Biblical quotations in Faustus’s *Capitula*

Scholars are still of the opinion that Augustine first started to read and discuss the Bible only once he became a Catholic Christian, or even only after his appointment as a Catholic priest. The possibility of Manichaean influences on Augustine’s reproduction of biblical texts is therefore, in many cases, not taken into account. However, the study of (Latin) Manichaean sources gives us reason to rethink that position. This article is an investigation of the use of Scripture in the most extensive, still existing Manichaean work, originally written in Latin, namely the *Capitula*. Its author was the Manichaean bishop Faustus (flor. app. 380 CE Roman Africa). The most important subject in the *Capitula* concerns those parts of Scripture that bear relevance to the real Christian. Therefore, the work provides important insight into the Manichaeans’ use and appreciation of Scripture. Faustus was well-known to the young Augustine and as a consequence the *Capitula* could well give us important insights into Augustine’s knowledge of and opinions on Scripture as a Manichaean hearer. One problem with this theory is the fact that Augustine only received the work some 13 years after his conversion to Catholic Christianity. However, the examination of the quotations from Scripture, that have as its focus those from the Old Testament, illustrates, amongst others, that Faustus mainly used Biblical texts already quoted in the works of Adas/Adimantus (flor. 270 CE). The *Capitula* turns out to be an eloquent recycling of earlier Manichaean biblical arguments – a fact that makes it very likely that the content of the *Capitula* was known to Augustine in his Manichaean years. As a consequence, one should reckon with Manichaean influence on Augustine’s reproduction of biblical texts.

**Introduction**

Faustus is an important witness to Manichaean beliefs in North Africa in the time of Augustine for two reasons. Firstly, he was an important person; he ranked highly in Mani’s Church, being one of its 72 bishops. From Augustine’s *Confessiones* we may also conclude that Faustus had a considerable reputation amongst the Manichaeans; he was considered to be the most important authority on questions about the teachings of the Manichaeans (see Van den Berg 2010:57, n. 34). Secondly, Faustus was the author of the *Capitula*, which is the most extensive still extant Manichaean work originally written in Latin (cf. Wurst [2001] 2012:307).

Thanks to Augustine, the *Capitula* were preserved for posterity, because in his *Contra Faustum* Augustine first quoted Faustus’s words in *in extenso*, after which he commented on them. In this way, Augustine discussed every chapter of the *Capitula*, dealing with one separate *capitulum* in each of the books of his *Contra Faustum*.

The most important subject in the *Capitula* concerns which parts of Scripture bear relevance to the real Christian. The *Capitula* contain many biblical quotes both from the Old and the New Testament. Therefore, the work provides much important insight into the Manichaeans’ use and appreciation of Scripture.

Faustus’s *Capitula* also give us an opportunity to learn more about the young Augustine, because Faustus and the young Augustine knew each other quite well. In his introduction to *Contra Faustum Manicheum*, Augustine explicitly refers to the story of his encounter with the Manichaean bishop, as well as his disappointment with Faustus, which Augustine describes as

---

1. See *Augustinus Confessionum libri XIII* 5, 7, 8; ‘iam generat Carthagineum quidam manichaeorum episcopus, Faustus nomine, magnus laqueus diaboli, et multi implicabantur in eo per inlecebram suaviloquentia.’
2. See *Augustinus Contra Faustum Manichaeorum 1*, 1: ‘Commodum autem arbitror sub eius nomine uerba eius ponere et sub meo responsionem meam’.
4. Faustus calls Catholic Christians ‘semichristiani’ (see *Augustinus Contra Faustum Manicheorum 1*, 2).
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an important development on his way to baptism. Besides, Augustine sometimes uses his specific knowledge about Faustus in Contra Faustum Manichaeum, not only to introduce him, but also to refute his arguments. These biographical issues are indicative of the fact that Faustus’s words bring us close to the young Augustine and will possibly give important insights into the still somewhat hidden years of Augustine. The opinions and beliefs of the young Augustine, especially those regarding his scriptural knowledge and his opinions about the contents of the Bible, may well be reflected in Faustus’s words, because Faustus’s work is meant to instruct Manichaeans for their debates with Catholic Christians. In his younger years, Augustine was involved in such discussions (see Van den Berg 2010:58). It is quite possible that Augustine was by no means surprised by the contents of the Capitula when he received the volume, because he already knew its discussions, as well as the biblical texts involved.

All this is important, because scholars still opine that Augustine first started to read and discuss the Bible when he had become a Catholic Christian, or even after his appointment as a Catholic priest. The many biblical quotes in Contra Faustum Manichaeum may well suggest that scholars should rethink this opinion.

Of course, we need to be cautious on this point. Since Augustine says in his introduction to Contra Faustum Manichaeum that he received a copy of the book and that he wrote about its author in the Confessionum libri XIII, it should be concluded that he did not read Faustus’s book before 400. This is at least 13 years after his baptism and some 16 years after their last meeting. It is quite possible that Faustus composed his book after Augustine’s conversion to Catholic Christianity, and that Faustus’s opinions had changed over the years, or that in the meantime his knowledge of Scripture had increased.

We may assume that the analysis of Faustus’s biblical quotations will provide us with some clues about Augustine’s knowledge of Scripture during his Manichaean years.

**Context of the Old Testament quotes**

Because of the quantity of the work itself and the large number of biblical quotations, the focus here is on the Old Testament.

This is still a rather large field, and to come to grips with it, it is useful to have an idea of the context of the quotations.

Whereas Adimantus’s Disputationes, another important Manichaean work that was dedicated to scriptural issues, seem to have been intended for a more offensive purpose (see Van den Berg 2010:167f.), the Capitula are written for a more defensive task, as explicitly stated by Faustus himself:

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

The Catholic Christians’s posing of questions determines the strategy of Faustus and, furthermore, there is something of an educational purpose to the book.

My impression of the Capitula – a view shared by others – has always been that it lacks any structure (see Van den Berg 2010:183). Rather recently, Decret wrote that the Capitula lacks any coherence and that we cannot be sure whether Faustus or Augustine is responsible for the order in the book (Decret 1996–2002:1246). Previously, Monceaux even tried to reconstruct the Capitula (Monceaux 1924).

To my surprise, some sort of arrangement can be identified in the questions that are related to the Old Testament. Firstly, there are five Capitula that discuss the basic question: ‘Why do you not accept the Old Testament?’ It concerns:

- Contra Faustum Manichaeum 4; here, Faustus’s answer is that he does not inherit anything from that Testament, nor accepts that poor inheritance.
- Contra Faustum Manichaeum 6; in this case, he says (in summary): I do not keep its precepts, nor do you.
- Contra Faustum Manichaeum 8; on this occasion, Faustus quotes the word of Jesus not to put new with old, defend the position that the Old Testament should be left aside.
- Contra Faustum Manichaeum 9; in this disputation the apostles are used as an authority to defend the position that the Old Testament should not be accepted.
- Contra Faustum Manichaeum 10; here, Faustus argues that both the Old and the New Testament teach us not to covet what belongs to another.

---


6. This is the case in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 5. In this book Faustus claims to be a real Christian because he obeys the rule of Jesus, for example, about not carrying money in purses, and because in his life one can observe the blessings of the gospel, as he is poor, meek, a peacemaker, pure in heart, and so on. In 5, S Augustine reminds his readers that the Manichaeans did not have money in purses, but that they had money in boxes and bags. This is aimed directly at Faustus: sleeping in a down-filled bed with blankets of goatskins, which is more luxurious than the bed his poor father used to sleep in.

7. Contra Faustum Manichaeum 1, 2–4–7.

8. For example, Houghton (2008:44ff.) minimises possible Manichaean influence on Augustine’s knowledge of Scripture.

9. Contra Faustum Manichaeum 1, 1: ‘hic quodam volumen edidit ... quod cum senisset in manus nostras ...’

10. Although this appears rather obvious, one can not be completely certain about this question. In relation to Adimantus’s Disputationes, Augustine also said in Retractationum libri ii 22, 1 that the work fell into his hands (erenerunt in manus meas ...). There is, however, sound reason to assume that Augustine knew the work from his Manichaean years; see Van den Berg (2010:59).

11. Contra Faustum Manichaeum 1, 2: ‘Satis superque in locum iam traductuserrubis ac judicis superstitionis simil et semichristiorum abunde detecta fallacio a doctissimo scilicet et solo nobis post beatum patrem nostrum Manichaeum studendo Adimanto non ali re usum est, fratres carissimi, hac quoque breuo uolatis et concinna responsa propter callidas et astutas conferentium nobiscum propositiones scribere, quam idem usus ex more parentis sui serpente captatio circumvenire questunculis uoluerint, et ipsi ad respondendum uigilantur eis sitis instructi.’

12. The introduction to the Capitula possibly indicates that the work was written during Faustus’s time in exile. The defensive position of the book, as well as Faustus’s aim to instruct other Manichaeans in how to answer difficult questions, could well indicate this.

13. Contra Faustum Manichaeum 8, 1: ‘nam panum, inquit, nouum nemo aduit vestimento ueteri, aliquan maior siccula fet.’ To this argument, Faustus adds: ‘... quam miser et stultus et insuper ingratus ero, si me ultra addixero seruitute? quippe Paulus inde Galatas arguit, quod in circumcisionem relabentes, ad infirma responsa propter callidas et astutas conferentium nobiscum propositiones scribere, quam idem usus ex more parentis sui serpente captatio circumvenire questunculis uoluerint, et ipsi ad respondendum uigilantur eis sitis instructi.’
The answers are at first straightforward (4 & 6) and then Faustus introduces arguments from the New Testament to deal with the same question: ‘Why do you not accept the Old Testament?’

A second cluster of questions on not accepting the Old Testament concerns the Catholic Christian belief that the Old Testament contains prophecies regarding Christ. This represents a further development of the argument, because it implies a counterargument, dealing as it does with a reason why (parts of) the Old Testament should be accepted. Faustus’s answers become more complicated and imply a greater depth of theological reasoning. Faustus argues against the possibility of prophecies concerning Christ in the Old Testament in the disputations quoted by Augustine in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 12–15:

- **Contra Faustum Manichaeum 12** sets off with the question: ‘Why do you not accept Prophets, as they made prophecies about Christ?’ Faustus gives a threefold answer. Firstly, he says, ‘I searched the Old Testament for prophecies, but found none.’ Further, he quotes from Matthew 3:17, 14 John 8:16ff. and 10:38, to demonstrate that the testimony of the Father was sufficient for Jesus. He presents a third argument concerning the sinful lives of the Prophets, referring to writings of ‘our fathers.’ This *capitulum* seems to be a kind of shorthand for Manichaeans, because it briefly mentions some crucial arguments.

- **Contra Faustum Manichaeum 13** discusses: ‘How can you worship Christ if you do not accept the Prophets?’ Faustus says that even if there are prophecies, they do not matter to him, because he is a gentile and not a Jew.

- In **Contra Faustum Manichaeum 14**, Faustus explains why he does not accept Moses: it is because of his curses, for example against Jesus (cf. Dt 21:23; Gl 3:13).

- **Contra Faustum Manichaeum 15** introduces the question: ‘Why do you not accept the Old Testament?’ In this case, Faustus’s answer comprises a compilation of elements already found in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 4, 6 and 10 with a more intensive sense, because of the use of the metaphor of adultery. Rather unexpectedly at this point, Faustus uses the example of a vessel, being full and fulfilled. In my doctoral dissertation, I suggested that the book *Modion* provides the background for this image (Van den Berg 2010:200–203).

This second stage of argument could be seen as a kind of preparation for a third stage, which is concerned with two New Testament texts that seem to imply that one should accept the Old Testament. This could be regarded as the next counterargument from the Catholic Christian standpoint, because it concerns texts that imply that Christ himself said that Moses and the Prophets wrote about him. In a discussion with Catholic Christians, the words of Jesus comprise the most sensitive area. Therefore, Faustus’s answers are quite long and have a personal, even emotional character:

- **Contra Faustum Manichaeum 16** starts with the questions: ‘Why don’t you accept Moses, since Christ said: Moses wrote about me, and: if you should believe Moses, you will also believe me (Jn 5:46).’ This *capitulum* can be regarded as an elaboration of *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 12. There, Faustus quotes from John. In *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 13, 5 Augustine reacts to these texts by asking why Faustus did not take into account the text under discussion in this *capitulum*. Thus the discussion in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 12, Augustine’s reaction to it in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 13, and the capitulum discussed here, may well reflect a common line of argument in the debates between Catholic and Manichaean Christians. The question itself is rather difficult for Faustus, and he uses eight paragraphs to answer it.

- **Contra Faustum Manichaeum 17**, 18 and 19 deal with one text (Mt 5:17): Why don’t you accept the Law and the Prophets, because Christ says: I did not come to destroy them but to fulfil them. Again Faustus’s answers are quite long, with many arguments put forward.

After this kind of climax, we find a single *capitulum* in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 22 on the question: ‘Why do you defame the Law and the Prophets?’ The answer in 22 is important because it introduces many fresh arguments about the sinful behaviour of the Prophets. In the remainder of the book, this argument is used quite often, and its source is probably a Manichaean text (see *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 12).

The last cluster of arguments in which the Old Testament plays an important role concerns the teachings of the Manichaean themselves. In each case, the Old Testament is used as a kind of weapon against the Catholic Christians:

- **Contra Faustum Manichaeum 25** concerns the (in)finity of God. The Manichaean do not conceive of an omnipresent God. The teaching about two realms, one of light and one of darkness, forbids this. In reaction to the question, Faustus says that Catholic Christians themselves also have a restricted God, because they call him the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Thus Faustus uses the Catholic Christian esteem for the Old Testament to defend himself.

- **Contra Faustum Manichaeum 26** discusses docetism: ‘How could Jesus have died, if he had not been born?’ Faustus counters this problem by asking his opponent: ‘How can Elijah, Moses and Enoch have been born, when you do not believe that they died?’

14. ‘Hic est filius meus, dilectissimus, credite illi.’

15. ‘Ego sum qui testificor de me, et testificatur de me qui me misit pater; ‘si mihi non creditis, dicenst operibus credite.’

16. ‘Alioquin nihil eos de Christo prophetasse abunde iam parentum nostrorum libris praedicantes tam flagitiose uixerunt.’

17. ‘Quapropter haec strictum interim et castigate ad interrogationem tuam responderim, quia quaenors, cur non accipiamus prophetas.’


19. See note 15.

20. Augustine in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 13, 5: ‘et non uultis contra uos inde proferri: scrutamini scripturas … si crederetis Moysi, crederetis et mihi: de me enim ille scripit.’

21. ‘Faustus dixit: Deus finem habet, aut infinitus est?’
• Contra Faustum Manichaeum 30 and 31 treat passages from the Letters to Timothy, quoted to blame the Manicheans. Contra Faustum Manichaeum discusses 1 Timothy 4:1ff., which speaks about people who feared their conscience with a branding iron and erred by forbidding marriage and by abstaining from food.22 Faustus avoids this difficult discussion by saying that the passage must be spurious, because otherwise it would also be contrary to Moses and Prophets like Daniel. Contra Faustum Manichaeum 31 considers 2 Timothy 1:15: ‘To the pure, all things are pure. But to the impure and defiled, nothing is pure.’23 Faustus again uses the example of Daniel to demonstrate that this text must be considered spurious by Catholic Christians as well.

• Contra Faustum Manichaeum 32 refers to the question why the Manicheans do not accept everything from the Gospel. The attitude of Catholic Christians towards the Old Testament is used by Faustus as an argument against accepting everything from the New Testament as well.

The last issue, found in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 33, very fittingly discusses a subject concerned with the ‘eschaton’. It deals with the question why the Manicheans do not acknowledge the patriarchs, whereas Jesus said that many shall come from east and west, and sit with Isaac and Jacob.

Although the structure of the Capitula is not very tight, there is a kind of thematic arrangement. There is a degree of continuous building on previous sections to be identified, especially in the first half of the book. When we read the Capitula as a scholarly textbook, Faustus’s arrangement makes some sense.

After I identified this thematic arrangement, I reread Gregor Wurst’s study of the structure of the Capitula, in which he denies the possibility of a thematic order. Nevertheless, he argues on formal grounds that there is a break after Contra Faustum Manichaeum 11 and after 19. His argument is based on the use of the singular in the questions in the first 10 Capitula and the use of the plural in the next seven. The last 15 are different in appearance from the first two groups (Wurst [2001] 2012:318–322). Wurst’s conclusion coincides largely with my findings.

The form of the Old Testament texts

As regards the Old Testament texts used in the discussion, it can be observed that many references are not quotations in a strict sense. In most cases we find short references to names (Moses, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and so on), or subjects (such as commandments) from the Old Testament. The majority of the discussion is not about a text (capitulum) from the Old Testament, but about a subject.24

There are some lists of Old Testament subjects that appear quite regularly in the discussion; for example, laws,25 some clusters of curses,26 an overview of important blessings,27 and a summary of the moral offences of the Prophets.28 Especially the inventory of laws is prevalent, seemingly used as a kind of foundation for the debates with Catholic Christians. Faustus uses it to solve all kinds of problems, amongst them to explain why the Old Testament’s inheritance is not for Catholic Christians, and to demonstrate that Christ had taught a different truth. The order of the words and the length of the list are variable. It can be found as a simple list, as in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 4.29 The inventory also appears in a more elaborate way, as in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 16, 631 and 18, 2. One cannot say much about the text traditions that are used in these lists of subjects related to the Old Testament, because the phrases are too short, or a paraphrase. Faustus demonstrates a great ability to reformulate his material, especially in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 18, 2:

Is it right to be circumcised [cf. Gn 17:9–14], that is, to mark the shame with shame and believe that God is pleased by such sacraments? Is it right to observe the Sabbath rest [cf. e.g. Nm 15:35] and entangle oneself in the fetters of the sodality of Saturnus? Is it right to satisfy the gluttony of the Jewish demon, for he is not God, with the sacrificing at one time of bulls, another time of rams, or even he-goats [cf. e.g. Lv 1–7], not to mention even humans [cf. e.g. Gn 22:2] and now exercise the practices for which we left the idols, in a more cruel way under the Prophets and the Law? To conclude, is it right to judge the meate of some...
dead animals as clean, and to treat others as unclean and defiling [cf. Lv 20:25], among which the flesh of the swine is the most defiling according to the Law and the Prophets [e.g. Dt 14:8].

There is, however, one interesting word in these lists. In *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 19, 5 one finds the following Old Testament laws:

I find sabbaths, circumcision, sacrifices, new moons, washings, unleavened bread, distinction of food, drink, clothes and other things which will take too long to discuss. This list of Old Testament laws is one of the longest we can find in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*. The word ‘washings’ is important. The Latin word used here, ‘baptismata’, is a translation of the Hebrew סמים, which is in Greek, πλύνω. The common Latin translation is ‘lavare’. Neither the Greek verb ‘baptizomai’, nor its noun – which would have been expected – is found in the LXX-text of the Pentateuch, nor its Latin equivalent in the Vulgate. The rendering ‘baptismata’ may have been influenced by Mark 7:4: ‘And from the market, they (the Pharisees) do not eat anything unless it has been washed (baptizentur).’ It is a feature rather frequently found in Manichaean literature that Old Testament quotations are quoted in accordance with their New Testament form (see Van den Berg 2010:130). I would cautiously propose another possibility as well. In the *Capitula* the subject ‘cleaning’ and the specific word for it (‘baptismata’) is only found in this list and in the next paragraph. In this *capitulum* Faustus argues autobiographically, and he explicitly praises his teacher for preventing him from obeying these rules. Quite possibly, the word ‘baptisms’ was written in one of the Manichaean books on these issues (or even more specifically on Mt 5) that Faustus read when he was converted to Manichaeism. If this were the case, one might wonder whether the word ‘baptisms’ was used because of the debates of the Manichaens with the baptising community from which they emerged. Possibly the baptising community had a text tradition in which an equivalent of ‘baptismata’ was used.

Apart from the short references to the Old Testament, there are also some longer quotations from the Old Testament. These longer sentences from the Old Testament (most of them are found in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 16 & 17) have characteristics in common with Adimantus’s quotations from Scripture in his *Disputationes* (see Van den Berg 2010:130). Very often one can find paraphrases, or combinations of several texts. This feature has already been observed in the ‘quotations’ found in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 16, 6 and 18, 2. A further example of a paraphrase is found in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* where Faustus refers to the law that a Prophet, who leads the people astray, should be killed. A clear example of the combination of different texts from Deuteronomy is found in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 17.2.

Sometimes Faustus’s quotation of the Old Testament appears to be influenced by a New Testament rendering of an Old Testament text, as for example, in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 16, 4 where we find: ‘His God said to Moses: I will raise up for them a prophet from your brothers, like you.’ This appears to quote Deuteronomy 18:15. Faustus’s text, however, is a bit shorter, for it lacks the phrase ‘from your race’ (de gente tua). Interestingly, this is also the case in Acts 3:22, which may well indicate that the New Testament version influenced Faustus’s quotation.

A remarkable feature is found in *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 16, 5. There, Faustus explicitly criticises the Catholic Christian reading of the text and Faustus’s remark is certainly apposite: Or will you bring up, what you use to employ: They will see their life hanging, and not believe? To which you add ‘on the wood’; because it does not have these words.

Some thoughts about Faustus’s sources

In the *Capitula*, Faustus relates that he was a pagan before he became an adherent of Mani’s church. So we may safely assume that much, if not all, that Faustus knows about Scripture was learnt during his Manichaean years.

There are reasons to suppose that the source of his knowledge may well have been specific Manichaean as well. In the introduction, Faustus indicates that he is highly impressed

---

32. Placet circumcisci, id est, pudendis insigne esse, et non credere sacramentis talibus defectantibus? placet suscipere sabbatum etum et Saturni comatus manum insertere catenis? placet ad inguiem judaorum danaeis, neque enim de, nunc tauras, nunc arietes, nunc etam hircis, ut non et homines dicam, culpae sterrere, ac propter quod idolo sumus exai, nunc exercere cruderis sub prophetis ac leges placet demique ferialium ciborum quaedam existimare mundae, quaedam in inmundis et nunc arietes, nunc etiam hircis, ut non et homines dicam, culpae sterrere, ac propter quod idolo sumus exai, nunc exercere cruderis sub prophetis ac leges.

33. ’inuenio sabbata, discretiones ciborum, discretiones potuum, vestimentorum, et alia quae percurrere longum est.’

34. Quare indeficientes ego praecipiori meo refero gratias, qui me similiter labantem retinuit, ut essem hodie christianus.’

35. ’Placet circumcidi, id est, pudendis insignire deum non mortuus debet uideri, sed nec natus hunc ego protinus dementem putarem, qui gentili mihi et longe alterius religionis religione morante praedicator adueniens Christum uellet ex prophetis insinuare, unde mihi non adduces malum de medio tui’ (Vulgate).

36. ’Dominus Deus vobis non declinabitis neque ad dextram neque in dexteram, nesc addas quicquam nec minuas: sed in iisdem perseverabis, ut benefici te dominus deus tuus.’ This text is not found anywhere in Deuteronomy in this form, but cf. (in Vulgate) Deuteronomy 4:40: ’custodi praecipe eius atque mandata quae ego praecipio tibi ut bene sit tibi et filiis tuis post te et permaneas multo tempore super terram quom Dominus Deus tuus daturus est tibi,’ and Deuteronomy 5:17: ’custode et facite quae praecipit Domino Deus vobis non debeat neque ex dextram neque in sinistrum’ sed per viam quam praecipit Dominus Deus vobis adumbalibus ut vivatis et bene sit tibi et filiis tuos in Deum et ab uos debeat neque ex sinistra neque ex dextrae vestrae;’ and also Deuteronomy 12:32 ’quod praecipio tibi hoc tantum facite Domino nec addas quicquam nec minuas.’

37. ’Deus suus loquitur ad Moyen deces: suscitate illis prophetam de fratribus ipsorum similem tibi.’ (Vulgate).

38. ’Prophetam de gente tua et de fratribus tuis sicut me suscitabit tibi Dominus Deus tuus ipsam audie’ (Vulgate).

39. ’Moses quidem dixit quia prophetam vobis suscitabit Dominus Deus vester de fratribus vestris tamquam me ipsam audietis iuxta omnia quaequecumque locutus fuerit vobis’ (Vulgate).

40. ’Deus suus loquitur ad Moyen deces: suscitate illis prophetam de fratribus ipsorum similem tibi.’ (Vulgate).

41. ’Prophetam de gente tua et de fratribus tuis sicut me suscitabit tibi Dominus Deus tuus ipsam audie’ (Vulgate).

42. ’Moses quidem dixit quia prophetam vobis suscitabit Dominus Deus vester de fratribus vestris tamquam me ipsam audietis iuxta omnia quaequecumque locutus fuerit vobis’ (Vulgate).

43. ’An illud effereamus eis, quod perinde soleat inducere: uidebunt uam suam pendentem, quod non credent? cui uos quidem adducit “in ligno.” nam non habet Deus suus loquitur ad Moysen dicens: suscitabo illis prophetam de fratribus. Deus suus loquitur ad Moyen deces: suscitate illis prophetam de fratribus vestris tamquam me ipsam audietis iuxta omnia quaequecumque locutus fuerit vobis’ (Vulgate).

44. ’In illo aferremon eis, quod perinde soleat inducere: uidebunt uam suam pendentem, quod non credent? cui uos quidem adducit “in ligno.” nam non habet Deus suus loquitur ad Moysen dicens: suscitabo illis prophetam de fratribus. Deus suus loquitur ad Moyen deces: suscitate illis prophetam de fratribus vestris tamquam me ipsam audietis iuxta omnia quaequecumque locutus fuerit vobis’ (Vulgate).

45. ’Unus nobis in hoc quid opus est uel praecipe quae ex diligentia conuersis ad Christum Hebraeorum deum non mortuos debet uideri, sed nec natus?’

---
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by Adimantus, especially because ‘he brought to light the Jewish superstition and detected the deception of the semi-
Christians.” Thus, there is good reason to suppose that many of the references to the Old Testament are from Adimantus.
When we compare the Capitula with the Disputationes of Adimantus there are indeed many similarities (see Van den Berg 2010, esp. pp. 96–102). Furthermore, Faustus provides some clues to Manichaean sources. He refers, for example, to writings of the fathers in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 12, 1:

Therefore, it is this which I reply concisely, provisionally and briefly to the question you ask: Why do you not accept the prophets? In any event, the books of our fathers have demonstrated sufficiently that they [i.e. the Prophets of the Old Testament] have predicted nothing concerning Christ. I actually point to this, how could the Hebrew forefathers, if they had known and predicted Christ, have lived so offensively? In Contra Faustum Manichaeum 22, Faustus appears to cite from this work. Another reference to a Manichaean source related to the Old Testament is found in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 19, 5. In reaction to the question whether he should accept the Old Testament, Faustus says: ‘For this reason I do not stop giving thanks to my teacher who prevented me from falling in the same way, so that I am now a Christian.” This is further indication that the arguments used by Faustus should be regarded as Manichaean and that many texts used in this connection stem from a Manichaean source. Finally, the form and the creative reworking of the contents of the lists point to the fact that these lists were well known, which also favours a Manichaean origin. Nevertheless, Faustus claims (in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 12; 16, 3) that he has searched the Prophets and Moses for prophecies concerning Jesus, which seems to imply that he read the Old Testament independently from a Manichaean textbook as well. It is difficult to determine how much Faustus read or which books. The capitulum discussed in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 12 is rather short and Faustus does not elaborate on the texts that he might have read. One could even claim that he read the prophets as far as they are discussed in the books of his forefathers.

Contra Faustum Manichaeum 16 provides more information to assist in establishing which texts Faustus read when he searched for prophecies regarding Christ. Faustus deals with the question of whether Moses had prophesied concerning Christ. In 16, 4 and 16, 5, Faustus discusses some of Moses’ words and he refers to them as favourite phrases of Catholic Christians. This implies that in the debates about prophecies, Catholic Christians brought some texts to the attention of Manichaeans to provide evidence that Moses indeed had spoken about Jesus. This procedure may well largely explain Faustus’s statement that he searched the words of Moses for prophecies concerning Jesus Christ. Furthermore it is a sound explanation for the fact that Faustus could review the reading of the text in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 16, 5. When the text was brought to Faustus’s attention he would have read it carefully and noticed the difference between the Catholic Christian’s oral rendering of the words and those in the codex.

In summary, we may conclude that some of the texts containing prophecies from Moses, will have been learnt by Faustus in his debates with Catholic Christians.

The main tendency of Faustus’s argument is in agreement with Marcion’s opinion of the Old Testament, as could be expected from a pupil of Adimantus (or Addas) (see Van den Berg 2010:168–170; BeDuhn 2007). Faustus works with a strong antithetical schema to explain the relationship between the Old and New Testaments. Nevertheless, there is an exception to this pattern at the climax of the discussion on the relationship between the two, namely in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 19, 2. The capitulum refuted by Augustine in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 19 gives a third possible answer to the question of how to deal with Matthew 5:17, in which Jesus says that he came not to destroy but to fulfil the Law and Prophets. In Contra Faustum Manichaeum 17 and 18 Faustus concluded that the text should be regarded as spurious. For the sake of argument, Faustus takes the text as genuine in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 19 and tries to find an explanation for these words. Faustus offers the following solution:

There are, however, three kinds of laws: one of them is that of the Hebrews, which Paul calls the law of sin and death. The other is that of the gentiles, which he calls the natural law: because, he says, the gentiles do by nature what is according to the law; and thus, they who do not have a law, are a law to themselves, who show the work of the law written in their hearts. The third kind of law is that of the truth, which is indicated by the apostle, when he says: because the law of the spirit of the life in Christ Jesus has liberated me from the law of sins and death. So there are three kinds of law.
In 19, 3 Faustus continues with an investigation into the question of what kind of law Jesus had in mind when he said that he did not come to destroy but to fulfil it. Faustus analyses the speech of Jesus on the Law in Matthew 5 and comes to the conclusion that he would have meant the Law that a person shall not kill, shall not commit adultery, and shall not bear false witness. This Law was, according to Faustus, promulgated by Enoch and Seth and the other just men, to whom the glorious angels had given these commands. The school of Marcion can not have inspired Faustus to develop the line of reasoning found in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 19, 3. This tradition considered Matthew 5:17, which says that Jesus came not to destroy but to fulfil the Law and Prophets, as spurious. Furthermore, the concept of a threefold law does not agree with their antithetical ideas (see May 1997:197). In addition, the context in Contra Faustum Manichaeum clearly demonstrates that the solution used in Contra Faustum Manichaeum 19, 3 was not Faustus’s first preference.

Nevertheless it is used more than once. In Contra Faustum Manichaeum 22, 2, in defence to the accusation that Faustus scoffed at the Law and the Prophets, we find the words: ‘But the true law is, “You shall not kill, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not bear false witness”’. It seems that Faustus, under pressure in this situation, might either have changed his mind, or have used another Manichean or gnostic viewpoint about the Law in order to avoid the difficulties that he was experiencing.

Some conclusions

The form of the quotes from the Old Testament in the Capitula, as well as Faustus’s references to Manichean books, suggest that much of the Old Testament material used by Faustus had its origin in Manichean sources. Especially Adimantus is an important authority. This can be concluded from Faustus’s words in praise of Adimantus in the introduction to the Capitula. Furthermore the general standpoint on the Old Testament and its supposed influence on the New Testament are largely in agreement with Adimantus’s opinions.

As a result, it is most probable to suppose that the Old Testament texts used in the Capitula were known to Faustus before his encounter with Augustine. Only some prophecies about Christ that Faustus learnt from Catholic opponents could stem from a later date than 384. The Faustus of the Capitula will not have been very different from the one Augustine came across in Carthage. Therefore, the contents of the Capitula will be of no surprise to Augustine.

After all, it is reasonable to suppose that most of the Old Testament quotes in the Capitula belonged to the standard material of the Manichean missionaries ever since Adimantus. This material was known to Augustine the candidate for conversion to Manichaeism, but also as a Manichean hearer involved in debates with Catholic Christians. As a result one should reckon with Manichean influence on Augustine’s use of the Old Testament. The extent of subjects and texts found in the Capitula may well indicate how large that influence was.
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