., "The Murder of the Magi", *JRAS*, 1944, p.142.

_____, "A Sogdian Fragment of the Manichaean Cosmogony," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 12 (1948): 306-18, reprinted in *W.B. Henning: Selected Papers*, vol. 2, *Acta Iranica, Hommages et Opera Minora* (Leiden, 1977) with original pagination.

Henrichs, A., L. Koenen, "Ein griechischer Mani-Codex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780)," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* V (1970): pp. 97-216, (repr. Bonn, 1993).

Henrichs, A., "The Timing of Supernatural Events in the Cologne Mani Codex," in L. Cirillo (ed.), *Codex Manichaeicus Coloniensis*, *Atti del Simposio Internazionale* (Cosenza, 1986).

Henry, P., *La Vision d'Ostie: Sa Place Dans La Vie et L'Oeuvre de S. Augustin* (Paris, 1938).

Hoffmann, A., *Augustin's Schrift De Utilitate Credendi: Eine Analyse* (Munster, 1997).

Hölscher, L., *The Reality of the Mind: Augustine's Philosophical Arguments for the Human Soul as a Spiritual Substance* (London, 1986).

Hunter, D.G., "The Date and Purpose of Augustine's 'De Continentia,'" *Augustinian Studies* 26 (1995), 7-24.

Hutter, M., *Manis kosmogonische Sabuhragan-Texte: Edition, Kommentar und literaturgeschichtliche Einordnung der manichäisch-mittelpersischen Handschriften M98/99 I und M7980-7984*, *Studies in Oriental Religions* XXI (Wiesbaden, 1992).

Jackson, A.V. W., *Researches in Manichaeism* (New York, 1931).

Jackson, B. D., "The Theory of Signs in St. Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*," in R. A. Markus, (ed.), *Augustine: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Garden City, New York, 1972), 92-147.

Johnson, D., W., "*Verbum* in the Early Augustine (386-397)" in *Recherches Augustiniennes*, vol. 8 (1972): 25-53.

Jolivet, R., M. Jourjon, *Six Traités anti-Manichéens*, *Œuvres de Saint Augustin*, vol. 17 (Paris, 1961).

Jones, A. H. M., *The Later Roman Empire: 284-602* (Oklahoma, 1964; repr. Baltimore, 1986). All references are to the reprint edition.

Jones, A. H. M., J. R. Martindale, J. Morris (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 1, A.D. 260-395 (Cambridge, 1971).

Jülicher, A., *Itala: Das Neue Testament in Altlateinischer Überlieferung*, vol. 1, *Matthäus Evangelium* (Berlin, 1938).

Kardong, T. G., "Cassiodorus," in E. Ferguson (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, 2nd ed., (New York, 1998).

- Kelly, J. N. D., *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London, 1975).
- King, P., (trans.), *Augustine: Against the Academicians and the Teacher* (Indianapolis, 1995).
- Klimkeit, H.-J. (trans.), *Gnosis on the Silk Road. Gnostic Texts from Central Asia* (San Francisco, 1993).
- _____, "Jesus, Mani and Buddha as Physicians in the Texts of the Silk Road," *La Persia e l' Asia Centrale da Alessandro al X secolo*, (Roma 1996), pp. 589-95.
- Koenen, L., C. Römer, (ed.), *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex: Über das Werden seines Leibes, Kritische Edition aufgrund der von A. Henrichs und L. Koenen besorgten Erstedition* (Opladen, 1988).
- Koenen, L., "Augustine and Manichaeism in the Light of the Cologne Mani Codex," *Illinois Classical Studies* 3 (1978): 154-95.
- _____, "Manichaean Apocalypticism at the Crossroads of Iranian, Egyptian, Jewish and Christian Thought" in L. Cirillo, A. Roselli (ed.), *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis* (Cosenza, 1986), pp. 285-332.
- _____, "How Dualistic is Mani's Dualism?" in L. Cirillo (ed.), *Codex Manichaeicus Coloniensis*, Atti del Secondo Simposio Internazionale (Cosenza, 1990), pp. 1-34.
- Koetzé, A., "Reading Psalm 4 to the Manicheans," *Vigiliae Christianae* 55 (2001): 119-136.
- Kruegeri, P., Th. Mommsen, *Codex Theodosianus*, vol. 1 (Hildesheim, 1990).
- La Bonnardière, A.-M., *Biblia Augustiniana: Le Livre de la Sagesse* (Paris, 1970).
- _____, "Did Augustine Use Jerome's Vulgate?" in P. Bright (ed. and trans.), *Augustine and the Bible*, The Bible Through the Ages, vol. 2 (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1999) based on A.-M. Bonnardière (ed.), *Saint Augustin et la Bible*, Bible de Tous Les Temps, vol. 3 (Paris, 1986), pp. 42-51. All references are to the translated version.
- _____, "The Bible and Polemics," in P. Bright, (ed. and trans.), *Augustine and the Bible*, The Bible Through the Ages, vol. 2 (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1999) based on A.-M. Bonnardière (ed.), *Saint Augustin et le Bible*, Bible de Tous Les Temps, vol. 3 (Paris, 1986), pp. 183-207. All references are to the translated version.
- Lacey, T. A., *Nature, Miracle and Sin: A Study of St. Augustine's Conception of the Natural Order* (London, 1916).
- Lancel, S., *Saint Augustine*, A. Nevill (trans.), (London, 2002). All references are to the translated edition.
- Landes Fredriksen, P. (trans.), *Augustine on Romans: Propositions from the Epistle to the Romans and Unfinished Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, R. L. Wilken, W. R. Schoedel (ed.), Texts and Translations, Early Christian Literature Series (Chico, CA, 1982).

- Lawless, G., *Augustine of Hippo and His Monastic Rule* (Oxford, 1987).
- Layton, B. (ed.) "The Gospel According to Thomas" in *Nag Hammadi Studies*, vol. XX (Leiden, 1989), 52-112.
- Lee, K.-L. E., *Augustine, Manichaeism, and the Good* (New York, 1999).
- Leftow, B., "Why Didn't God Create the World Sooner?" *Religious Studies* 27 (1991): 157-172.
- Lieu, S. N. C., "Precept and Practice in Manichaean Monasticism," *Journal of Theological Studies* 32 (1981): 153-62.
- _____, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China: A Historical Survey*, rev. 2d ed. (Manchester, 1992).
- _____, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East* (Leiden, 1994).
- _____, *Manichaeism in Central Asia and China* (Leiden, 1998).
- Lim, R., "Unity and Diversity Among Western Manichaeans: A Reconsideration of Mani's *sancta ecclesia*," *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 35 (1989): 231-250.
- _____, "Manichaeans and Public Disputation in Late Antiquity," *Recherches Augustiniennes* 26 (1992): 233-272.
- _____, *Public Disputation, Power and Social Order in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1995).
- Lizzi, R., "Ambrose's Contemporaries and the Christianization of Northern Italy," *Journal of Roman Studies* 80 (1990): 156-173.
- Lütcke, K., "Auctoritas" in C. Mayer and E. Feldmann (ed.) *Augustinus-Lexikon* 1.4, (Basel, 1990), pp. 498-510.
- Macdonald, S., "The Divine Nature," in E. Stump, N. Kretzmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 71-90.
- MacKenna, S., B. S. Page (trans.), *Plotinus: The Six Enneads*, Great Books of the Western World, R. M. Hutchins (ed.) (Chicago, 1952).
- MacKenzie, D. N., "I, Mani..." in H. Preißler, H. Seiwert (ed.), *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65 Geburtstag* (Margurg, 1994) 183-198.
- Madec, G., *Jean Scot et ses auteurs: Annotations Érigéniennes* (Paris, 1988).
- _____, *Saint Augustin et la philosophie: Notes critiques* (Paris, 1992).
- Maher, J. P., "St. Augustine's Defense of the Hexaemeron against the Manicheans" *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 7 (1945): 76-90, 206-222, 306-325.

- _____, "St. Augustine and Manichean Cosmogony" *Augustinian Studies* 10 (1979): 91-104.
- Mahoney, C., *The Rare and Late Latin Nouns, Adjectives and Adverbs in St. Augustine's De Civitate Dei: A Morphological and Semasiological Study* (Washington, 1935).
- Maker, W., "Augustine on Evil: The Dilemma of the Philosophers," *International Journal for the Philosophy of Religion* 15 (1984): 149-160.
- Mandouze, A., *Saint Augustin: L'Aventure de la raison et de la grâce* (Paris, 1968).
- _____, "L'extase d'Ostie: possibilités et limites de la méthode de parallèles textuels," *Augustinus Magister* 1 (Paris, 1954): pp. 67-84.
- de Margerie, B., *An Introduction to the History of Exegesis: Saint Augustine*, vol 3, P. de Fontnouvelle (trans.), (Petersham, Mass., 1995).
- Markus, R. A., "Marius Victorinus and Augustine," in A. H. Armstrong (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 331-424.
- _____, "St. Augustine on Signs," in R. A. Markus (ed.), *Augustine: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Garden City, New York, 1972), pp. 61-91.
- _____, "Augustine's *Confessions* and the Controversy with Julian of Eclanum: Manicheism Revisited," in B. Bruning, M. Lamberigts, J. Van Houtem (ed.), *Collectanea Augustiniana: Mélanges T. J. van Bavel*, vol. 2 (Louvain, 1990), pp. 913-925.
- _____, *End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge, 1990).
- Martin, J., *Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1901).
- Martin, T. F., *Rhetoric and Exegesis in Augustine's Interpretation of Romans 7:24-25A*, *Studies in Bible and Early Christianity*, vol. 47 (Lewiston NY, 2001).
- H.-I. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la Fin de la Culture Antique* (Paris, 1938).
- _____, G. Lamb (trans.), *A History of Education in Antiquity* (Paris, 1956; New York, 1964).
- Matthews, J., *Western Aristocracies and the Imperial Court A.D. 364-425* (Oxford, 1975).
- Mayer, C. P., *Die Zeichen in der geistigen Entwicklung und in der Theologie des jungen Augustinus*, vol. 2 (Würzburg, 1969).
- _____, "Die antimanichäischen Schriften Augustins. Entstehung, Absicht und kurze Charakteristik der einzelnen Werke unter dem Aspekt der darin verwendeten Zeichentermini," *Augustinianum* 14 (1974): 277-313.
- _____, "Allegory," in *Augustinus-Lexikon* 1.1 (Basel, 1994).

- McCool, G.A., "The Ambrosian Origin of St. Aug. Theology of the Image of God in Man" in *Theological Studies* 20 (1959): 62-81.
- McGinn, B., *The Presence of God: History of Western Christian Mysticism*, vol. 1, *The Foundation of Mysticism: Origins to the Fifth Century* (New York, 1994).
- McLynn, N. B., *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley, 1994).
- McMahon, J. J. (trans.), "The Magnitude of the Soul (*De quantitate animae*)" in *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 4 (New York, 1947).
- Merdinger, J., E., *Rome and the African Church in the Time of Augustine* (New Haven, 1997).
- Merkelback, R., "Manichaica (7): Ein Fragment aus der Epistula Fundamenti," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* LXIII (1986): pp. 303-4.
- _____, "Der manichäische Codex von Tebessa," *Manichaean Studies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism*, P. Bryder (ed.), (Lund, 1988), pp. 229-264.
- Metzger, B. M., "The Evidence of the Versions for the Text of the New Testament," in M. M. Parvis, A. P. Wikgren (ed.), *New Testament Manuscript Studies: The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus* (Chicago, 1950), pp. 25-68.
- _____, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford, 1978).
- _____, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 3d ed., rev. and enl. (New York, 1992).
- Miles, M. E., *Augustine on the Body* (Missoula, 1979).
- Milne, C. H., *A Reconstruction of the Old-Latin Text or Texts of the Gospels used by Saint Augustine, with a Study of Their Character* (Cambridge, 1926).
- Mirecki, P., J. BeDuhn (ed.), *The Light and The Darkness: Studies in Manichaeism and its World* (Leiden, 2001).
- Mitchell, C. W. (ed.), *S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion and Bardaisan, Discourse addressed to Hypatius* (Oxford, 1912).
- Mommsen, T. M, M. Paul (ed.), *Codex Theodosianus, vol 1: Theodosiani Libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondinis* (Berlin, 1905; reprint, Bodenheim, 1990).
- Moon, A. A., *De Natura Boni of St. Augustine: A Translation with an Introduction and Commentary* (Washington, 1955).
- Morano, E., "A Survey of the Extant Parthian Crucifixion Hymns" in *Studia Manichaica, IV Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.-18. Juli 1997* (Berlin, 2000), 398-429.

Mourant, J. A., *Augustine on Immortality* (Villanova, 1969).

_____, *St. Augustine on Memory* (Villanova, 1979).

Nash, R. H., "Some Philosophic Sources of Augustine's Illumination Theory," *Augustinian Studies* 2 (1971): 47-66.

Nestle, E., B. Aland, K. Aland (ed.), *Novum Testamentum Latine* (Stuttgart, 1992).

_____, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart, 1990).

Newman, A. H. (trans.), "St. Augustin: On Two Souls, Against the Manichaeans," in P. Schaff (ed.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, vol. 4 (Edinburgh, 1887; reprint, Grand Rapids, 1996).

O'Connell, R. J., "The Enneads and St. Augustine's Image of Happiness," *Vigiliae Christianae* 17 (1963): 129-164.

_____, "The Plotinian Fall of the Soul in St. Augustine," *Traditio* 19 (1963): 1-35.

_____, *St. Augustine's Early Theory of Man, A.D. 386-391*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1968)

_____, *St. Augustine's Confessions: The Odyssey of Soul* (Harvard, 1969).

O'Daly, G., *Augustine's Philosophy of Mind* (Berkeley, 1987).

O'Donnell, J. J., *Augustine* (Boston, 1985).

_____, *Augustine Confessions*, 3 vol. (Oxford, 1992).

_____, "Augustine's Classical Readings" in *Recherches Augustiniennes* 15 (1980): 144-175.

_____, "Bible" in A. D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, 1999), 99-103.

_____, "Augustine: His Time and Lives," in E. Stump, N. Kretzmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 8-25.

O'Loughlin, T., "The *Libri Philosophorum* and Augustine's Conversions," in T. Finan, V. Twomey (ed.), *The Relationship between Neoplatonism and Christianity* (Dublin, 1992), pp. 101-125.

_____, "Cassiodorus," in A. D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, 1999), 143-144.

O'Meara, J. J., *The Young Augustine: The Growth of St. Augustine's Mind up to His Conversion* (London, 1954; 2nd rev. ed. New York, 2001).

- _____, "Research Techniques in Augustinian Studies," *Augustinian Studies* 1 (1970): 277-84.
- _____, *Eriugena* (Oxford, 1986).
- _____, "Augustine's Confessions: Elements of Fiction," in J. McWilliam, J. (ed.), *Augustine: From Rhetor to Theologian* (Waterloo, 1992), pp. 77-95.
- _____, *Understanding Augustine* (Dublin, 1997).
- _____, "The Immaterial and the Material in Augustine's Thought," in J. Petruccione (ed.), *Nova & Vetera: Patristic Studies in Honor of Thomas Patrick Halton* (Washington, 1998), pp. 181-195.
- Ort, L. J. R., *Mani: A Religio-Historical Description of His Personality* (Leiden 1967).
- Parsons, W., (trans.), *Saint Augustine's Letters*, vol 1 (1-82), The Fathers of the Church, A New Translation, vol. 12, H. Dressler (ed.), (Washington, 1951).
- Paulsen D. L., "Early Christian Belief in a Corporeal Deity: Origen and Augustine as Reluctant Witnessess" in *Harvard Theological Review* 83.2 (1990): 105-16.
- Pedersen, N. A., *Studies in the Sermon on the Great War: Investigations of a Manichaean-Coptic Text from the Fourth Century* (Aarhus, 1996).
- Pelikan, J., *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism* (New Haven, 1993).
- Perkins, P., "Beauty, Number, and Loss of Order in the Gnostic Cosmos" in R. T. Wallis, J. Bregman (ed.), *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism* (New York, 1992), pp. 277-296.
- Perler, O., J.-L. Maier, *Les Voyages de Saint Augustine* (Paris, 1969).
- Peters, E., "What Was God Doing Before He Created the Heavens and the Earth?" *Augustiniana* 34 (1984): 53-74.
- _____, "Aenigma Salomonis: Manichaean Anti-Genesis Polemic and the Uitium curiositatis in Confessions III.6," *Augustiniana* 36(1986): 48-64.
- Petersen, W. L., *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance and History in Scholarship* (Leiden, 1994).
- Pharr, C., T. S. Davidson, M. B. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code and the Novels and their Sirmondian Constitutions: A Translation with Commentary, Glossary and Bibliography* (1952; reprint, New York, 1969). All references are to the reprint edition.
- Polotsky, H. J. (ed.), *Manichäische Homilien, Manichäische Handschriften der Sammlung A. Chester Beatty, Band I*, (Stuttgart, 1934).

- _____, "Manichäismus," in G. Wissowa (ed.), *A. Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, suppl. VI (Stuttgart, 1935), cols. 241-72; repr. in *Collected Papers by H. J. Polotsky* (Jerusalem 1971), pp. 699-714.
- _____, A. Böhlig, and C. G. SCHMIDT (ed.), *Kephalaia*; 1. Hälfte (Lieferung 1-10), *Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin*, 1 (Stuttgart, 1940).
- Portalié, E., , R. J. Bastian (trans.), *A Guide to the Thought of Saint Augustine* (Chicago, 1960).
- Prendiville, J.G., "The Development of the Idea of Habit in the Thought of St. Augustine," *Traditio* 28 (1972), 22-99
- Puech, H.-Ch., 'Le Prince des Ténèbres en son royaume', in B. de Jesus-Marie (ed.), *Satan*, (Études Carmélitaines), (Paris, 1948), pp. 136-174; English trans. in *Satan* (London, 1951), pp. 117-57. All references are to the translated edition.
- _____, *Le Manichéisme, sa Fondateur – sa Doctrine* (Paris, 1949).
- _____, "Gnostische Evangelien und verwandte Dokumente," in E. Hennecke, W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, vol. 1 (Tübingen, 1968), pp. 157-271; English trans. by R. Wilson, 'Gnostic Gospels and Related Documents', in E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha I. Gospels and Related Writings* (London, 1963), pp. 231-362.
- _____, *Sur le Manichéisme et Autres Essais* (Paris, 1979).
- Quinn, J. M., "Anti-Manichaeism and Other Moral Precisions in Confessions 3.7.12-9.17," *Augustinian Studies* 19 (1988): 165-194.
- Quispel, G., "Mani et la Tradition Évangélique des Judéo-Chrétiens," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 60 (1972): 143-150.
- _____, "Mani, the Apostle of Jesus Christ," in Fontaine, J., Kannengiesser, C., (eds.) *Epektasis. Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (Paris, 1972), pp. 667-72. (repr. *Gnostic Studies*, II [Istanbul, 1975], pp. 230-37). References are made to the reprint edition.
- Rackett, M. R., "Anti-Pelagian Polemic in Augustine's 'De Continentia,'" *Augustinian Studies* 26 (1995): 25-50.
- Ramsey, B. (trans.), *Ambrose, The Early Church Fathers*, C. Harrison (ed.), (London, 1997).
- Reeves, J. C., *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Tradition* (Cincinnati, 1992).
- Rickaby, J., *The Manichees as Saint Augustine Saw Them* (London, 1925).
- Ries, J., "La Bible chez saint Augustin et chez les manichéens," *Recherches Augustiniennes* 7 (1961): 231-243.

- _____, "Une version liturgique copte de l'Epistula Fundamenti de Mani réfutée par Saint Augustin," *Studia Patristica* 11 (1972): 341-349
- _____, "Le fête de Bêma dans l'Église de Mani" in *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 22 (1976): 218-233.
- _____, *Les Études Manichéennes: des controverses de la réforme aux découvertes du X^e siècle* (Louvain, 1988).
- _____, "Saint Paul dans la formation de Mani," in J. Ries, F. Decret, W. H. C. Frend, M. G. Mara (ed.), *Le Epistole Paoline nei manichei, i donatisti e il primo Agostino*, (Sussidi Patristici, 5), Roma: Istituto Patristico Augustinianum (1989), pp. 7-27.
- _____, "La création de l'homme et l'histoire du salut dans le De Genesi contra Manichaeos de saint Augustin," dans *De Genesi Contra Manichaeos, De Genesi ad litteram liber imperfectus di Agostino d'Ippona, Lectio Augustini*, Settimana Agostiniana Pavese VIII (Palermo, 1992), pp. 65-98.
- _____, "Notes de lecture du *Contra Epistulam Fundamenti* d'Augustin, à la lumière de quelques documents Manichéens," *Augustinianum* 32 (1995): 537-548.
- Rist, J. M., *Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptized* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Roche, W., "Measure, number and Weight in St. Augustine," *The New Scholasticism* 15 (1941): 350-76.
- Ropes, J. H., *The Texts of Acts* (London, 1926).
- Rose, E., *Die Manichäische Christologie* (Wiesbaden, 1979).
- Rousseau, R., "Augustine and Ambrose: The Loyalty and Singlemindedness of a Disciple," *Augustiniana* 27 (1977): 151-165.
- Rouwhorst, G. A. M., "Das manichaeische Bemaifest und das Passaifest der syrischen Christen," *Vigiliae Christianae* 35 (1981): 397-411.
- Ruska, J., "Al-Biruni als Quelle für das Leben und die Schriften al-Razi's," *Isis* 5 (1923): 26-50.
- Russell, F. H., "'Only Something Good Can Be Evil': The Genesis of Augustine's Secular Ambivalence," *Theological Studies* 51 (1990): 698-716.
- _____, "Persuading the Donatists: Augustine's Coercion by Words," in W. E. Klingshirn, M. Vessey, (ed.), *The Limits of Ancient Christianity: Essays on Late Antique Thought and Culture in Honor of R. A. Markus* (Ann Arbor, 1999), pp. 97-130.
- Russell, R. P. (trans.), "Divine Providence and the Problem of Evil," in *The Writings of Saint Augustine*, vol. 1 (ed.) Schopp, L., *The Fathers of The Church, A New Translation*, vol. 5 (new York, 1948).

- Russell, R., "The Role of Neoplatonism in St. Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*," in H. J. Blumenthal, R. A. Markus, (ed.), *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought: Essays in Honour of A. H. Armstrong* (London, 1981), 160-170.
- Schaeder, H. H., "Urform und Fortbildung des manichäischen Systems," *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg*, 1924-5 (Leipzig, 1927).
- Schäfer, C., "Augustine on Mode, Form, and Natural Order," *Augustinian Studies* 31:1 (2000): 59-77.
- Scher, A. (ed.), Theodore Bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum, Pars Posterior* (CSCO, Scriptores syri, textus, series secunda, 66), (Paris, 1912).
- Schipper, H. G., "Manichaeans in Spain. On the Correspondence of Leo the Great and Turribius of Astorga" in R. E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, P. Zieme (ed.) *Studia Manichaica, : IV Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14.-18. Juli 1997* (Berlin, 2000) 511-516.
- _____, Van Oort, J. (ed.), *St. Leo the Great, Sermons and Letters Against the Manichaeans: Selected Fragments*, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, Series Latina, vol. 1 (Turnhout, 2000).
- Schmidt, C., H. J. Polotsky, *Ein Mani-Fund in Ägypten: Originalschriften des Mani und seiner Schüler* in SPAW (Berlin, 1933), pp. 4-90 (repr. in *Collected Papers by H. J. Polotsky* [Jerusalem, 1971], pp. 673-98).
- Scoppello, M., "Agostino contro Mani: note sull'opera polemica del *Contra epistulam Manichaei quam uocant fundamenti*" in *La polemica con i manichei di Agostino di Ippona: Lectio Augustini XIV—Settimana Agostiniana Pavese*, *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 69 (Rome, 2000), pp. 7-34
- _____, "L'Epistula Fundamenti à la Lumière Des Sources Manichéennes du Fayoum" in J. Van Oort, O. Wermelinger, G. Wurst (ed.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West* (Leiden, 2001).
- Solignac, A., *Les Confessions* (Oeuvres de saint Augustine, 13) 2 vol. (Paris, 1962).
- _____, "Memoria dans la tradition augustinienne," *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, vol. 10 (1980), pp. 995-99.
- Somers, H., "Image de Dieu et illumination divine," *Augustinus Magister* 1 (Paris, 1954), pp. 450-462.
- Souter, A., *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (London, 1913).
- Sparks, H. F. D., "Jerome as Biblical Scholar," in P. R. Ackroyd, C. F. Evans (ed.) *Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1970).
- Stein, M., *Manichaei epistula fundamenti: Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterungen*, *Manichaica Latina* 2, *Papyrologica Coloniensia* vol. XXVII/2 (Paderborn, 2002).

- Stevenson, J., *Creeds, Councils and Controversies: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church AD 337-461* (London, 1993).
- Stock, B., *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge and the Ethics of Interpretation* (Cambridge, MA 1996).
- Stothert, R., A. H. Newman (trans.), *St. Augustin: The Writings Against the Manichaeans and Against the Donatists*, in P. S. Schaff, (ed.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. IV (Edinburgh, 1887; reprint, Grand Rapids, 1996).
- Stroumsa, G., "The Incorporeality of God: Context and Implications of Origen's Position," *Religion* 13 (1983): 345-358.
- _____, "Esotericism in Mani's Thought and Background" in *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis, Atti del Simposio Internazionale* (Cosenza, 1986), pp. 153-168.
- _____, "The Words and the Works: Religious Knowledge and Salvation in Augustine and Faustus of Milevis" in S. N. Eisenstadt, I. F. Silver, *Cultural Traditions and Worlds of Knowledge: Explorations in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Knowledge and Society, 7, (Greenwich, 1988), pp. 73-84.
- _____, "Titus of Bostra and Alexander of Lycopolis: A Christian and a Platonic Refutation of Manichaean Dualism," in R. T. Wallis (ed.), *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism*, *Studies in Neoplatonism: Ancient and Modern*, vol. 6, (New York, 1992), pp. 337-349.
- _____, P. Fredriksen, "The Two Souls and the Divided Will," in A. I. Baumgarten, J. Assmann, G. G. Stroumsa (ed.), *Self, Soul and Body in Religious Experience* (Leiden, 1998), pp. 198-217.
- _____, *Barbarian Philosophy, The Religious Revolution of Early Christianity* (Tubingen, 1999).
- Stroumsa, S., G. G. Stroumsa, "Aspects of Anti-Manichaean Polemics in Late Antiquity and Under Early Islam," *Harvard Theological Review* 81:1 (1988): 37-58.
- Sundermann, W., *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer*, *Berliner Turfantext IV* (Berlin, 1973).
- _____, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*, *Berliner Turfantexte XI* (Berlin, 1981).
- _____, (ed), *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous: Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus*, *Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version* (Berlin, 1992).
- _____, "Manichaeism, Cosmogony and Cosmology (iii)" in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, E. Yarshater (ed.), vol. 6.3 (Costa Mesa, 1992).
- Tardieu, M., "Les Manichéens en Égypte," *Bulletin de la Societe Francaise d'Egyptologie* 94 (1982): 5-19.

- Tavard, G., "St. Augustine Between Mani and Christ," *The Patristic and Byzantine Review* V (1986): 196-206.
- TeSelle, E., *Augustine the Theologian* (London, 1970).
- Teske, R. J., "The Aim of Augustine's Proof that God Truly Is," *International Philosophical Quarterly* (1986): 253-268.
- _____, "Homo spiritualis in St. Augustine's De Genesi contra Manichaeos," *Studia Patristica* 22 (Leuven, 1989).
- _____, (trans.), "Saint Augustine on Genesis: Two Books on Genesis Against the Manichees and On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis: An Unfinished Book" in T. P. Halton (ed.), *The Fathers of the Church, A New Translation*, vol. 84 (Washington, D. C., 1991).
- _____, "Augustine's Philosophy of Memory," in E. Stump, N. Kretzmann (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 148-158.
- Testard, M., *Saint Augustine et Ciceron* (Paris, 1958).
- Thiele, W. (ed.), *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bible*, Epistulae Catholicae, vol. 26.1 (1956-1969).
- Torchia, N. J., "St. Augustine's Treatment of *Superbia* and its Plotinian Affinities," *Augustinian Studies* 18 (1987): 66-80.
- _____, "Curiositas in the Early Philosophical Writings of Saint Augustine," *Augustinian Studies* 19 (1988): 111-120.
- _____, *Creatio Ex Nihilo and the Theology of St. Augustine: The Anti-Manichaean Polemic and Beyond* (New York, 1999).
- Tubach J., M. Zakeri, "Mani's Name" in J. Van Oort, O. Wermelinger, G. Wurst (ed.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 272-286.
- Van Bavel, T. J., "'No One Ever Hated His Own Flesh,' Eph. 5:29 in Augustine," *Augustiniana* 45 (1995): 45-93.
- Van den Brink, J. N. B., "Tradition and Authority in the Early Church," Inaugural Address to the Conference, delivered on 16 September 1963 in the Examination Schools, Oxford, *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966): 3-22.
- Van Der Horst, P. W., J., Mansfeld, *An Alexandrian Platonist Against Dualism: Alexander of Lycopolis' Treatise 'Critique of the Doctrines of Manichaeus'* (Leiden, 1974).
- Van der Lof, L. J., "The Threefold Meaning of Servi Dei in the Writings of Saint Augustine," *Augustinian Studies* 12 (1981): 43-59.
- Van der Meer, F., *Augustine the Bishop: Church and Society at the Dawn of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1961).

- Van Fleteren, F. E., "Authority and Reason, Faith and Understanding in the Thought of St. Augustine," *Augustinian Studies* 4 (1973): 33-71.
- _____, "Augustine's Ascent of the Soul in Book VII of the Confessions: A Reconsideration," *Augustinian Studies* 5 (1974): 29-72.
- _____, "Augustine's De uera religione: A New Approach," *Augustinianum* (1976): 475-497.
- _____, "The Early Works of Augustine and His Ascents at Milan," *Studies in Medieval Culture* 10 (1977): 19-23.
- _____, "The Cassiciacum Dialogues and Augustine's Ascents at Milan," *Mediaevalia* 4 (1978): 59-82.
- Van Lindt, P., *The Names of Manichaeon Mythological Figures: A Comparative Study on Terminology in the Coptic Sources* (Wiesbaden, 1992).
- Vannier, M. A., *Creatio, Conuersio, Formatio, Chez S. Augustin* (Fribourg, 1991).
- Van Oort, J., "Augustine on Sexual Concupiscence and Original Sin," in E. Livingstone (ed.), *Papers presented to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1987*, Historica, Theologica, Gnostica, Biblica et Apocrypha, (Studia Patristica, 22) (Leuven, 1989), pp. 382-386.
- _____, *Jerusalem and Babylon: A Study into Augustine's City of God and the Sources of His Doctrine of the Two Cities* (Leiden, 1991).
- _____, "Manichaeism in Augustine's De civitate Dei," In E. Cavalcanti (ed.), *Il de civitate Dei: L'Opera, le interpretazioni, l'influsso* (Roma, 1996), pp. 193-214.
- _____, *Mani, Manichaeism and Augustine: The Rediscovery of Manichaeism and Its Influence on Western Christianity* (Tbilisi, 1996).
- _____, "Secundini Manichaei Epistula: Roman Manichaeon 'Biblical' Argument in the Age of Augustine," in J. Van Oort, O. Wermelinger, G. Wurst (ed.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*, Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaeon Studies (IAMS) (Leiden, 2001) 161-173.
- Van Tongerloo, A., "Manichaeus Medicus" in R. E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, P. Zieme (ed.), *Studia Manichaica*, IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus, (Berlin, 2000), pp. 613-621.
- _____, "The Father of Greatness" in H. Preissler, H. Seiwert, (ed.), *Gnosis forschung und Religionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65 Geburtstag* (Marburg, 1994), pp. 329-42.
- Van Winden, J. C. M., "In the Beginning: Some Observations on the Patristic Interpretation of Genesis 1:1," *Vigiliae Christianae* 17 (1963).

- Verbeke, G., "Spiritualité et immortalité de l'âme chez Saint Augustin," *Augustinus Magister* 1 (Paris, 1954): 329-334.
- Vermes, M. (trans.), S. N. C. Lieu, K. Kaatz, *Hegemonius: Acta Archelai (The Acts of Archelaus), Manichaeae Studies*, vol. IV (Lovanii, 2001).
- Vogels, H., *Evangelium Palatinum: Studien zur ältesten Geschichte der lateinischen Evangelienübersetzung* (Münster, 1926).
- Waldstein, M., F. Wisse (ed.), "The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II, 1; III, 1; and IV, 1 with BG 8502, 2" in J. M. Robinson, H. J. Klimkeit (ed.), *Nag Hammadi and Manichaeae Studies*, vol. 33 (Leiden, 1995).
- White, C., *The Correspondence (394-419) Between Jerome and Augustine of Hippo*, *Studies in Bible and Early Christianity* vol. 23, (Lewiston, N.Y., 1990).
- Wiles, J.W., *A Scripture Index to the Works of St. Augustine in English Translation* (London 1995).
- Williams, F., (tr.), *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis, Book I (Sects 1-46), II-III (Sects 47-80, De Fide)*, I-II, (Nag Hammadi Studies 35; Nag Hammadi and Manichaeae Studies, 36), (Leiden, 1987-1994).
- Williams, M. A., *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling A Dubious Category* (Princeton, 1996).
- Williams, R., "Good for Nothing? Augustine on Creation," *Augustinian Studies* 25 (1994): 9-24.
- _____, "Creation" in A. D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, 1999).
- Willis, G. G., "Patristic Biblical Citations: The Importance of a Good Critical Text, Illustrated from St. Augustine," *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966): 576-579.
- Wilmart, D. A., "Operum S. Augustini elenchus a Possidio eiusdem discipulo Calamensi episcopo digestus post Marinorum labores novis curis editus critico apparatu numeris tabellis instructus," in *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 2 (Rome, 1930), pp. 149-233.
- Winkler, K., "La Théorie augustinienne de la memoire à son point de-départ," *Augustinus Magister* vol. 1 (Paris, 1954), pp. 511-19.
- Wordsworth, I., H. I. White (ed.), *Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine, Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronimi* (Oxonii, 1905).
- Wurst, G., "Bemapsalm 223 -- Eine liturgische Version der Epistula Fundamenti?" in A. van Tongerloo, S. Giversen (ed.), *Manichaeae Studies I, Manichaica Selecta: Studies Presented to Professor Julien Ries*, *Manichaeae Studies* 1, (Lovanii, 1991), pp. 391-99.
- _____, *Das Bemafest der ägyptischen Manichaäer* (Altenberge, 1995).

_____, (ed. and trans.), *Die Bema-Psalmen*, Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum, 4; Series Coptica, I, The Manichaean Coptic Papyri in the Chester Beatty Library, Psalm Book, Pars II.1 (Turnhout, 1996).

_____, "Bemerkungen zum Glaubensbekenntnis des Faustus von Mileve (Augustinus, *Contra Faustum* 20,2)" in R. E. Emmerick, W. Sundermann, P. Zieme (ed.), *Studia Manichaica: IV. Internationaler Kongreß zum Manichäismus*, Berlin, 14.-18. Juli 1997, (Berlin, 2000) p. 648-657.

Zarb, S. M., "Chronologia Operum Sancti Augustini," in *Angelicum* 10 (1933): 359-396 and 478-512.

Zieme, P., "A Turkish Text on Manichaean Cosmogony," in L. Cirillo, A. Van Tongerloo (ed.), *Manichaean Studies III* (Lovanii, 1997), pp. 395-409.

Zumkeller, A., "Agone Christiano, de," *Augustinus-Lexikon* 1 (Basel, 1986-), pp. 221-27.

_____, "Consuetudo," *Augustinus-Lexikon* 1 (Basel, 1994), pp. 1253-66.