

BIBLICAL TRADITIONS AND THEIR TRANSFORMATION IN FOURTH CENTURY MANICHAISM¹

A desideratum when examining the reception of ideas and values within a religious tradition is to determine where the limits of an acknowledgement reside. In the case of the adherents of Manichaeism, their religion was defined and promulgated according to the levels of dependence which Manichaean teaching owed to prior religious traditions and their revealers. The importance of the notion of apostolic succession in determining the nature of Mani's teaching, and for formulating the teleological character of Manichaeism, has been firmly established and clearly documented.² However, for fairly obvious reasons, attempts to document states of dependence between different authors within Manichaeism itself, remains a rather nebulous area of investigation. For a start, the genuine Manichaean literature in our possession consists largely of fragmentary material, and any attempt to establish the influence of the thoughts and ideas of early Manichaean authors on later Manichaean writers is not therefore always feasible. Furthermore, our understanding of whether Manichaeism experienced developments in its doctrinal thought from the time of Mani onwards is woefully inadequate, thus making the conceptual categories employed within reception studies (dependence, borrowings, influence, transformation *etc*) somewhat inappropriate in terms of understanding the relationships between Manichaean writers and the reception of their teachings. Nevertheless, an opportunity to document the nature of relations between different Manichaean authors can be teased from the writings of two Manichaean figures, Adimantus, *sectator Manichaei*,³ and Faustus, Manichaean Bishop of Milevis, whom Augustine turned his attention towards in the final decade of the fourth century, resulting

¹ My great thanks go to Prof. Markus Stein for his observations about aspects of this article: I am, of course, responsible for any remaining faults.

² Vide, J.C. REEVES, *Heralds of that Good Realm: Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions* (Leiden, 1996), pp. 5-30; also, B.A. PEARSON, *Gnosticism, Judaism and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis, 1990), pp. 53-83. The formative statement on prophetic succession in Manichaean literature can be found in *Kephalaion* 1 (11. 21ff): for references to the Coptic Manichaean work, the *Kephalaia*, I have used the English translation of I. Gardner, *The Kephalaia of the Teacher* (Leiden, 1995).

³ AUGUSTINE, *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum* (c. adv. leg.) II. xii. 41 (PL 42. 664): ... *et contra Adimantum, qui Manichaei sectator cum ille viveret fuisse iactatur* ...

in the magisterial *Contra Faustum* (c. *Faust.*), correctly identified as a “*Fundgrube* to anyone studying Manichaeism.”⁴

In the minds of ancient and modern commentators, Adimantus and Faustus stand together in the history of Latin Manichaeism as the foremost scriptural commentators within their religion. Augustine himself identified his writings against the two authors as representing a unified front against the principal *fontes* of Manichaean biblical arguments.⁵ One of the most authoritative contemporary commentators on North African Manichaeism states: “nous savons ... que les préoccupations du ‘disciple de Mani’ étaient sensiblement les mêmes que celles de l’évêque manichéen d’Afrique.”⁶ The basis for Decret’s assessment is that both authors adopted a critical attitude towards the Jewish scriptures, in light of their evaluation against the Christian Gospels and Pauline texts, which were read according to Manichaean hermeneutical principles.⁷ However, the association really ought to be understood primarily on the basis of Faustus’s acknowledgement concerning the importance of Adimantus for Manichees and the theological teachings of their community, detailed in a statement from the work of Faustus preserved by Augustine in an early section of his c. *Faust.*:

⁴ J. VAN OORT, “Augustine and Manichaeism in Roman North Africa: Remarks on an African Debate and Its Universal Consequences”, in P.Y. FUX, J.M. ROESSLI and O. WERMELINGER (eds.), *Augustinus Afer. Saint Augustin: africanité et universalité. Actes du colloque international Alger-Annaba, 1-7 avril 2001*, vol. 1, p. 202. For Faustus, v. A. BRUCKNER, *Faustus von Mileve. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des abendländischen Manichäismus* (Basel, 1901); concerning the *capitula* v. P. MONCEAUX, “Le manichéen Faustus de Milev. Restitution des ses Capitula” in *Mémoires de l’Institut National de France, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 43, 1ère partie (Paris, 1933), pp. 1-111, – to be read alongside, G. WURST, “Bemerkungen zu Struktur und genus litterarium der Capitula des Faustus von Mileve”, in J. VAN OORT, O. WERMELINGER & G. WURST, *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West: Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaean Studies* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 307-324. I have been unable to obtain the dissertation of P. CANTALOU, *L’harmonie des deux Testaments dans la “Contra Faustum Manichaeum” de Saint Augustin* (Faculté de Théologie de L’Institut Catholique de Toulouse, 1955). For a brief introduction to the life and literary activities of Faustus, v. F. DECRET, “Faustum Manicheum (Contra-),” and “Faustus Manichaeus” in *Augustinus-Lexikon* vol. 1, fasc. 7-8, cols. 1244-1255.

⁵ Augustine’s studies against these prominent Manichees appear, however, not to have been particularly well received; c. *adv. leg.* II. xii. 41 (PL 42. 664): *et fortasse si illa vel non omnino, vel non multum necessarium fuisset haec scribere.*

⁶ F. DECRET, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l’Afrique romaine: Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Felix avec saint Augustin* (Paris, 1970), p. 98.

⁷ Concerning the Manichaean manner of reading the scriptures, v. my “‘...quaedam disputationes Adimanti’ (Retr. I. xxii. 1): Reading the Manichaean Biblical Discordance in Augustine’s *Contra Adimantum*”, *Augustinian Studies* 34:2 (2003), 175-196

Faustus dixit: Since the errors have been clearly brought to light, and the treachery (*fallacia*) of Jewish superstition and of the semi-Christians has been thoroughly exposed by the most learned Adimantus, the one who alone ought to be studied by us after our blessed father Mani, it did not seem out of place my dear brothers, to write these brief and appropriate responses for you on account of the sharp and astute propositions of those debating with us.⁸

Faustus's statement undeniably contains numerous points of very great interest which open up potentially important lines for future investigation, including: an expansion of the errors referred to by Faustus which had been combated by Adimantus; a fuller appreciation of Faustus's pejorative classification of Judaism and Catholic Christianity;⁹ and, an explanation as to why Faustus chose to write his "brief and appropriate responses", in terms which define the arguments generated by the opponents of Manichaeism. One aspect of Faustus's statement, however, which has failed to raise eyebrows concerns the inevitable equivocality arising from possible reasons explaining the composition of his own endeavours, and the status and usefulness of Adimantus's work: thus, if indeed Adimantus had so fully exposed the errors, why does Faustus state that further replies are needed for the benefit of his community (*fratres carissimi*)? The implication of the acknowledgement appears unambiguous: the North African Manichaean church continues to seek answers to questions arising out of a polemical environment which even the work of the revered Adimantus cannot address. This investigation will discuss Faustus's acknowledgement of Adimantus's standing within fourth century North African Manichaeism by examining the manner in which the *disputationes* of Adimantus were handled by Faustus in his *capitula*, and address

⁸ Faustus apud Augustine, *c. Faust.* 1, 2 (CSEL 25.1. 251.22-252.5): *Faustus dixit: Satis superque in lucem iam traductis erroribus ac Iudaicae superstitionis simul et semichristianorum abunde detecta fallacia a doctissimo scilicet et solo nobis post beatum patrem nostrum Manichaeum studendo Adimanto non ab re uisum est, fratres carissimi, haec quoque breuia uobis et concinna responsa propter callidas et astutas conferentium nobiscum propositiones scribere. Cf. c. Faust. VI. 6 (CSEL 25.1. 292.26; 293.16-18): ... sicut uester Adimantus, quem post Manichaeum Faustus praecipue laudat ... quapropter quia in exordio harum litterarum suarum Faustus sic miratur Adimantum, ut ei solum praeferat Manichaeum ...*

⁹ The Manichaean perception of catholics as *semichristiani* was of course judged against their own sense of identity as the *veri christiani*, making the Manichaean church "the genuine article"; further work is needed to identify and analyse the exact components of Manichaean identifiers; cf. I.M.F. GARDNER and S.N.C. LIEU, "From Narmouthis (Medinet Madi) to Kellis (Ismant El-Kharab): Manichaean Documents from Roman Egypt", *Journal of Roman Studies* 86 (1996), 146-169 (especially, 167).

the issue as to whether we can identify a transformation of Adimantus's status within the Manichaean community in the western Roman Empire.

Augustine is our earliest authority for the little that is known about both Adimantus and Faustus: the former Manichaean *auditor* preserves arguments and sections from the writings of both figures. Adimantus's biblical work is preserved by Augustine in the form of *antitheses*, opposing quotations or paraphrastic statements from the scriptural texts. Augustine also preserves the *capitula* of Faustus with the teachings of Faustus introduced by the formula *Faustus dixit*.¹⁰ Clearly then, there are serious limitations as to what can be known about the writings of Adimantus and Faustus, and we must bear in mind that there was undoubtedly greater detail to the Manichaean works than Augustine chose to present for the benefit of his audience. The *disputationes* of Adimantus,¹¹ an antithetical collection of pairs of scriptural passages, have been preserved by Augustine in his *Contra Adimantum* (c. *Adim.*) and in some of his *sermones ad populum*.¹² It is also Augustine who relates the tradition which held that Adimantus (ἄδείμαντος- 'undaunted' or 'without fear'¹³) was one and the same person as Addā,¹⁴ the missionary-teacher charged by Mani himself with

¹⁰ On the literary structure of the *capitula* within the context of Manichaean literary genres (viz. the *Kephalaia*), v. G. WURST, "Bemerkungen zu Struktur und *genus litterarium* der *Capitula* des Faustus von Mileve", pp. 307-324.

¹¹ AUGUSTINE, *Retractationes* I. xxii. 1 (CCSL LVII. 63. 1-13): *eodem tempore uenerunt in manus meas quaedam disputationes Adimanti, qui fuerat discipulus Manichaei, quas conscripsit aduersus legem et prophetas, uelut contraria eis euangelica et apostolica scripta demonstrare conatus*.

¹² Vide my "The Manichaean use of the Minor Prophets in Augustine's *sermo* L", forthcoming.

¹³ Perhaps an honorific title; v. H.G. LIDDELL & R. SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon*; rev. ed., H. STUART JONES & R. MCKENZIE (Oxford, 1976), p. 20.

¹⁴ AUGUSTINE, c. *adv. leg.* II. xii. 42 (PL 42. 666): *Iam illud aliud quod in eodem codice scribi coeperat, Adimanti opus est, illius discipuli Manichaei, qui proprio nomine Addas dictus est*. Concerning the identification of Adimantus with Adda in Augustine and later sources, v. R. MERKELBACH, "Addās=Adeimantos", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 56 (1984), 51-53; R. MERKELBACH, "Nachtrag zu Manichaica (3) Addas=Adeimantos", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 58 (1985), 57-58; J. TUBACH, "Nochmals Addas=Adeimantos", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 106 (1995), 170-174; also, G. SFAMENI GASPARRO, "Addas-Adimantus unus ex discipulis Manichaei: for the History of Manichaeism in the West", in R.E. EMMERICK, W. SUNDERMANN and P. ZIEME (eds.), *Studia Manichaica IV. Internationaler Kongress zum Manichäismus, Berlin, 14-18 Juli 1997* (Berlin, 2000), pp. 546-59; most recently v. Nils Arne Pedersen, *Demonstrative Proof in Defence of God: A Study of Titus of Bostra's Contra Manichaeos- The Work's Sources, Aims and Relation to its Contemporary Theology* (Leiden, 2004), pp. 179-186.

the development of Manichaeism in the western Empire of the late third century.¹⁵ Therefore, any surviving works by Addā/Adimantus, no matter how fragmentary, are of immense significance in terms of reconstructing the history of Manichaeism, its biblical traditions, and particularly its place in the religious environment of late Roman North Africa. Later fragmentary Iranian Manichaean texts make reference to Addā's literary endeavours within the context of his mission to the Roman Empire, and it is apparent that he produced a number of writings:¹⁶ very little is known about these works, and considerable conjecture, both ancient and modern, has surrounded their character.¹⁷ Nevertheless, there is a remarkable similarity detailing controversial intent between Faustus's description of Adimantus's contribution to the Manichaean cause as the "exposer of treachery", with the activities of Addā in later Iranian literature, where he is remembered as the "opposer of dogmas": we can infer from these accounts that there was a common polemical purpose to the writings.¹⁸ Thus, working with a paucity of detail, the description given by Faustus of Adimantus's importance for Manichaeism is perhaps most appropriately aligned with the contents of the work (or works?), the *disputationes*, which Augustine challenged in his *sermones* and more fully in the *c. Adim.* over a period of approximately four years between 391 to 395.¹⁹ According

¹⁵ For translations of these texts, v. now, IAIN GARDNER & SAMUEL N.C. LIEU, *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 111-114; for commentary v. W. SUNDERMANN, "Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer II", *Altorientalische Forschungen* 13 (1986) 246-50; additional commentary in SAMUEL N.C. LIEU, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East* (Leiden, 1994), pp. 22-38.

¹⁶ Cf. N. A. PEDERSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

¹⁷ Vide Photius on the comments of Heraclianus of Chalcedon concerning the refutation of Addā's writings by Titus of Bostra and Diodorus of Tarsus, *Bibliotheca* 85 (65a/b) 9-10 (PG. 103. 287); and recently, v. G. SFAMENI GASPARRO, *op. cit.*, p. 549, nt. 21, and N.A. PEDERSEN, *op. cit.*, pp. 182-3, on modern attempts to associate the *μῦθος* of Adda with the anti-Old Testament work refuted by Augustine in the *c. Adim.*

¹⁸ Specifically, M 2 I R II-33, F.C. ANDREAS & W.B. HENNING, *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch Turkestan II in Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, pp. 301ff. ET: J.P. ASMUSSEN, *Manichaean Literature: Representative Texts Chiefly from Middle Persian and Parthian Writings* (New York, 1975), pp. 21-22; reproduced in IAIN GARDNER and SAMUEL N.C. LIEU, *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire*, p. 111.

¹⁹ Cf. F. DECRET, *L'Afrique manichéenne (IVe-Ve siècles). Étude historique et doctrinale*; I. Texte. (Paris, 1978), p. 96; Decret suggests that Adimantus's *disputationes*, with Augustine's response appended, may originally have circulated in the form of *cartulae*, which were then collected into one volume, viz. the *c. Adim.* Reconstructing the circumstances behind the development and use of *cartulae* would assist

to initial investigations forming the first ever complete study of the *c. Adim.*,²⁰ the concerns of Adimantus were contained within a series of antithetical pairings of passages from the scriptures, each set comprising one or more text taken from the Old Testament, and the opposing passage taken from either the Gospels and/or the letters of Paul (or those ascribed to Paul). With Manichaean hermeneutical principles determining the reading of the passages at hand,²¹ the juxtaposition of the biblical texts was understood to set up a radical series of oppositional statements dealing with a number of important concerns for the Manichaean community including, the characters of the two 'gods' in the Jewish and Christian traditions,²² the delineation of food laws,²³ and the nature of the substance comprising the soul.²⁴ As reported by Augustine, additional commentary of an interpretive form explaining the nature of the opposition associated with the original *disputationes* was limited, amounting to the appending of a rhetorical question or statement which demonstrably served the purpose of accentuating the sense of opposition between the passages.²⁵

Arising from polemical endeavours of this nature, the reputation of Adimantus in Manichaeism was second only to the founder, Mani. The comments by Faustus are therefore an important channel for understanding the evaluation within Manichaean circles of those sources which lay outside the canon of Mani's own writings. With this in mind, the issue that will be addressed in this short paper concerns the extent to which Faustus employed the arguments of Adimantus in his *capitula*- to determine the extent of his borrowings from Adimantus. Was Faustus's admiration for Adimantus reflected in his use of the Manichaean authority's *disputationes*? Or, do we see Faustus developing his own lines of argumentation in order to answer the demands of the Manichaean community in the fourth century, perhaps to meet the challenge presented by Catholic figures like Augustine to Manichaean hermeneutics?

in understanding the circulation of Manichaean works in Augustine's time: a useful comparative model could prove to be Augustine's initial knowledge of Julian of Eclanum's *Ad Turbantium* which was acquired in part through *cartulae*; v. J. LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum: Studien zu seinem Leben, seinem Werk, seiner Lehre und ihrer Überlieferung* (Leiden, 2001), p. 281, nt. 183.

²⁰ N.J. BAKER-BRIAN, *Manichaeism in Roman North Africa: A Study of Augustine's Contra Adimantum* (Lewiston [N.Y.], Lampeter, forthcoming 2007).

²¹ N.J. BAKER-BRIAN, *op. cit.*, 180-186.

²² *c. Adim.* 7; 11; 17: cf. Faustus apud Augustine, *c. Faust.* XXII. 4.

²³ *c. Adim.* 14; 15.

²⁴ *c. Adim.* 12.

²⁵ Vide N.J. BAKER-BRIAN, *op. cit.*, 178-180.

Augustine presents the antitheses of Adimantus as 'units' (for want of a more suitable term) of sayings and teachings from the bible according to the scheme of Old Testament passage(s) *versus* New Testament passage(s): it is very likely that Augustine is faithful to the original presentational methods of Adimantus. It is important to note at this stage that the *capitula* contain surprisingly few of these scriptural 'units', and the ones that are reproduced by Faustus are not entirely unproblematic. In fact, as reported by Augustine, perhaps only one antithetical unit can be found in Faustus's *capitula* which is identical to a *disputatio* from Adimantus. In book nineteen of the *c. Faust.*, Faustus highlights the antithesis presented by the opposition between Ex. 21. 24 and Mt. 5. 38-40, as the key piece of evidence in his argument demonstrating that Jesus destroyed rather than fulfilled the law of the Hebrews: the opposition highlighted for Faustus what he considered to be the doubtful nature of Mt. 5. 17, according to which Catholics held that Jesus had expressed his mission as one of fulfilling the Mosaic law as opposed to seeking its destruction.²⁶ However, whilst this same antithetical example appeared in Adimantus's arguments,²⁷ it is Jesus himself in the Matthean verse who introduces the opposition between his own teachings and the commandment from the law. This example clearly does not originate from Adimantus; rather, within Manichaeism this verse, together with other examples from the Gospel demonstrating the repudiation of Jewish legalism by Jesus determined so it seems by the discourse in Mt. 5. 21-44, had acquired the status of an antithetical archetype precisely because to the Manichaean mind, Jesus himself had instituted the hermeneutical concerns which formed the basis for the Manichaean approach to the scriptures. Thus, we see this antithetical unit taking a central place in many Manichaean and anti-Manichaean sources.²⁸

²⁶ The entire discourse from Mt. 5. 21-44 is crucial for Faustus not only in demonstrating the interpolated nature of Mt. 5. 17, but for illustrating Jesus' fulfilment of the teachings from previous Apostles of Light; Faustus explicitly refers to Enoch and Seth as the promulgators of Ex. 20. 13-16. Faustus apud Augustine, *c. Faust.* XIX. 3 (CSEL 25.1. 498.19-25): ... *non occides, non moechaberis, non peierabis- haec autem erant antiquitus in nationibus, ut est in promptu probare, olim promulgata per Enoch et Seth et ceteros eorum similes iustos, quibus eadem inlustres tradiderint angeli temperandae in hominibus gratia feritatis- cui non uideatur hoc eum de ueritatis dixisse lege et eius prophetis?*

²⁷ *c. Adim.* 8 (CSEL 25/1. 130. 9-20).

²⁸ Cf. N. A. PEDERSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 184. Interestingly, in *c. Faust.* XIX. 3, Faustus acknowledges that Jesus himself sets out to develop a series of oppositional statements against the teachings of the law, and he provides the examples from Mt. 5. 17-40. In the *c. Adim.* 8, the citation from Mt. 5. 39-40 does not contain Jesus' original

Nevertheless, when it comes to the repudiation of the laws and the legalistic nature of the Law and the Prophets, Faustus follows faithfully in the footsteps of Adimantus. One example in particular demonstrates not only the manner in which Adimantus's thought was received by Faustus, but it also provides important information concerning what can be understood about the intentions behind the arguments; or more correctly, the lines of investigation that ought to be followed for the purposes of developing a reasonably accurate reconstruction of Adimantian material. In the sixteenth book of the *c. Faust.*, Augustine transmits a series of Manichaean arguments from the *capitula* of Faustus, all of which centre around the argument over Faustus's assertion that he has identified an interpolation in the text of the Gospel- *Moses de me scripsit: et si crederetis Moysi, crederetis et mihi* (Jn. 5. 46).²⁹ For Faustus, verses such as this one from John were intended to encourage Catholics to hold the erroneous conviction that the retention of the Law and the Prophets, their rites and beliefs, was fundamental for Christians in the profession and practice of their faith. Faustus's assessment was determined by an important Manichaean hermeneutical presupposition, that the author of the Law and the Prophets wished to restrict the salvific teachings of Jesus and Paul by diluting their wisdom with material deriving from the evil principle.³⁰

reference to Ex. 21. 24, and therefore gives the impression to the reader that the two passages, Ex. 21. 24 and Mt. 5. 39-40 exist independently of one another. This is the way in which the opposition is presented in the epistle from Diodorus to Archelaus summarising the teachings of Mani in Hegemonius, *Acta Archelai* XLIV 9, which appears to hold that Mani himself brought forward the opposition between the two passages (ed. C.H. Beeson, *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* 16 (Leipzig 1906)). On the historicity of the *Acta*, v. Samuel N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*, pp.132-152. J. BeDuhn has recently delivered a paper ("Biblical Antitheses, Adda, and the Acts of Archelaus") examining possible lines of influence between the exegetical work of Adda/Adimantus and the antitheses ascribed to Mani in the *Acta Archelai* XLIV.1-XLV.9. The abstract can be viewed on-line at <http://www4.nau.edu/manichaeism/2003abstracts.asp>

²⁹ Faustus apud Augustine, *c. Faust.* XVI. 1 (CSEL 25.1. 439.25-440.3): *Faustus dixit: Quare Moysen non accipitis, cum Christus dicat: Moyses de me scripsit, et: si crederetis Moysi, crederetis et mihi? Ego uero non solum Moysen de Christo scripsisse uelim, sed omnes etiam prophetas Iudaeorum et gentium.* Then later, Augustine relates Faustus's assessment of the verse, *c. Faust.* XVI. 2 (CSEL 25.1. 441.4-11): *nam ego quidem scripturas eius perscrutatus, ut iussum est, nullas ibidem de Christo prophetias inveni, sive quia nullae sunt, sive quia intelligere ipse non potui. unde in ingenti positus aestu ratione cogebar in alterum e duobus, ut aut falsum pronuntia-rem capitulum hoc, aut mendacem Iesum. Sed id quidem alienum pietatis erat, deum existimare mentitum. rectius ergo uisum est, scriptoribus ascribere falsitatem, quam veritatis auctori mendacium.*

³⁰ Vide, N.J. BAKER-BRIAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 182-3.

There is a two-fold structure to the Manichaean arguments preserved in the sixteenth book of the *c. Faust.* First, Faustus demonstrates that no such witnesses exist in the books of the Law and the Prophets who can be brought forward to offer a proclamation of Jesus; second, he employs an antithetical series of arguments to illustrate the separation of the Jewish and Christian traditions.³¹ Three antitheses are introduced to illustrate the division, all of which draw on the previous arguments of Adimantus: the religious importance of the Sabbath and the requirement of rest from labour in Ex. 20. 8-11 set against the repudiation of Sabbath observance by Jesus in Jn. 5. 17;³² the cultic significance of circumcision and the punishment of those remaining uncircumcised in Gen. 17. 9-14, against the judgement of Jesus in Mt. 23. 15 that a circumcised man becomes a two-fold son of Gehenna;³³ and, the extensive list of prohibited and permissible foods in Lev. 11, Ex. 20. 8-11, Ex. 31. 13-17, and the instruction of Jesus in Mt. 15. 11 which is taken to represent teaching to the contrary, that pollution is only caused by what comes out of a man's mouth and not by that which enters into it. The important feature of all three examples is that Jesus is seen to repudiate specific points of the Law (the Sabbath, circumcision, dietary requirements); and although these examples are not self-contained units of the type best represented by Jesus'

³¹ Faustus apud Augustine, *c. Faust.* XVI. 6 (CSEL 25.1. 444. 11-13): ...*quia dissimilis admodum traditio est et longe altera Moyseos et Christi, ut si eorum alteri Iudaei crederent, alteri necessario repugnarent.*

³² Faustus apud Augustine, *c. Faust.* XVI. 6 (CSEL 25.1. 444.14-18): [Note Moses is the author of the law even though God gave the command]: *nam Moyses quidem prae ceteris ab opere omni abstinendum docet in sabbato causamque inducit religionis huius hanc esse, quia deus cum mundum et quae in eo sunt omnia fabricaret, sex diebus indulerit operi, septima vero cessaverit- quod est sabbatum.* Cf. Adimantus's argument in *c. Adim.* 2 (CSEL 25.1 116. 22-117.2), where Jn. 5. 17 is set against Gen. 2. 2 (also discussed earlier by Augustine in his *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* I. xxii. 33): *De eo quod scriptum est: et consummauit deus die sexto omnia opera sua, quae fecit, et in septimo requieuit ab eisdem omnibus operibus suis quae fecerat. Huic etiam loco Manichaei calumniam mouent et dicunt nouo testamento aduersari, quod in genesi scriptum est deum septimo die requieuisse ab omnibus operibus suis, quae fecit, quoniam dominus in euangelio dicit: pater meus usque modo operatur.*

³³ Faustus apud Augustine, *c. Faust.* XVI. 6 (CSEL 25.1. 445.7-10): *et hoc ergo Iudaei ualde crediderant, adseuerante Moyse, idcircoque fidem Christo habere non poterant infirmanti ea et insuper adseueranti, quod dupliciter gehennae filius fieret, qui esset circumcisis.* Cf. *c. Adim.* 16 where Augustine presents the *disputatio* composed of Gen. 17. 9-14 against Mt. 23. 15 as part of a larger argument which also includes the repudiation of Deut. 5. 12-15 concerning the observation of the Sabbath against the statement from Gal. 4. 10-11 (*dies obseruatis et sabbata et sollemnitates: timeo uos, ne frustra laborauerim in uobis*).

repudiation of Ex. 21. 24 in Mt. 5. 38-40, the importance of these antitheses in Manichaean traditions is that Jesus is presented as providing the point of departure from the influence of Jewish legalism.

While the methodology and examples employed by Faustus in these portions from his *capitula* undeniably reveal the influences of Adimantus, one of the clearest examples of his adoption by Faustus can be seen in the exegesis of the verse from Mt. 15. 11 (*nihil est ingrediens in hominem coinquinans eum, sed ea quae procedunt de eo coinquant*) which is taken straight from the *disputatio* of Adimantus. Turning to the fifteenth chapter of the *c. Adim.*, Augustine reproduces Adimantus's argument comprising the juxtaposition of Lev. 11 with Mt. 15. 11 in the following statement:

Concerning what is written in Leviticus: *Separate the clean from the unclean, and no one shall eat the meat of the camel, or of the ass, or of the rabbit, or of the swine, or of the eagle, or of the kite (miluus), or of the crow, or of the vulture, nor of those others which remain ...* [Adimantus] thought that this passage from the Gospel where the Lord said, *Nothing entering a man pollutes him, but those things which come from him pollute him*, ought to be opposed to the reading from Leviticus.³⁴

The crucial point for Augustine concerns the comparison of this argument with the previous *disputatio* preserved in chapter fourteen of the *c. Adim.*, where Rom. 14.21 (*bonum est non manducare carnem neque bibere vinum*) together with Lk. 21. 34, and 1 Cor. 10. 21, had been set against Deut. 12. 15-16.³⁵ For Augustine, the fact that Adimantus in one argument employed a text which stated that *It is good not to eat meat and drink wine*, and in another the saying that *Nothing entering into a man pollutes him* was the clearest indication of his signally opportunistic approach to interpreting the text (*hoc si imprudens*

³⁴ *c. Adim.* 15 (CSEL 25.1. 154.4-15): *De eo quod in leuitico scriptum est: separate a mundo immundum et nemo manducet carnem cameli, asini et leporis et porci et aquilae et milui et corui et vultures et reliquorum ... namque huic sententiae illud ex euangelio credidit obponendum, ubi dominus dicit: nihil est ingrediens in hominem coinquinans eum, sed ea quae procedunt de eo, coinquant.*

³⁵ *c. Adim.* 14 (CSEL 25.1. 148.1-11): *De eo quod scriptum est in deuteronomio: secundum desiderium animae tuae occide et manduca omnem carnem iuxta uoluptatem quam dedit tibi dominus. cave autem, ne sanguinem manduces, sed effunde tamquam aquam super terram. his uerbis legis Adimantus contrarium esse arbitratur quod in euangelio dominus ait: non grauentur corda uestra cruditate, et vinolentia et curis saecularibus et quod ait apostolus: bonum est non manducare carnem, neque bibere uinum, et iterum: non potestis mensae domini participare et mensae daemoniorum.*

fecit, nihil caecius: si autem sciens, nihil sceleratius).³⁶ Augustine continued by suggesting that Adimantus himself had recognised that there was a glaring disparity between the meanings of the two texts, and in order to remedy this problem, he had annotated his argument by emphasising that the Matthean verse had been spoken by Jesus *ad turbam*.³⁷ Augustine notes that this was done not only to ameliorate a clear contradiction between the teachings of two of the foremost prophets within Manichaeism (viz. Jesus and Paul), but principally because Adimantus had wanted to distinguish the dietary requirements of the *electi* from those of the *auditores*. This argument is related by Augustine in the following statement:

[Adimantus] recalled that the Lord spoke this [saying] to the crowd ... in order that later he [Adimantus] should say to the Hearers that the Lord spoke these things to the crowd and not to a few sacred people, such as they [the Elect] themselves wished to be seen; since, they [the Elect] permit their Hearers to eat meat in so far as they are in an unclean state, whereas the Elect think that it is utterly depraved and execrable for them [to eat meat] as if they were clean.³⁸

³⁶ c. *Adim.* 15 (CSEL 25.1. 154.7-16): *nusquam manifestius plenissima dolis et fraudibus anima huius hominis deprehendi potest, qui tanquam sibi aduersa atque contraria de utroque testamento capitula obiecit, quam in hoc loco, ubi commemorauit in leuitico scriptum esse, ut a nonnullis animalium carnibus temperetur. namque huic sententiae illud ex euangelio credidit obponendum, ubi dominus dicit: nihil est ingrediens in hominem coinquinans eum, sed ea, quae procedunt de eo, coinquinant. hoc si imprudens fecit, nihil caecius; si autem sciens, nihil sceleratius.*

³⁷ Vide c. *Faust.* VI. 6, for clear evidence of Adimantus's reading of Mt. 25. 11; v. text below, nt. 37.

³⁸ c. *Adim.* 15 (CSEL 25.1. 156.18-25): *commemorauit dominum hoc ad turbam dixisse ... ut postea diceret auditoribus suis ad turbam dominum ista locutum esse, non ad paucos sanctos, quales se ipsi videri volunt, ut, quoniam suos auditores tamquam adhuc immundos permittunt carnibus uesci, sibi autem quasi iam mundis consceleratum et nefarium esse arbitrantur.* Augustine's response to Faustus's reading of Mt. 15. 11 stresses that Jesus reiterated what he had said to the crowd, to his disciples *remotus a turbis* (c. *Faust.* VI. 6. (CSEL 25.1. 293.1-2)). The whole passage pertaining to this issue reads as follows (c. *Faust.* VI. 6 (CSEL 25.1. 292.21-293.16)) : *ita delirantes adhuc putatis, quod ideo sumus inimici ueteris testamenti, quia nullam carnem immundam dicimus tenentes apostoli sententiam dicentis: omnia munda mundis (Tit. 1. 15), et illud, ubi dominus ait: non quod intrat in os uestrum, uos coinquinat, sed quod exit (Matt. 15. 11). quod non ad solas turbas dominus dixit, sicut uester Adimantus, quem post Manichaeum Faustus praecipue laudat, cum ueteri testamento calumniaretur, uoluit intelligi, sed etiam remotus a turbis hoc idem discipulis suis euidentius et expressius elocutus est. cum enim hanc domini sententiam testamento ueteri obposuisset Adimantus, quia in illo scripta sunt quaedam immunda carnis, a quibus ille populus iussus est abstinere, timuit ne sibi diceretur: cur ergo uos non quasdam, sed omnes carnes immundas existimatis atque ab edendis omnibus temperatis, cum tu ipse proferas euangelium testimonium, non coinquinari hominem ex*

This particular issue raises some new areas of investigation, primarily concerning the way that Manichees used biblical passages as proof-texts to illustrate that their codes and practices had solid foundations in the teachings of Jesus and Paul; representing, perhaps, one of the most important qualifiers for the internal identity of the Manichaean church. Indeed, we can go further and indicate that the Manichaean community perceived the scriptural text as a record of instructions to be received in a literal and utilitarian manner, and as a source whose teachings were tailored to the various duties and responsibilities corresponding with the bicameral structure of their movement. Thus, in these two Adimantian examples, Jesus' saying was taken to determine the dietary characteristics of the Hearers, whilst Paul's saying outlined the ascetic lifestyle of the Elect.³⁹

In the *capitula*, we see the faithful transmission of this late third century argument into a late fourth century context. Faustus reproduces the argument exactly, maintaining the line of interpretation ascribed to Adimantus, that Jesus spoke for the benefit of the crowd in a manner which dictated that the laity are not required to distinguish certain items of food as prohibited, whilst upholding the stipulation for the *discipuli* that meat ought not to be consumed, serving as they

his, quae in os ingrediuntur et in uentrem uadunt atque in latrinam emittuntur? itaque has artissimas et fallaciam suam manifestissima ueritate praefocantes angustias conatus euadere ait hoc dominum ad turbas dixisse, quasi paucis ille in secreto uera diceret, in turbas autem falsa iactaret, cum et hoc de domino credere sacrilegum sit, et omnes qui legunt, nouerint hoc et remotis turbis eum planius dixisse discipulis.

³⁹ Evidence for "targeted exegesis" of the scriptures can be found in numerous places in Manichaean literature. By way of citing just one example, v. *Kephalaion* 91. 229. 6-15, for an indication as to the manner in which Manichaeism developed the correlation between biblical proof-texts and the graduations within their Church. Whilst discussing the possibility that Manichaean Hearers who live a perfect life in imitation of the *electi* can be saved immediately without having to undergo transmigration, the *Kephalaion* reports Mani as citing 1 Cor. 7. 29-31 in order to establish an unbroken line of continuity between Manichaean teaching on the unblemished catechumenate, who recognise the true value of material wealth, and the original source of this instruction from Paul the Apostle. The evidence for "targeted exegesis" in the *c. Adim.* corresponds with similar evidence preserved in germane texts from within the Latin Manichaean tradition itself, namely the *codex Thevestinus*. In A col. 46 (8), the author of the work introduces the biblical *exempla* of "the two sisters", namely Mary and Martha (Lk. 10. 38-42; Jn. 12. 2) as the typological representations for the bicameral structure of the Manichaean community. For text and commentary, v. M. STEIN, *Manichaica Latina Band 3. 1: codex Thevestinus* (Paderborn, 2004), p. 48; pp. 265-270. For an English translation, v. JASON BEDUHN & GEOFFREY HARRISON, "The Tebessa Codex: A Manichaean Treatise on Biblical Exegesis and Church Order", in PAUL MIR-ECKI & JASON BEDUHN (eds.), *Emerging from Darkness: Studies in the Recovery of Manichaean Sources* (Leiden, 1997), pp. 33-87.

did as the template for the *pauci sancti* of the Manichaean community.⁴⁰ Therefore, on this occasion we can clearly demonstrate the influence of Adimantus on a *capitulum* of Faustus.

Thus, it is reasonable to suggest that in a number of instances, Faustus replicated the theses of Adimantus, and yet in certain instances he used the arguments as the foundation for his own challenge. One particular example illustrates this process of adaptation well, in the opening chapters of books four and fifteen of the *c. Faust.* Our area of interest is only a small part of a much larger Manichaean argument explaining, with the assistance of analogies drawn from the bible, the reasons for their rejection of the Old Testament. Faustus turns his attentions towards the theme of rewards (*praemia*) and cites some examples of those offered by the *deus Hebraeorum* to worshippers who abide by his wishes. These rewards, referred to by Faustus as *sordidi quaestus*, comprise gold and silver, an abundance of food (*saturitas ventris*), and the land of Canaan.⁴¹ An interest in comparing and contrasting the rewards presented by the gods of the two Testaments appears to have been one of Adimantus's foundational themes, forming the centrepiece of his comparison between the mammonish excesses of the Law and the Prophets with what was perceived to be the leading concern with ascetic restraint present in the teachings of Jesus and Paul. In the related but wider sense, Adimantus also employed the antitheses in order to illustrate the localised and material gifts offered by the Jewish god (alias the *princeps tenebrarum*) to those who abided by the Law of Moses (rewards unwittingly leading believers to bind Matter and Light closer together), in contrast to the

⁴⁰ Faustus apud Augustine, *c. Faust.* XVI. 6 (CSEL 25.1. 445.16-23): *haec ergo Iudaei fortiter crediderunt scribente Moyse idcircoque Christo iam credere non poterant indifferentiam docenti ciborum et a suis quidem discipulis omnia penitus remouenti, saecularibus uero uulgo concedenti omnia quae possent edi, atque adseueranti, quod eos nihil in os intrans pollueret, quia quae de ore inpudenter procedant, ea sola sint, quae polluant hominem.* Cf. Faustus apud Augustine, *c. Faust.* XXX. 2.

⁴¹ Faustus apud Augustine, *c. Faust.* IV. 1 (CSEL 25.1. 268.12-17): *an ignoras testamentum uetus Chananaeorum terram repromittere, sed eam tamen Iudaeis, id est, circumcisis et sacrificantibus et abstinentibus a porcina ac reliquis carnibus, quas immundas Moyses appellat, sabbata obseruantibus, et azymorum sollemnitatem, ac reliqua huiusmodi, quae eius ipse testator eis obseruanda mandauit?* Also, Faustus apud Augustine, *c. Faust.* XV. 1 (CSEL 25.1. 416. 12-20): *uestra sane ecclesia usurpet testamentum uetus, quae ut lasciuia uirgo inmemor pudoris, alieni uiri et muneribus gaudet et litteris. amator denique ille uester et pudoris corruptor Hebraeorum Deus diptychio lapideo suo aurum uobis promittit et argentum, uentris saturitatem et terram Chananaeorum. hi uos delectauerunt tam sordidi quaestus, ut libeat peccare post Christum, ut sitis ingrati tam inmensis dotibus eius. haec uos incitiunt, ut in Hebraeorum depereatis Deo post nuptias Christi.*

spiritual rewards presented to the followers of God the Father (ultimately, freedom from the confines of Matter). Augustine has preserved at least four examples of such arguments from the work of Adimantus, and the possibility is that many more existed. The key arguments are as follows:

- i) Haggia 2.9 vs. Lk. 16. 9 and Tim. 6. 10⁴²
- ii) Deut. 28. 1-6 vs. Mt. 16. 24-26, Mt. 5. 35 and Mk. 8.38.⁴³
- iii) *ego sum qui diuitias do amicis meis et paupertatem inimicis* vs. Mt. 5. 3, Lk. 6. 24.⁴⁴
- iv) Lev. 26. 3-10 vs. Mt. 10. 9-10, Lk. 12. 20.⁴⁵

⁴² s. L. 1 (CCSL XXLI. 625. 1-15): *De Aggo propheta Manichaei calumniantur, inuidiose accusantes quod dixerit ex persona dei loquentis: Meum est aurum, et meum est argentum, et quia euangelium ueteri legi student pugnaciter comparare, ut sibi utraeque scripturae uelut aduersariae contrariaeque uideantur, ita proponunt quastionem: 'in Aggeo' inquiunt 'propheta scriptum est: Meum est aurum, et meum est argentum, in euangelio autem saluator noster mammona huiusmodi iniquitatis speciem appellauit, de cuius usu beatus apostolus ad Timotheum scribens: Radix autem omnium malorum, inquit, est auaritia, quam quidam appetentes, auersi sunt a fide et inseruerunt se doloribus multis.'*

⁴³ C. Adim. 18 (CSEL 21.1. 172. 15-26): *De eo quod in deuteronomio scriptum est: si aure audieris uocem domini dei tui, benedictus es in agro tuo, benedictus es in prato tuo, benedictus fructus uentris tui et fructus terrae tuae et generationes iumentorum tuorum et armentum bouum tuorum et grex ouium tuarum: benedictus es in introitu tuo et ergressu. huic capitulo illud dicunt in euangelio esse contrarium: si quis uult me sequi, abneget semet ipsum sibi et tollat crucem suam et sequatur me, quid enim prode est homini, si totum mundum lucretur, animae autem suae detrimentum patiar? aut quam dabit homo commutationem pro anima sua?*

⁴⁴ C. Adim. 19 (CSEL 25.1. 175. 8-13): *De eo quod scriptum est in lege: ego sum, qui diuitias do amicis meis et paupertatem inimicis. huic sententiae illud obponunt, quod dominus dicit: beati pauperes spiritu, quoniam ipsorum est regnum caelorum et: uae uobis diuitibus, quia percepistis consolationem uestram.*

⁴⁵ c. Adim. 20 (CSEL 25.1. 176.21-177.16): *De eo quod scriptum est in lege: si ambulaueritis in lege et praecepta mea custodieritis, dabo pluuias tempore suo et producet terra fructus suos et arbores poma et uindemiae tuae messibus succedent et satio uindemiis: et saturabimini et sedebitis in pace in terra uestra et dormietis et non erit qui uos terreat; et perdam omnem beluam ex terra uestra et persequimini inimicos uestros, et cadent ante uos in gladio; et insequentur quinque ex uobis centum et centum ex uobis persequentur decem milia et concident inimici uestri ante uos in gladio: et ueniam et benedicam uos, et multiplicabo uos et disponam uos. Manducabitis uetus, quod inueterauit, et proicietis uetus ante nouum. ... Sed tamen quod etiam huic loco de nouo testamento dicunt esse contrarium illud uidelicet, quod dominus ait: nolite portare aurum neque argentum neque nummos in zonis uestris, non peram in uia neque duas tunicas neque calciamenta neque uirgam: dignus est enim operarius mercede sua ... (CSEL 25/1. 178.3-5): Addunt etiam de illo diuite, cui deus dixerat: stulte, hac nocte a te animam tuam expetam: quae autem praeparasti cuius erunt?*

The roots of this theme lie deep within Manichaeian traditions, and undoubtedly stretch back to the teachings of Mani, who is reported to have repudiated earthly treasures for "an immortal treasure [given by the Father], which does not pass away."⁴⁶ The fact that this antithesis was presented in vivid relief in the two Testaments appealed to Adimantus, who made much of the contrast between the material gifts of the *deus Hebraeorum* and the spiritual rewards of Jesus in the Gospel.

It is indeed very likely that the arguments of Adimantus served as a template for the concerns of Faustus; nevertheless, it is also apparent that when compared with the attention given to the theme of rewards in the scriptural text by Adimantus, Faustus of Milevis did not devote a great deal of his work to the role of *praemia* in his *capitula*. The difference in emphasis between the concerns of the two writers can only therefore be explained by the distinct intentions which their writings served. With regard to this particular theme, Faustus refers to *praemia* as part of his attempt to develop a corporate response explaining to Catholics the reasons for the Manichaeian rejection of the Law and the Prophets (*quare non accipitis Testamentum Vetus?*).⁴⁷ In contrast, the importance of these arguments for Adimantus lay in the individual issues brought to light by the disputations, and the implications that such antitheses had for the Manichaeian community. This explains in part why we see very little emphasis in Faustus's *capitula* on the interpretation of particular antithetical units à la Adimantus. What is important for Faustus is to provide a wider response concerning the points of separation between Catholic and Manichaeian traditions, and the reception of the Law and the Prophets provides one of the main areas of divergence.⁴⁸ The differences between

⁴⁶ *Cologne Mani Codex* 75. 16-18: ed. L. KOENEN and C. RÖMER, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex. Über das Werden seines Leibes. Kritische Edition aufgrund der von A. Henrichs und L. Koenen besorgten Erstedition herausgegeben von Ludwig Koenen und Cornelia Römer*. Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Sonderreihe Papyrologica Coloniensia; XIV (Opladen, 1988), 52; ET: R. CAMERON and A.J. DEWEY (Montana, 1979), p. 59.

⁴⁷ Cf. G. WURST, "Bemerkungen zu Struktur und *genus litterarium* der *Capitula* des Faustus von Mileve", pp. 318-322.

⁴⁸ Another important area of concern for Faustus in the *capitula* lay in the discussions surrounding the Catholic understanding of the Incarnation (derived in part from Faustus's reading of the genealogies in Mt. and Lk.) in relation to Manichaeian Christology (viz. Faustus, apud Augustine, c. *Faust.* XVI. 4). There is a possibility that Faustus's repudiation of the Catholic christological position also derived from Adimantus, perhaps from the *disputationes* or from a different work, as according to the anathema formulae of Zacharias of Mitylene (*Capita VII contra Manichaeos* (4. 113))

the two Testaments- their authorship, contents and intentions- highlights for Faustus the chasm between the Jewish-Christian and Manichaean religions. This approach is undeniably derived from the principles informing the hermeneutical strategy of Adimantus; however, Adimantus in examining individual passages from the scriptures, wished to demonstrate the precise points of difference between the understanding and actions of the two traditions primarily in the areas of theological discourse, behavioural demands, anthropological reflection, and ascetic considerations. Therefore, although the *disputationes* demonstrate the separation of the two Testaments, careful attention needs to be paid to each argument precisely because they illustrate the principal areas according to which Manichaeism determined its separation from its Jewish-Christian heritage.

Nevertheless, it is fair to say that Faustus appears to have understood this nuanced quality of Adimantus's argument. Whilst he may not have chosen to concentrate on antitheses in the mould of Adimantus, we can still detect the influence of the *discipulus Manichaei* on the contents of the *capitula*. Indeed, in order to appreciate the full significance of his influence, it requires us to reassess what we have thus far presumed to be the main interest of Adimantus. It may be that the clearest sign of Faustus's dependence on Adimantus is not in the use of antitheses, but in the awareness that the scriptural text is practically applicable to the sensibilities of its Manichaean audience. As we have seen, Adimantus sought to explain the passages Mt. 15. 11 and Rom. 14. 21 as informing the behaviour and responsibilities of the Hearers and the Elect respectively. Taking this as a starting point for understanding the purpose of his work, we are now in a position to begin a revaluation of the long-standing assessment of Adimantus as a polemicist, whose only concern was with illustrating the divergence between the Law and the Gospel. Whilst Adimantus's hermeneutic is both antithetical and controversial, it can nevertheless be plausibly maintained that he was also looking to annotate his arguments with the awareness that the passages he employed were directly relevant in terms of defining and determining the needs and activities of his community; in other words, Adimantus wished to transmit a series of biblical proof-texts for informing Manichaean thought and action. This is perhaps where we see Adimantus's true influence on

Mani, Addas and Adeimantos (treated as two separate individuals) are cited as the figures who repudiate the mystery of the Incarnation; for the text, translation and commentary, v. SAMUEL N.C. LIEU, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Near East*, p. 242.

Faustus. Aspects of the *capitula* demonstrate that Faustus continued in this line of exegesis, borrowing important biblical passages employed by Adimantus and demonstrating his own commitment to the moral injunctions of the Gospel: thus, positing reasons for Faustus's use of Adimantian material in this manner is surely a pressing matter for investigation.

It can be argued therefore that scriptural exegesis understood in terms of acting on the injunctions of the Gospel was a concern of some importance for Adimantus, as his *disputationes* flag a total of seventeen sayings from the Gospel which represent a call to an ascetic way of life in the mould of Jesus and his apostles, set against those passages from the Law and the Prophets which advocated engagement with the familial and mercantile concerns of the world.⁴⁹ In one memorable section of his *capitula* Faustus takes a number of these passages and creates an autobiographical gallimaufry demonstrating his commitment to the Gospel and the ascetic lifestyle in imitation of the apostles:⁵⁰ above all else, this portrait is a shameless piece of self-promotion. Indeed, it could be argued that Faustus's portrayal of himself as the devoted adherent of Jesus' injunctions played a crucial role in the Manichaean defence of their exegetical approach against the challenge brought by the Catholics: thus, accepting (and by implication, understanding) the Gospel is about acting on what Jesus taught and ordered,

⁴⁹ For examples of some of these antitheses from Adimantus v. c. *Adim.* 3- Gen. 2. 18-24 vs. Mt. 19. 29; c. *Adim.* 4- Gen. 4. 10-12 vs. Mt. 6. 34; 26; c. *Adim.* 6- Ex. 20. 12 vs. Lk. 9. 59-60; c. *Adim.* 14- Deut. 12. 15-16 vs. Lk. 21. 34; Rom. 14. 21; 1 Cor. 10. 21.

⁵⁰ Faustus apud Augustine, c. *Faust.* V. 1 (CSEL 25.1. 271.11-13): *Ego patrem dimisi et matrem, uxorem, filios et cetera quae euangelium iubet* (Mt. 19. 29); cf. c. *Adim.* 3 (CSEL 25.1. 118.19-24): *huic rursus loco* (Gen. 2. 18-24) *Manichaei calumniantur, dicentes contra nouum testamentum esse istam sententiam, qua deus scribitur et formasse mulierem et uiro coniunxisse, propterea quia in euangelio dicit dominus: omnis qui reliquerit domum aut uxorem aut parentes aut fratres aut filios propter regnum caelorum ...* Faustus apud Augustin, c. *Faust.* V. 1 (CSEL 25.1. 271.15-16): *Ego aurum argentumque reieci et aes in zonis habere destiti* (Mt. 10. 9-10); cf. c. *Adim.* 20 (CSEL 25.1. 177.11-14): *sed tamen quod etiam huic loco* (Lev. 26. 3-10) *de nouo testamento dicunt [Manichaei] esse contrarium illud uidelicet, quod dominus ait: nolite portare aurum neque argentum neque nummos in zonis uestris.* Faustus apud Augustine, c. *Faust.* V. 1 (CSEL 25.1. 271.21-24): *uides pauperem, uidetes mitem, uidetes pacificum, puro corde* (Mt. 5. 8-9)... *et dubitas utrum accipiam euangelium?* cf. c. *Adim.* 19 (CSEL 25.1. 175. 14-16): *beati pauperes spiritu, quoniam ipsorum est regnum coelorum ... beati mites, quoniam ipsi hereditate possidebunt terram.* Concerning the Manichaean imitation of this apostolic paradigm, v. the important study by DANIEL CANER, *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2002), pp.76-78.

and not solely believing in the genealogies stating that Christ was born.⁵¹

How Adimantus was remembered by fourth century Manichees is an important question which requires further investigation. We may tentatively conclude at this stage that there was more to Adimantus's literary legacy than simply the remembrance of a polemicist who advanced the cause of Manichaeism in the Empire through biblical antitheses. Whilst this may have been his principal achievement, it may also be true that an important aspect explaining the standing of Adimantus within the Manichaean community lay in his role as the custodian *par excellence* of those biblical texts which defined the cultic responsibilities of Manichaeism. According to the clues garnered from the *capitula* of Faustus, Adimantus's *disputationes* also had the collective status as compendium of scriptural passages, containing important practical instructions drawn from the teachings of the Apostles of Light, Jesus and Paul, and which in turn were adopted as the templates for the behaviour and responsibilities of the community. That such arguments could have a dual purpose appears plausible; indeed, the two characteristics of polemics and didactics coalesce in the sense that Manichees could illustrate to other Christian groups where they had been led astray by the corrupting influence of the Law and the Prophets, by demonstrating the extent to which Manichaean doctrine and practices were squarely in line with the precedents of the Apostles.

Dr. N. J. BAKER-BRIAN

⁵¹ Faustus apud Augustine, c. *Faust.* V. 3 (CSEL 25.1. 273.8-18): *Age ergo, ipsum eundem interrogemus Christum, et unde potissimum nobis salutis oriatur occasio, ex eius ore discamus. ... non dixit: docentes eos quia sim natus, sed ut mandata consequerent. item alibi: amici mei eritis, si feceritis quae praecipio vobis, non dixit: si natum me credideritis.* Cf. G. STROUMSA, "The Words and the Works: Religious Knowledge and Salvation in Augustine and Faustus of Milevis", in S.N. EISENSTADT and I.F. SILBER (eds.), *Knowledge and Society: Studies in the Sociology of Culture Past and Present* vol. 7 (Connecticut, 1988), pp. 73-84.