

## Macquarie University ResearchOnline

---

**This is the published version of:**

Lieu, Samuel N. C. (2012) Book review : Augustine's Manichaeon Dilemma-1 : conversion and Apostasy, 373-388 CE, *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 92, No. 1 (January 2012), pp. 131-133

**Access to the published version:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/663742>

**Copyright:**

Copyright 2012 by University of Chicago Press. Originally published in *The Journal of Religion*.

olence, noting only in the chapter's conclusion his "Ambivalent Response to Violence." That part of Aquinas's "response" to violence was to develop Augustine's reflections on the waging of war into a recognizable Just War framework does not seem to concern Johnson. Given the vigorous Just War discourse that has been going on for nearly forty years, this is a strange omission.

Johnson's chapter on Thomas Jefferson, "Disestablishing Religion and the Waning of Christian Violence," is problematic less for its treatment of Jefferson's understanding of Jesus's life and teachings or its discussion of Jefferson's role in the disestablishment of churches in Virginia and, eventually, the young United States, than for its inattention to context. Johnson misses an opportunity to situate Jefferson more fully by ignoring his place in the colonial slavocracy and religious arguments for and against slavery. He also misses an opportunity to refine his own argument by ignoring the persistence of "Christian" violence in America—anti-Native American, anti-Catholic, antislave, anti-Mormon—in spite of Jefferson's legislative victories. Why, in a context characterized by unprecedented if limited freedom of religion, did religiously motivated brutality persist? What, in the end, is the connection between different forms of religious toleration and the myriad forms of religiously inflected or religiously motivated violence?

There is much that is worth reading in Johnson's book. His chapters on Lull, Cusa, and the epilogue section on La Chambon, France, a town that gave protection to Jews during the Second World War, are both fascinating and rewarding. It is clear that Johnson has a great deal of knowledge and experience to bring to bear on the history he describes, and one can't fault Johnson for wanting to recover resources from Christian history that support tolerance and peaceful dialogue. It is clear also that the book's stated topic and its central figures are frequently an uncomfortable match. In the end, Johnson is not attentive enough to the lives and writings of some of his central figures to make the book convincing as a whole. Perhaps a title that situated the volume less in the growing group of works on religion and violence and more in the literature on interreligious dialogue and toleration would make more sense and would save readers from looking for arguments and for evidence that are not to be found.

JONATHAN H. EBEL, *University of Illinois.*

BEDUHN, J. *Augustine's Manichaean Dilemma-1: Conversion and Apostasy, 373–388 CE.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010. viii+402 pp. \$70.00 (cloth).

This is the first of three projected volumes on a major theme in the study of Augustine, namely his experience as a Manichaean for nine years and his subsequent theological wrestling with the tenets of the sect. The scope of the project calls for comparison with the three-volume work of François Decret and is the twenty-first century's equivalent of Prosper Alfaric's *L'évolution intellectuelle de Saint Augustin*, vol. 1, *Du Manichéisme au Néoplatonisme* (Paris, 1918).

The study of Manichaeism has undergone a sea change since the days of Alfaric, owing to the discovery and the ongoing decipherment of genuine Manichaean texts (in Coptic, Greek, and Syriac) from Egypt. This new material (cf. Iain Gardner and Samuel Lieu, eds., *Manichaean Texts from the Roman Empire* [Cambridge University Press, 2004]) has greatly enriched our knowledge of the

## The Journal of Religion

life of Mani and of original Manichaean teaching. It is surprising therefore that this book by Jason BeDuhn, who is an internationally established scholar of Manichaean studies, does not begin with a study of how Manichaeism came to Roman North Africa from its original homeland of Sasanian Babylonia; nor is the reader introduced to the diverse religious background and enigmatic personality of the founder, who grew up in a Judaeo-Christian baptist sect but who preached under the shadow of a Zoroastrian revival. Instead, the reader is presented with a sumptuous array of modern scholarly models of cultic involvement and religious affiliation and “disassociation” in a period of rapid Christianization. This certainly makes the work startlingly original, at the expense perhaps of its not giving a fuller picture of the Manichaean missionary challenge to late Roman Christianity.

BeDuhn states emphatically that “the Manichaean account of the origin, nature, and resolution of the problematic, mixed nature of the cosmos constituted a comprehensive mythic history of the universe” (78). But nowhere in this long first volume is the Manichaean myth fully presented to the reader and assessed for its attractiveness or repulsiveness to the late Roman beholder. (For this, the reader will have to turn to the two classic works of Henri-Charles Puech.) The very basic outline of the myth given by BeDuhn (79–80) is highly demythologized and is intended for drawing philosophical implications, especially on the Manichaean doctrine of the soul. Augustine scholars might take comfort in such an approach, as they will not have to master the intricacies of a religion that originated in the complex cultural and religious milieu of Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christianity in order to study Augustine’s early intellectual developments.

BeDuhn takes seriously J. P. Maher’s observation that Augustine was apparently ignorant of several key members of the full Manichaean mythological pantheon; one can only infer from this that Augustine was not conversant with material that features strongly Manichaean teaching texts such as the *Kephalaia* (preserved only in Coptic and recovered from Egypt). Nevertheless, BeDuhn finds considerable significance in *Kephalaion* 38, “Concerning the Light-Mind (*nous*)” (cf. Gardner and Lieu, 208–18), which uses the iconic Pauline imagery of the “Old” and the “New Man,” to illustrate the regenerative power of the “mind of light” (89–90). Similarly, BeDuhn, in commenting on the very moving passage in *Confessions* (IV.vi.11) on the death of his friend, claims that “Augustine, in a typically Manichaean opposition of an *enthumēsis* of life battling against an *enthumēsis* of death drew upon what Manichaeism had to offer as a concept-based emotional repertoire with which to respond to death” (94). But both the terms and concepts of the two *enthumēseis* are known to us mainly from the Coptic *Kephalaia* (IV, 26.18) and from oriental sources. If Augustine or his coreligionists had no direct access to *Kephalaic* material and its highly myth-based teaching of Mani, then BeDuhn’s analogous discussion using this material would be difficult to justify.

BeDuhn believes that the appeal of the sect to the young Augustine lay in its cultic elements (especially the holy meal of the sect), its apparent high moral standards, its ability to handle the perennial philosophical question of “Whence evil?” (*unde malum?*), and its practice of regular confessions (52). This observation is followed by a fascinating and multidisciplinary examination of the way in which Manichaean leaders might have “guided converts into what they regarded as insight into the inner workings of the individual from which self-contradictory behavior springs” (53). However, regular and formulaic confes-

sions of sin may have been a more distinctive feature of the sect in central Asia—where it came under the influence of Buddhism—than in the West, as there are few examples of Manichaean confessional texts of Roman provenance. The term “to confess” in the Coptic Manichaean *Psalm-Book* recovered from Medinet Madi is used in the sense of “to profess” (49.17, 23, and 96.21.26). It is not impossible historically that it was Manichaeism, a highly missionary religion, that found the young Augustine, alone and unaccustomed to university life at Carthage, rather than vice versa, and that his so-called philosophical quest for truth with a moral dimension reflects retrospection. As a Hearer, Augustine may have taken part, as other Hearers were attested to have done, in copying Manichaean scriptures. We also know from community texts recovered from Kellis that the copying and reading of Manichaean texts was strongly encouraged (cf. Gardner and Lieu, 273–75). Later in life, Augustine was able to cite from the Manichaean canonical text, the *Thesaurus*, on the so-called “Seduction of the Archons” and also from the *Epistula Fundamenti* (see G. Fox, J. Sheldon, and S. Lieu, *Greek and Latin Texts on Manichaean Cosmogony* [Turnout, 2010], 4–13 and 20–21).

A central and brilliant chapter of the volume (105–34) is devoted to the colorful Manichaean bishop Faustus of Milevis, Augustine’s Manichaean mentor and *patronus*; this will be read with great profit particularly by students of the *Confessions*. Faustus’s *Capitula* is one of the few works by a leader of the sect that has partially survived. BeDuhn interestingly attributes Faustus’s debating skill and refutation techniques to the skepticism of the Platonic New Academy. He also rightly reminds us of the modern relevance of the Manichaean bishop from Milevis: “Some early Protestant theologians felt they could see a kindred spirit in Faustus both in his critiques of Catholic accommodation of pagan practices and in his ‘biblical theology.’ His challenge to the integrity of the New Testament text foreshadows modern historical critical approaches” (112).

The first of BeDuhn’s projected trio of volumes is a somewhat long but methodologically highly sophisticated work that at times tells us more about the nature of philosophical and religious allegiance than about Augustine as a Manichaean, or Manichaeism in North Africa. The book is a major contribution to Augustine studies, but it only partially bridges Augustine and Manichaean scholarship. The two branches of scholarship, because they are each underpinned by large corpora of extant literary sources and traditions of scholarship, are likely to remain separated like the Two Kingdoms in the Manichaean myth.

To the well-stocked bibliography of the book should be added the following highly relevant works: A. Böhlig, “The New Testament and the Concept of the Manichean Myth,” in *The New Testament and Gnosis: Essays in Honour of Robert McL. Wilson*, ed. A. H. B. Logan and A. J. M. Wedderburn (Edinburgh, 1983), 90–104; R. Lim, “The *Nomen Manichaeorum* and Its Uses in Late Antiquity,” in *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity*, ed. E. Iricinschi and H. M. Zellentin (Tübingen, 2008), 143–167; E. Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie* (Wiesbaden, 1979); and M. Franzmann, *Jesus in Manichaean Writings* (London, 2003). One correction is also needed. The seminal article “Augustin manichéen” in *Freundesgabe für Ernst Robert Curtius* (cited on 381) was the work of the Alexandria-born French orientalist Jean de Menasce and not the British Hermeticist G. H. Mead. SAMUEL N. C. LIEU, *Macquarie University*.