

A CRITICAL EDITION OF FRG. MANICH. RENUNT.  
(*FRAGMENTA QUATTUOR AD MANICHAEUM RENUNTIANDUM  
PERTINENTIA*), INCLUDING THE *TESTIMONIUM  
DE MANICHAEIS SECTORIBUS*, AND OF AUG. EPIST. 79

by

PETER RIEDLBERGER

ABSTRACT: The present article contains a critical edition of the *Fragmenta quattuor ad Manichaeum renuntiandum pertinentia* (including the so-called *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectoribus*), and of Augustine, *Epistula* 79. Contrary to currently available editions, the text offered in the article is based on several mediaeval manuscripts. Apart from a discussion of the manuscripts in question, this article further comprises a detailed analysis of the second part of the *Fragmenta quattuor*, namely Cresconius's subscription and Felix's testimony.

The two texts I am going to present here have been known for a long while, though only from early prints and one 16<sup>th</sup> century manuscript. AUG. epist. 79 was recently edited based on four mediaeval witnesses (DAUR 2005: 92), but the result is unsatisfactory because of problematic editorial interventions (→ p. 165<sup>33</sup>). My own edition is based on eight mediaeval manuscripts (which include the one from which the early prints and the 16<sup>th</sup> century manuscript are derived). In addition, this article contains translations of these texts, an editorial introduction, and a commentary, although the latter is limited to the second half of the “Four fragments” (which happens to be the text I am most interested in myself)<sup>1</sup>.

While the nomenclature for the second text is straightforward (its established designation is AUG. epist. 79), things are less obvious with the first text. It is, so far,

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 677638. To my friends Dario INTERNULLO, Tommaso MARI, and Clemens WEIDMANN I am very grateful for their crucial comments on my draft. The extent of my indebtedness to Aäron VANSPAUWEN is considerable: he saved me from several foolish mistakes, and not only pointed me to manuscript L (which I otherwise would have overlooked) but even provided me with reproductions (which would have been impossible to obtain while the Lilly Library is closed not only because of the current pandemic but also because of ongoing restoration work). I also wish to record my gratitude to all anonymous referees. Phillip FACKLER and Matthew HOSKIN took care that at least the English of the present article will not strike the reader as grossly substandard.

absent from the most thorough inventory of ancient Latin texts we possess, namely the Index to the *ThLL*<sup>2</sup>. However, it is listed in the *CPL*<sup>3</sup> as no. 727a<sup>3</sup>, under the name *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus*. This title cannot be found in any manuscript or in any of the early modern printings. If I have not missed something, it is first used by HAMMAN in PLS II published in the years 1960–1962<sup>4</sup>. Given the lack of any other label and the ready availability of PLS, *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus* is the title employed by a majority of scholars who have worked on the text. Although this has been the default title, there are excellent reasons to discontinue it. For starters, *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus* does not sound like idiomatic Latin. More importantly, this title refers only to the latter two of the four fragments we find in the manuscripts (i.e., FRG. 3 and FRG. 4; in fact, almost all earlier editors only edited them, omitting FRG. 1 and FRG. 2); strictly speaking, it is only correct for the very last bit of the text (fragment 4), as even fragment 3 is neither a “testimony” nor “about Manichaean sect members”.

In order to avoid any further confusion regarding the naming of these texts, I contacted *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* and inquired how this text should be cited to ensure consistency. Kees VAN LEIJENHORST, who is in charge of the index there, kindly provided me with the following recommendation, which I gladly follow. The general abbreviation is FRG. Manich. renunt. (*Fragmenta quattuor ad Manichaeum renuntiandum pertinentia*). The first two fragments, however, are more accurately cited as variants of AUG. c. Fel.<sup>5</sup> This leaves us with “FRG. Manich. renunt. 3” for the bit on Cresconius, and “FRG. Manich. renunt. 4” for the denunciation by Felix.

### (1) EDITIONS

I have abstained from indicating the following things in the apparatus in order to keep it readable and uncluttered: (i) the scribe of **R** planned to add a few initial letters in red, but forgot to do so; hence, FRG. 2 to 4 in this manuscript start with ...go, ...go, and ...elix, respectively (where “...” corresponds to the blank space

---

<sup>2</sup> Given the highly obscure nature of many of the texts cited in this article, I will employ the *ThLL* abbreviations (explained in *Thesaurus linguae latinae. Index librorum scriptorum inscriptionum ex quibus exempla afferuntur*, Leipzig<sup>2</sup>1990; online updates can be found on the website of the *ThLL*).

<sup>3</sup> E. DEKKERS, E. GAAR, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, Steenbrugge<sup>3</sup>1995.

<sup>4</sup> In the first edition of *CPL*, our text is missing. *CPL*<sup>2</sup> of 1961 lists it (p. 81, no. 322), although without using the label *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus*: “Addatur abiuratio (subdititia?) CRESCONII MANICHAEI et FELICIS, quam edidit A. Mai...”. PLS II appeared in fascicles shortly afterwards, between 1960 and 1962. *CPL*<sup>3</sup> no longer refers to MAI directly, but rather to the reprint in PLS II, and calls the text now *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus*. As HAMMAN *only* refers to MAI (who does not use this label), it was in all likelihood HAMMAN himself who invented it.

<sup>5</sup> For obvious reasons, *ThLL* citations exactly indicate the speaker. So in *ThLL*, the references would be to AUG. c. Fel. and to FEL. Aug. c. Fel., respectively. The reader will excuse my less careful style of citation.

the scribe left for the letter). (ii) **A** is damaged, primarily (but not exclusively) on its binding-side margin. Several letters per line are missing. I decided not to indicate the missing letters: this would have meant a second edition in a papyrological fashion, and that for very little gain. Sometimes, the letter can still be made out, and, invariably, one can see how much space the missing letters occupied and compare this to other manuscripts. On the basis of these observations, I conclude that nothing of editorial importance was lost in the damaged part. (iii) The early editions of **BARONIO**, **LABBÉ**, and **MAI** are based, directly or indirectly, on one extant manuscript. It therefore does not make sense to list their (numerous) incorrect readings (or, in the case of **MAI**, haphazard conjectures), except in a few cases which will be discussed later. (iv) I do not indicate orthographic features (e.g., all manuscripts have *Thipasa* instead of *Tipasa*; the spelling of *Hippone* can be creative, including *Yppone*).

### FRG. Manich. renunt. 1-4

- (1) Augustinus episcopus ecclesiae catholicae:  
Iam anathemavi Manichaeum et doctrinam eius et spiritum, qui per eum  
tam execrabiles blasphemias locutus est, quia spiritus seductor erat, non  
5 et spiritum erroris ipsius.
- (2) Ego Felix, qui Manichaeo credideram, nunc anathemo eum et  
doctrinam ipsius et spiritum seductorem, qui in illo fuit, qui dixit deum  
patrem suam genti tenebrarum miscuisse naturam, et eam turpiter  
10 liberare, ut virtutes suas transfiguret in feminas contra masculina  
daemonia et ipsas iterum in masculos contra feminea daemonia, ita ut  
postea reliquias ipsius partis suae configat in aeternum globo tenebrarum.  
Has omnes et ceteras blasphemias Manichaei anathemo.
- (3) Ego Cresconius unus ex Manichaeis scripsi, quia, si discessero,  
antequam gesta subscribantur, sic sim habendus, ac si Manichaeum non  
15 anathemaverim.
- (4) Felix conversus ex Manichaeis dixi sub testificatione dei me  
omnia vera confiteri, de quo scio. Esse Manichaeos vel Manichaeas  
in partes Caesarienses Mariam et Lampadium, uxorem Mercurii argentarii,  
20 cum quibus etiam apud electum Eucharistum pariter oravimus;  
Caesariam et Lucillam filiam suam; Candidum, qui commoratur Tipasa;  
Victorinam Hispanam, Simplicianum Antonini nepotem,  
Paulum et sororem suam, qui sunt Hippone.  
Quas etiam per Mariam et Lampadium scivi esse Manichaeas. Hoc  
25 tantum scio. Quod si aliud inventum fuerit me scire supra quam dixi,  
me reum ego ipse confiteor.

1 Augustinus] item *praem. omnes praeter ALM*; ego *praem. L* episcopus *om. P* catholicae  
ecclesiae *tr. omnes praeter ALM* 2 anathematizavi *BPTS*<sup>2</sup>, et sic semper *BPT*, sed non *S*<sup>2</sup>  
4 et nunc *om. S* (*corr. S*<sup>2</sup>) 7 deum *om. S* (*corr. S*<sup>2</sup>) 10 et ipsas iterum in masculos contra  
feminea daemonia *om. P* (*a.c.*) *T* (*a.c.*) *Labbé* 13 Cresconius] *C. Baronio*; conversus *Labbé*

17 esse *om.* **MS** (*corr.* **S**<sup>2</sup>)    18 Lampadium **A**; Lapadium **B**    20 Caesaria **AL**    et Lucil-  
lam *om.* **S** (*corr.* **S**<sup>2</sup>)    Lucilla filia sua **L**    21 Victorina Hispana **AL**    nepotem] patrem  
**RV**    24 quam supra *tr.* **B**

### AUG. epist. 79

Commonitorium sancti Augustini episcopi ad presbyterum Manichaeum

- Sine causa tergiversaris, cum longe appareat, qualis sis. Quid tecum locuti fuerint fratres, indicaverunt mihi. Bene, quia non times mortem. Sed eam mortem debes timere, quam tibi ipse facis talia de deo blasphemando.
- 5 Et quod intellegis mortem istam visibilem, quam omnes homines norunt, separationem esse mentis a corpore, non est magnum intellegere. Sed quod adiungis de vestro, separationem esse boni a malo, si mens bonum est et corpus malum, qui ea commiscuit non est bonus. Dicitis autem, quia deus bonus ista commiscuit. Ergo aut malus est aut malum timebat. Et tu
- 10 gloriaris, quia non times hominem, cum deum talem tibi fingas, qui tenebras timuit, ut commisceret bonum et malum. Noli autem extolli animo, sicut scripsisti, quia vos magnos facimus, eo quod impedire volumus venena vestra, ne ad homines pestilentia serpat. Non enim apostolus, quos canes appellat, magnos facit, cum dicit "Cavete canes", aut
- 15 illos magnos faciebat, quorum sermonem dicebat serpere ut cancrum. Itaque denuntio tibi in nomine Christi, †ut† si paratus es, solve re quaequestionem, in qua defecit praecessor tuus Fortunatus (et ita hinc ierat, ut non rediret, nisi cum suis disputatione collata inveniret, quid contra respondere posset, disputans cum fratribus). Si autem ad hoc non es paratus,
- 20 discede hinc, et noli pervertere vias domini, et illaqueare et venenis inficere animas infirmas, ne adiuvente dextera domini nostri, quomodo non putaveras, erubescas.

4 ipse tibi *tr.* **B**    6 mentis esse *tr.* **M**    8 eam **T** (*a.c.*)    15 cancer **AL** *Labbé*    16 solve] **ALM** *Labbé et fortasse S (ante rasuram)*; solve **BPRTVS** (*post rasuram*)    18 collata] collecta **M**  
19 disputa **L**    adhuc **M**    es non *tr.* **B** (*a.c.*)    21 animas *om.* **S** (*corr.* **S**<sup>2</sup>)  
14 Philippians 3:2    15 2 Timothy 2:17    20 Acts 13:10

### (2) TRANSLATIONS

#### FRG. Manich. renunt. 1-4

(1) Augustine, Bishop of the Catholic Church: I have already previously anathematised Mani, his teachings and the spirit that spoke such abominable blasphemies through him, for this spirit was seducing not towards truth but towards a heinous falsity. Also today, I anathematise said Mani and the spirit of his falsity.

(2) I, Felix, who had believed in Mani, now anathematise him, his teachings and the seducing spirit that was in him, who claimed that God the Father had mixed his nature into the folk of darkness and that he frees it in a shameful way, namely by morphing his virtues into women against male daemons and, inversely, into men against female daemons, later confining the remainders of this part of his

forever to the lump of darkness<sup>6</sup>. I anathematise all of these and any further blasphemies of Mani.

(3) I, Cresconius, one of the Manichaeans, have written what follows: “If I should withdraw before the *gesta* have been subscribed, I shall be considered as if I had not anathematised Mani”.

(4) I, Felix, converted from the Manichaeans, have said with God as witness that I will truthfully confess everything I know. The following are male or female Manichaeans: in the region of Caesarea, Maria and Lampadia, the wife of Mercurius, the silversmith (together with these, we also prayed with the Elect Eucharistus), Caesaria and her daughter Lucilla. Candidus, who lives in Tipasa. Victorina from Spain, Simplicianus, the grandson of Antoninus, Paulus and his sister, who are in Hippo. I have learned through Maria and Lampadia that also these ladies are Manichaeans. I only know so much. However, in the event that it should transpire that I have knowledge of anything beyond what I have said, I myself acknowledge my felony.

#### **AUG. epist. 79**

Memorandum by the Bishop Saint Augustine to a Manichaean presbyter<sup>7</sup>

You prevaricate for no good reason, as it is obvious from afar what kind of person you are. The brothers told me what they have discussed with you.

It is good that you are not afraid of death. However, you should be afraid of that death which you prepare for yourself by uttering such blasphemies about God! And that you understand that this visible death, which all men know, is the separation of the mind from the body – this is not a great intellectual feat. But as to what you add from your teachings, namely that it is the separation of the good from the evil: if the mind is the good and the body the evil, then the one who mixed these together is not good. But you claim that the good God mixed these together. Hence, either he was evil, or he was afraid of evil. And you pride yourself on not being afraid of man, while you contrive such a God who was afraid of the darkness and therefore mixed good and evil.

And do not pride yourself (as you write) on us extolling you, because we try to fight your venom so that pestilence does not creep to the people. For the

---

<sup>6</sup> I will not go into details here regarding Manichaean beliefs. For the idea of God transforming his virtues into alluring mates, cf. e.g. AUG. c. Fel. II 7. For the notion of the ‘bolos’ (*globus* in Latin, here translated as “lump”), cf. WILLIAMS JACKSON 1938.

<sup>7</sup> This line is certainly a later addition: Augustine would not call himself “saint” nor would he leave out the name of the letter’s recipient. Also note that there is no such thing as a Manichaean “presbyter”.

apostle does not extol those he calls dogs when he says: “Beware of dogs!” nor does he extol those of whose preaching he said that it creeps like a cancer.

Therefore, I command you in the name of Christ, if you are ready, to solve the question in which your predecessor Fortunatus failed (and he left hither, never to return, except if he might find, after a discussion with his folk, something which he could object)<sup>8</sup>. However, if you are not ready for that, begone from here! Do not pervert the ways of the Lord! Do not try to ensnare and to poison the souls of the weak so as not to be embarrassed, with the help of Our Lord, in a way you never could have imagined!

### (3) THE DOSSIER

In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, while preparing an edition of the *Acta Archelai* – a long anti-Manichaean work in the guise of a minuted dispute with Mani himself as participant, which is completely extant only in a Latin translation – Charles H. BEESON discovered that several manuscripts contain an identical dossier of texts related to heresy and Manichaeism. He knew five such mediaeval manuscripts plus one early modern apograph; to this list, three more mediaeval manuscripts can now be added. With two exceptions<sup>9</sup>, the mediaeval manuscripts are of approximately the same age (12<sup>th</sup> century) and, again with two or three exceptions<sup>10</sup>, they stem from the same small region (Valenciennes), while all of them seem to have originated in the wider region of Northern France and Flanders. This suggests a common context of origin, and BEESON (1906: XXX) proposed some connection to the Cathars. The challenge posed by them might easily account for a renewed interest in heresies and Manichaeism and hence explain the production of the 12<sup>th</sup> century copies, although the date of the oldest manuscript (A, 10<sup>th</sup> century) is perhaps slightly early for any such connection; the original compilation of the dossier should therefore be explained in a different way. Said dossier comprises the following texts (BEESON 1906: XXX) which appear in identical order in these manuscripts (though not all of them have the full dossier, → p. 161):

1. Correspondence between Augustine and Quodvultdeus regarding the composition of *De haeresibus* (*ThLL*: AUG. epist. 221–224; manuscript-wise this is actually a kind of front matter to *De haeresibus* – the adoption of these letters

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. AUG. c. Fort. 37.

<sup>9</sup> Namely **A** which is from the 10<sup>th</sup> c. and **M** which is possibly from the 11<sup>th</sup> c.

<sup>10</sup> Namely **B** which is from the near vicinity of Bruges (hence, not from the Valenciennes region, but then again, not terribly far off), **A** which is from Arras (which is actually quite near to the Valenciennes region), and **L**, the provenance of which is unclear, although it probably stems from Northern France or Flanders.

- into Augustine's epistolary collection is just a modern editorial custom, cf. GOLDBACHER 1923: LXXI–LXXII).
2. Augustine's *De haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum* (*ThLL*: AUG. haer.).
  3. ***Fragmenta quattuor ad Manichaeum renuntiandum pertinentia*** (*ThLL*: henceforth **FRG. Manich. renunt.**; these four declarations do not feature any title in the manuscripts – their incipit is: “[Item or Ego] Augustinus episcopus ecclesiae catholicae [or: catholicae ecclesiae]. Iam anathema[tiza]vi”, their explicit: “me reum ego ipse confiteor”).
  4. ***Commonitorium S. Augustini episcopi ad presbyterum Manichaeum*** (*ThLL*: **AUG. epist. 79**).
  5. *Commonitorium quomodo sit agendum cum Manichaeis* (*ThLL*: Ps. AUG. comm.; *CPL*<sup>3</sup> 533).
  6. Extracts from *Acta Archelai* (incipit: “Quod iste Manes non sit auctor”; explicit: “carnes vero volucibus dari iussit”; *ThLL*: ACT. Archel. 62, 2–66, 3).

Since the texts numbered 1, 2, 5, and 6 are well-known from various other manuscripts, we will instead focus on numbers 3 and 4 which occur exclusively in these dossier manuscripts<sup>11</sup>.

Number 4 is known to us today as AUG. epist. 79 and is apparently a letter by Augustine in response to previous communication by an unnamed Manichaean.

The case of number 3 is more complicated. This text possesses neither a real *incipit* formula (→ p. 163) nor any *explicit* formula at all. It is pieced together from four different fragments, the first two of which are well known: they come from the end of Augustine's *Contra Felicem*, where the Manichaean Felix is ready to recant his Manichaeism but wants Augustine to go first so as to have a model anathema. The first declaration is actually Augustine's anathema of Manichaeism (AUG. c. Fel. II 22, CSEL XXV 2, p. 852, 12–17), the second one is Felix's (FEL. Aug. c. Fel. II 22, CSEL XXV 2, p. 852, 19–26). The last two fragments (FRG. Manich. renunt. 3 and 4), however, are not extant anywhere else. This is why they have been published by most early editors separately from the well-known rest and came to be regarded as a work in its own right, the so-called *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus* (→ p. 154). Yet by omitting the first two fragments (the presence of which clearly demonstrates the disparate nature of the collected snippets), the relationship between the third and the fourth

---

<sup>11</sup> Some authors describe a different setting. ESCRIBANO PAÑO (2014: 291) writes: “Al final de las actas [the discussion between Augustine and Felix], tras la abjuración de Felix, figura un añadido transmitido en dos manuscritos misceláneos”. This is wrong; the text is never transmitted after c. Fel. Similarly, J. LIEU, S. LIEU (1981: 174): “Another version was given by Cardinal Angelo Mai from a Vatican manuscript where it followed the text of *De actis cum Felice manichaeo*”. This is a misunderstanding of MAI's Latin: “post anathematismum, quo concluditur liber secundus actorum sancti Augustini cum Felice manichaeo, sequitur alius anathematismus”. MAI is only talking about the anathemata (i.e., FRG. Manich. renunt. 1–2), not about the whole work.



fragment appears stronger than it is. In actuality, FRG. Manich. renunt. 3 and 4 do not belong together. The third fragment is a written declaration by a certain Cresconius who apparently has abjured Manichaeism but needs to wait until he can sign the official document before his conversion can go into effect. The fourth fragment is the stenographed testimony of a certain Felix (*not* Augustine's Felix!) who reveals everything he knows about his (apparently clandestine) fellow Manichaeans.

#### (4) THE MANUSCRIPTS

- A** Atrebatensis (Abbaye Saint-Vaast d'Arras), today Boulogne-sur-mer 45, 10<sup>th</sup> c., vellum, size unknown, ff. 86r–86v<sup>12</sup>.
- B** Thosanus (Abbaye de Ter Doest), today Bruges 119, 12<sup>th</sup> c., parchment, 353 x 250 mm, ff. 178v–179v<sup>13</sup>.
- L** Lillianus, of unknown provenance (RICCI: “Northern France or Flanders”, HAMEL: “France”), today Lilly Library Ricketts 162, Bloomington, Indiana, USA, 12<sup>th</sup> c. (HAMEL even: second quarter of 12<sup>th</sup> c.), parchment, 220 x 132 mm, ff. 105r–106v<sup>14</sup>.
- M** Marchianensis (Abbaye de Marchiennes), today Douai 275, 11<sup>th</sup> c., parchment, 330 x 240 mm, ff. 10v–11r<sup>15</sup>.
- P** Amandiensis (Abbaye de Saint-Amand-les-Eaux), today Paris. Lat. 1918, early 12<sup>th</sup> c., parchment, 320 x 230 mm, f. 101v–102r<sup>16</sup>.
- R** Salviensis (Prieuré de Saint-Saulve), today Rouen 470, mid-12<sup>th</sup> c., parchment, 295 x 205 mm, ff. 124r–124v<sup>17</sup>.
- S** Aquicintensis (Abbaye Saint-Sauveur d'Anchin), today Douai 280, late 12<sup>th</sup> c., parchment, 330 x 250 mm, ff. 108v–109r<sup>18</sup>.

---

<sup>12</sup> *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements*, vol. IV: Arras – Avanches – Boulogne, Paris 1872, p. 601.

<sup>13</sup> A. DE POORTER, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques de Belgique*, vol. II: *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque publique de la ville de Bruges*, Gembloux–Paris 1934, pp. 154–156.

<sup>14</sup> Ch. DE HAMEL, *Gilding the Lilly: A Hundred Medieval and Illuminated Manuscripts in the Lilly Library*, Bloomington, IN 2010, pp. 34 f.; Seymour DE RICCI, *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, vol. I, New York 1935, p. 642.

<sup>15</sup> *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements*, vol. VI: Douai, Paris 1878, pp. 145 f. According to this entry and ZYCHA (see below, n. 24), even 10<sup>th</sup> c.

<sup>16</sup> Ph. LAUER, *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, vol. II: (*Nos 1439–2692*), Paris 1940, p. 238. LAUER's date is 12<sup>th</sup> c., my early 12<sup>th</sup> c. follows BEESON 1906: XXXII.

<sup>17</sup> H. OMONT, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements*, vol. I: Rouen, Paris 1886, p. 97. The date given by me is based on the identification of Hugo (→ p. 169).

<sup>18</sup> *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements*, vol. VI: Douai, Paris 1878, pp. 148 f.



**S**<sup>2</sup> Second hand (corrector) in **S**.

**T** Tornaciensis (Abbaye Saint-Martin de Tournai), today Paris. Lat. 1908, 12<sup>th</sup> c., parchment, 295 x 210 mm, ff. 53v–54r<sup>19</sup>.

**V** Vat. Reg. Lat. 562, 16<sup>th</sup> c., paper, 276 x 190 mm, f. 18r–18v<sup>20</sup>.

Of these manuscripts, six (**BMPRST**) include the full dossier. **L** lacks no. 6 and never contained it (after no. 5, on the same page follows a collection of short texts and extracts, starting with AUG. epist. 184, penned by the same hand as the dossier). Nor does **A** include this text, although theoretically<sup>21</sup> it might have done so earlier, as the last surviving folio of **A** – which is, sadly, damaged – ends with part of the very first line of text no. 5. **V** is an early modern manuscript which contains only a portion of the dossier (nos. 3–6). Its creator apparently was not interested in copying the well-known texts of nos. 1 and 2. From an editorial point of view, the interest of this manuscript is negligible, as it is a direct descendent of one extant manuscript (**R**)<sup>22</sup>. The dates I give are based on the dates indicated in the catalogues (except where I have provided additional information in the pertinent footnote). The sizes, too, are taken directly from the catalogues as, unfortunately, I have been unable to see any of these manuscripts in the original<sup>23</sup>. The stated folio ranges indicate the portions with my texts (i.e., nos. 3–4), *not* those of the full dossier. Two early modern editors mention a Codex Gervasianus, which is, in all likelihood, identical with **R** (→ p. 168).

For any serious attempt to build a stemma, one would need to collate the whole dossier, an undertaking which is clearly beyond the scope for this little edition of mine. But let us review what the editors of other parts of the dossier thought about the relationships of the various witnesses, and also about the quality of individual manuscripts. For editing AUG. epist. 221–224 (my no. 1), GOLDBACHER only used one of our manuscripts (**A**; his G), so there are no comparisons between dossier manuscripts to be found in his work. The edition of *De haeresibus* (and also of AUG. epist. 221–224, hence, my nos. 1–2) by VANDER

---

<sup>19</sup> Ph. LAUER, *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, vol. II: (*Nos 1439–2692*), Paris 1940, pp. 233 f. LAUER's date is early 13<sup>th</sup> c., my 12<sup>th</sup> c. follows BEESON 1906: XXXII.

<sup>20</sup> A. PONCELET, *Catalogus codicum hagiographicum Latinorum bibliothecae Vaticanae*, Bruxellis 1910, p. 373.

<sup>21</sup> **A** and **L** are closely related, however (→ p. 163); if **L** never included no. 6, so perhaps neither did **A**.

<sup>22</sup> BEESON (1906: XXXIV) has shown this beyond doubt. **V** even copies the scribal subscription of **R** (→ p. 169).

<sup>23</sup> For the reproductions I owe an enormous debt of gratitude to Ludo VANDAMME and Heidi KEEREMAN in Bruges, to Sandrine BOUCHER in Boulogne, to Jean VILBAS in Douai, to Catherine HUBBARD in Rouen, to Aïron VANSPAUWEN, and to whosoever is making it possible that reproductions of manuscripts held by the Bibliothèque Nationale and by the Biblioteca Vaticana can be found on the internet.

PLAETSE and BEUKERS (CCSL XLVI 1969, pp. 263–345) uses **M** (their C) and **A** (their L), although the latter only indirectly through GOLDBACHER's edition. Interestingly, they succeeded back in 1969 in identifying most of the dossier manuscripts (pp. 266 f.), but they did not know of BEESON's earlier work, and their own work was ignored by anyone working on the so-called *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus*. In their stemma (p. 269), they do not indicate a position for **A**. For his edition of no. 4, DAUR used **ABMR** (→p. 165<sup>33</sup>). He does not explain the individual weight he attaches to these manuscripts, although one can observe that he (quite inexplicably) prefers a reading of **B** against the consensus of **AMR**.

The standard edition of the *Commonitorium quomodo sit agendum cum Manichaeis* (my no. 5) was prepared by ZYCHA who used three of our manuscripts (**MPT**) as well as three other witnesses. According to ZYCHA<sup>24</sup>, **P** (his T) and **T** (his P)<sup>25</sup> are very similar, with **P** being slightly more carefully written, while **M** is especially important (“hic codex libros ad secundam classem pertinentes pretio longe vincit”); to this second class belong **P** and **T** as well as one manuscript which does not contain the dossier, but just the *Commonitorium quomodo*).

We owe the most circumstantial discussion of our manuscripts to BEESON (1906). He edited the *Acta Archelai*, of which the dossier manuscripts merely provide extracts (my no. 6), giving BEESON the opportunity to compare their readings against a text which is based on more complete and better manuscripts. BEESON knew **MPRST**. He also underscores the striking similarity of **P** and **T**, with **P** being penned with more care (p. XXXII), although quite surprisingly, it is **T** which is correct in one place where all other dossier manuscripts known to BEESON fail (p. XXXV; this might however be a scribal conjecture). BEESON concurs with ZYCHA, too, when it comes to **M** (pp. XXXIV f.), calling it the best of the dossier manuscripts and pointing out that it alone among these preserves certain correct readings (which can be verified against the full manuscripts). However, there are several mistakes only to be found in **M**. According to BEESON (p. XXXV), **S** might either be a direct descendant or a sibling of **M**, while **R** is “am nächsten verwandt” with **S**. BEESON sums up: “Das ungenügende Material erlaubt mir nicht, das Verhältnis der HSS dieser Gruppe mit Sicherheit zu bestimmen”.

My own observations, exclusively based on texts nos. 3–4, are as follows: **P** and **T** are indeed strikingly similar. This similarity even extends to the layout,

<sup>24</sup> I. ZYCHA, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vol. XXV, Sect. VII Pars 2: *S. Aureli Augustini, Contra Felicem...*, Vindobonae 1892, p. LXXVII.

<sup>25</sup> I am sorry for the confusion: ZYCHA prefers to call Paris. Lat. 1908 “T” after its former owner Le Tellier (*Tellerianus*), while I derive my sigla consistently from either the place of provenience or of keeping.

actually even to the very spot where a missing line is later added in the top margin! The presence of mistakes unique to each manuscript (**P** lacks *episcopus*, **T** alone includes the wrong *eam*) suggests that they are siblings. There is no reason to doubt that **V** is derived directly from **R**. **A** and **L** are closely related; judging by my small sample, **L** could even be a direct descendant of **A**. Otherwise, it is not possible to identify any direct connections between manuscripts. Their text is quite uniform, and the occasional slip of the pen found in one does not resurface in any other manuscript.

One important observation regarding the first line is in order. In the two oldest manuscripts (**AM**), we have the text as found in c. Fel., from where it derives (*Augustinus episcopus* etc. being the subject of the first phrase). In almost<sup>26</sup> all the other manuscripts, this is reinterpreted as an *incipit*: *item* is added (and the word order of *ecclesiae catholicae* changed for no obvious reason)<sup>27</sup>. This *item* of course refers to *De haeresibus* by Augustine, which immediately precedes the fragments in the dossier manuscripts. The intact transmission of the first line suggests that **AM** might preserve better readings than others; it also corroborates the specific importance **ZYCHA** and **BEESON** attached to **M** (note that neither of the two used **A**; so their silence on this manuscript does not mean they doubted its worth).

#### (5) EDITORIAL ISSUES

Some editorial issues require further comment. First, *anathemare/ana-thematizare*. One may wonder whether this deserves any editorial attention, as it might be considered a negligible orthographic fluctuation<sup>28</sup>. But *ThLL* I 20, 64 f. claims that *anathematizo* is “frequentius ac prius ab ecclesiasticis adhibitum quam *anathemo*”, so it is worth justifying my decision. The corrector of **S**<sup>2</sup> changed initially from *-are* to *-atizare* (against **S**), so it did matter at least to him. The **PT** group consistently uses *-atizare*, as does **B**, while **ALMR** employ *-are*. I have opted for *-are* in my edition because almost<sup>29</sup> all manuscripts, even **AR**

---

<sup>26</sup> The exception is **L**, where an *Ego* is added, so that *Ego Augustinus* matches *Ego Felix* and *Ego Cresconius*.

<sup>27</sup> In **ZYCHA**'s edition, the word order is: “Augustinus ecclesiae catholicae episcopus”. However, the apparatus indicates that “Augustinus episcopus ecclesiae catholicae” is also broadly attested, across both manuscript families indicated by **ZYCHA**. Accordingly, *episcopus* directly after *Augustinus* is not an idiosyncrasy of the dossier manuscripts.

<sup>28</sup> Compare the editorial decisions of **BARONIO**, **LABBÉ**, and **MAI**: all of them used manuscripts exclusively showing *-are* (namely a manuscript derived from **R**, **R** itself, and **V**), though **BARONIO** consistently uses *-atizare*, whereas **LABBÉ** and **MAI** have *-are*.

<sup>29</sup> In the case of **A**, we do not know, as the last surviving word of this defective manuscript is *cum* in the title phrase *Commonitorium quomodo sit agendum cum*. **L** has *anathemaverint* at the start of text no. 5, hence also a uniform orthography, but a different one.

with *-are* in text no. 3, do have *anathematizaverint* right at the start of text no. 5, *Commonitorium quomodo sit agendum cum Manichaeis*. This gives us cause to suspect that the uniform orthography in other manuscripts reflects an aspiration for consistency introduced at the cost of a faithful rendering of the exemplar.

Secondly, there is a problem regarding a skipped line. Of “*suas transfiguret in feminas contra masculina daemonia et ipsas iterum in masculos contra feminea daemonia*”, two manuscripts (**PT**) omit the part “*et ipsas [...] daemonia*”. This can easily be explained as a case of *saut du même au même*, and the missing words are added in both cases later in the upper margin. In **LABBÉ**’s edition (based on **R**, not on **PT**) we encounter the same lacuna. For various reasons, this same mistake must have occurred independently (→ p. 171).

Thirdly, the overall text quality of no. 3. We can check the text of the first two fragments against the version transmitted by the full manuscripts of *Contra Felicem*. When comparing FRG. Manich. renunt. 2 with Felix’s anathema, one cannot but notice that the dossier text is clearly worse (for a full comparison, → p. 175<sup>50</sup>). Most disturbing is “*qui dixit deum patrem suam genti tenebrarum miscuisse naturam*”. This was originally “*qui dixit deum partem suam genti tenebrarum miscuisse*”, and by a slip of the pen, *partem* became *patrem*. Thus, we had a God the Father but unfortunately also an orphaned *suam*. Then, another scribe had the infelicitous idea of adding *naturam* to account for it. We shall see in the commentary that the text of FRG. Manich. renunt. 3 and 4 is problematic in places. This could be readily explained by the nature of these fragments, being minuted utterances of (possibly) substandard speakers. But the comparison just made should raise an alarm; any of the oddities we encounter could easily be due to a scribal mistake (or to an incompetent attempt at correction). There is no methodological way out of this dilemma.

Fourthly, the only real textual problem posed by **AUG.** epist. 79 is presented by “*denuntio tibi in nomine Christi, †ut† si paratus es, solvere [or: solve] quaestionem*”. The two best manuscripts, **AM**, present *solvere* (as do **L** and **LABBÉ**’s edition, and probably also **S** prior to an erasure which ostensibly removed a few letters following the now remaining *solve*), which is certainly preferable to *solve* of all other manuscripts. The latter apparently is a later modification to let the phrase run parallel to the subsequent conditional-imperative sequence “*si [...] non es paratus, discede*”. Yet neither *solvere* nor *solve* can go with *ut*. Nor is it possible to understand *ut si*, both for reasons of semantics and grammar (i.e., the indicative *es*). **GOLDBACHER**, who only knew the *solve* variant, indicated a lacuna in his edition. But *solvere* could be dependent on *denuntio*, a construction Augustine uses (e.g. **AUG.** civ. X 11), in which case *ut* either hides a different word, or later crept in; any such corruption is easily understandable in view to the well-known construction *denuntiare ut*, as also found in translations of 2 Thessalonians 3:5, “*denuntiamus autem vobis, fratres, in nomine Domini Nostri Iesu Christi, ut...*” (identical wording in both the Vulgate and the Bible

Augustine himself used, cf. AUG. spec. 37 p. 242, 12 f., AUG. op. monach. 3, 4). Theoretically, as an alternative one might keep *ut* and change *solvere* to a corresponding form in the subjunctive; but this is hardly advisable, as it would remove a construction elsewhere attested in Augustine's writings, and render the construction more banal. Eventually, I have put *ut* into *cruces* as there is no way to decide whether it needs to be athetised or rather changed to a different (and, moreover, indeterminable) word.

#### (6) EDITORIAL HISTORY

No. 4 of the dossier was first published in 1576, as part of the Louvain edition of Augustine's works, though without indication of the manuscript used<sup>30</sup>. It was reprinted in subsequent editions of the letters by VIGNIER and REINHART, who took over the Louvain text without any recourse to manuscripts. The Maurist edition in 1679 assigned the new number 79 to this letter (and we still know this text as AUG. epist. 79); further, the Maurists – who carefully indicated the manuscripts they used – stated (col. 911) that they could find it only in a single Vatican manuscript (i.e., my **V**)<sup>31</sup>. GOLDBACHER (to whom we owe the still authoritative modern edition of Augustine's letters) failed to locate any manuscript of the text and noted: “Epistulam LXXIX, quam Maurini in uno codice Vaticano se repperisse dicunt, cum in libris manu scriptis frustra quaesivissem, transscripsi ex edd. l s r m<sup>32</sup>; inscriptio deest”. DIVJAK et al. (1996–2002: 1012, n. 196) add: “Die Ausgabe Goldbachers basiert auf älteren Editionen; die einzige Handschrift Vatikan. Reg. 562 des 16. Jh.s war ihm nicht bekannt”. DIVJAK's alleged *codex unicus* Vat. Reg. 562, is **V**, i.e. the early modern paper manuscript which is a direct copy of **R**. It is to the credit of DAUR (2005: 92) that he produced the first critical edition of AUG. epist. 79 using four mediaeval manuscripts (my **ABMR**); but questionable editorial decisions render his edition inferior to GOLDBACHER's<sup>33</sup>.

<sup>30</sup> GOLDBACHER 1923: LXXXIII: “theologi Lovanienses [...] magnam librorum mss., maxime Belgicorum copiam conquirebant”. Given the provenance of most mediaeval manuscripts of this text, it is not surprising the Louvain editors came across it!

<sup>31</sup> Louvain (*Tomus II operum D. Aurelii Augustini [...] complectens epistolas per theologos Lovanienses...*, Antverpiae 1576, no. 244, p. 341); VIGNIER (*Sancti Aurelii Augustini [...] operum omnium [...] supplementum*, Hieronymus Vignier, Parisiis 1654, Tom. I, no. 142, p. 469); REINHART (*S. Aurelii Augustini [...] epistolae CCLXXIIX [...] curae Lucae Friederici Reinharti*, Altdorffii 1668, no. 144, p. 941), Maurini (*Sancti Aurelii Augustini [...] operum tomus secundus [...] opera et studio monachorum ordinis S. Benedicti e congregatione S. Mauri*, Parisiis 1679, no. 79, col. 187; cf. col. 911: “Non reperitur nisi in Vaticano exemplari”).

<sup>32</sup> These are the older editions: Louvain, the supplement by VIGNIER, REINHART, and the Maurini.

<sup>33</sup> DAUR does not explain the weight he ascribes to the individual manuscripts, his apparatus is often unreliable, and editorial decisions appear haphazard. In our text, there are two divergencies

Again, the case of no. 3 is more complicated. Of the four declarations, scholars focused on the latter two, the later thus called *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus*. Its first edition dates back to 1602, when the text was printed in the tenth volume of the *Annales ecclesiastici* by Cesare BARONIO (1538–1607) as an addendum to an earlier volume<sup>34</sup>. BARONIO states that his edition is based on a copy Nicolas LE FÈVRE procured from a codex in the possession of the *Collegium Gervasianum*. Apart from the *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus*, BARONIO only edits one additional text from the dossier, namely the *Commonitorium quomodo sit agendum cum Manichaeis*. Most modern scholars use BARONIO's work in THEINER's later re-edition. There, the text is no longer relegated to an addendum, but instead moved to the correct place<sup>35</sup>. Unfortunately, THEINER's reissue includes an additional typo (*babendus*).

Philippe LABBÉ (1607–1667) created an independent edition which appeared posthumously in 1671. It comprises the full “Four Fragments” as well as the *Commonitorium ad presbyterum Manichaeum* (i.e., AUG. epist. 79) and the *Commonitorium quomodo*<sup>36</sup>. His edition is according to his own indication also based on the Codex Gervasianus. Accordingly, there should not be any differences in the text of the *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus* between BARONIO and LABBÉ, but in fact there are (→ p. 171).

A further edition of (just) the *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus* is due to Angelo MAI<sup>37</sup>. His text is based on V, Vat. Reg. 562 (he mistakenly writes

---

from GOLDBACHER, both unconvincing: first, DAUR changes “Commonitorium sancti Augustini episcopi ad presbyterum Manichaeum” to “Commonitorium cuidam presbytero Manichaeo Augustinus” by conjecture, pointing to AUG. epist. DIVI. 22. But the first line of epist. 79 certainly is a later addition (→ p. 157<sup>7</sup>). Hence, it must not be modified according to an address Augustine himself used. Secondly, for no apparent reason DAUR retains the transposition “ipse tibi” based on **B**, against the consensus von **AMR**. DAUR attempted to point out the parts missing in manuscript **A**, but his indications are unreliable (e.g., “non est” in my line 6 is completely gone, which DAUR does not note; conversely, he claims that “et illaqueare et venenis inficere animas” in my line 20 is lost, although most of it can actually be made out under the repair strip glued on it). Furthermore, some readings escaped DAUR's notice. Finally, he did not attempt to tackle the one real textual problem of the text (DAUR just notes in the apparatus “*post ut lacunam conii. g* [= GOLDBACHER]”).

<sup>34</sup> *Annales ecclesiastici auctore Caesare Baronio Sorano...*, Tomus decimus, Romae 1602, p. 952 (or: Romae 1603, p. 955), “Tom. 5. anno 404”. The remarks by OORT (2017: 88, esp. n. 12) must be disregarded, as these are based on various misconceptions (this is about an appendix to the fifth volume, not in the fifth volume; the arrangement of later posthumous editions of BARONIO differs from his own, so it does not mean anything if it is found in the sixth volume of a later edition). DECRET (1970: 333, n. 3) claims it is edited in the fifth volume, which is wrong.

<sup>35</sup> *Caesaris [...] Baronii [...] annales ecclesiastici denuo excusi [...] ab Augusto Theiner, Tomus sextus*, Barri-Ducis 1866, p. 431.

<sup>36</sup> *Sacrosancta concilia ad regiam editionem exacta quae nunc quarta parte prodit auctior studio Philip. Labbei, & Gabr. Cossartii [...], Tomus quartus ab anno CCCLI ad annum DXXV*, Lutetiae Parisiorum 1671, coll. 1661–1663.

<sup>37</sup> Angelo MAI, *Novae patrum bibliothecae, Tomus primus continens Sancti Augustini novos ex codicibus vaticanis sermones...*, Roma 1852, pp. 382 f.



569, but indicates the correct folio number, so “569” must be a slip of the pen). His text is worse than either BARONIO’s or LABBÉ’s because he modifies his manuscript’s readings without notifying his readers. He drops *vel Manichaeas*, changes “quas [...] esse Manichaeas” to “quos [...] esse Manichaeos”, and genderbends *Victorinam* to *Victorinum* (which allows him to identify this person with a Manichaean of this very name known from Augustine! For this Victorinus, → p. 184). MAI did not know of BARONIO’s or LABBÉ’s earlier editions, and he firmly believes that the *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus* belongs to the end of *Contra Felicem* (apparently, he identifies the Felix of FRG. 4 with Augustine’s Felix). Given these unannounced changes, it is unfortunate that MAI’s edition is usually cited (cf. OORT 2017: 88 with n. 23), though this is unsurprising given that it was popularised by both PLS (II, col. 1389) and *CPL*<sup>38</sup>.

In 2001, DECRET (2001: 344, n. 8) merged the BARONIO and MAI editions, and published a reproduction of a part of V (namely, FRG. Manich. renunt. 4; DECRET 2001: 345). Oddly, DECRET used MAI’s edition as a base, citing conflicting evidence from BARONIO only in footnotes, even though one can see in DECRET’s own reproduction of V that MAI’s edition includes several misreadings<sup>39</sup>. (DECRET overlooked LABBÉ’s edition.)

Back in 2007, PERRIN (2007: 84) promised an edition with comments to appear shortly thereafter. Yet nothing came of it (PERRIN 2007: 84 f., n. 72, mentions only R and V as the base of his planned edition, though he cites BEESON, who already had pointed out four more mediaeval manuscripts).

## (7) THE CODEX GERVASIANUS

Both BARONIO and LABBÉ refer to a manuscript of the *Collegium Gervasianum*. This Codex Gervasianus was considered lost, but BEESON (1906: XXXII–XXXIV) managed to retrieve it. Let us quickly check the evidence. The notice in BARONIO does not help much (“Post hanc [...] subiicienda sunt ista, quae inter cetera antiqua monumenta a Nicolao Fabro Parisiis accepta, ex Bibliotheca Col. Gervasiani descripta, in cuius codice in fine libri S. Augustini de haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum, haec posita leguntur” – “After that [...] one has to add [to the text printed in BARONIO’s 5<sup>th</sup> volume] a text which I have received together with further ancient works from Nicolas Le Fèvre in Paris and which was copied

<sup>38</sup> When HAMMAN added FRG. Manich. renunt. 3 and 4 as *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus* to PLS, he apparently was not aware of the fact that this text was already included *twice* in the original PL: PL XLII, coll. 517 f. (indirectly from BARONIO); PL LXV, col. 27 (LABBÉ).

<sup>39</sup> The explanation is that DECRET took over the merged text unchanged from an earlier work of his (DECRET 1978: II 138 f., n. 124), but it remains difficult to understand why he did not check it against his own reproduction.



from the library of the *Collegium Gervasianum*; in one of its codices, at the end of Saint Augustine's book *On Heresies to Quodvultdeus*, one can read the following"), but LABBÉ's indications are a great deal more informative: "In veteri codice, qui est in bibliotheca collegii Gervasiani Parisiis, diciturque fuisse liber prioratus S. Salvii episcopi et martyris ad Valentianas in marchia Franciae scriptus tempore Hugonis prioris, post librum S. Augustini de haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum episcopum proxime sequuntur nonnulla" – "In an old manuscript, which is kept in the library of the *collegium Gervasianum* in Paris and which is said to have been a book of the Priory of the Bishop and Martyr Saint Salvius near Valenciennes in the March of France, written during the time of the prior Hugo, there follows some text immediately after Saint Augustine's book *On Heresies to the Bishop Quodvultdeus*". At some point after LABBÉ's edition, the Codex Gervasianus vanished<sup>40</sup>.

The *Collegium Gervasianum* must<sup>41</sup> be identified with the Collège de Maître Gervais, one of the constituent colleges of the University of Paris. Its library owned numerous manuscripts, some of which are known to have contained works by Saint Augustine (CHATELAIN 1988: 16). After the suppression of the Paris colleges, its library (just like those of the other colleges) went to the Collège Louise-Grand. The majority of these manuscripts finally ended up in the Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne<sup>42</sup>, though during the revolutionary turmoil many others were lost. Around two generations later<sup>43</sup>, the municipal library of Rouen acquired a manuscript from an unknown seller. This manuscript – which is my **R** – includes our dossier. At the very end of it, there is the following notice (f. 127v): "Liber Santi [*sic*] Salvii episcopi et martyris. Scriptus tempore Hugonis prioris". This is almost word for word the phrase LABBÉ used for the Codex Gervasianus. The notice was written by the same 12<sup>th</sup> century hand which also penned our dossier

---

<sup>40</sup> Note that the Maurini, working not much later than LABBÉ, found their letter 79 only in V. They were seemingly unaware of **R**, which was kept in their hometown of Paris. Of course, this does not prove that the Codex Gervasianus had disappeared by then; it was probably just a case of oversight.

<sup>41</sup> While explicating the manuscripts on which the Maurini drew, KUKULA (1898: 16) claims that Gervasianus as an adjective applied to a codex refers to the Aumônerie Saint-Gervais de Paris, which is, according to him, identical with the *collegium Gervasianum*. He does not give any proof for this, and I could not find any evidence that the sisters of St. Anastase (which is the more common name for this community running a hospital) kept a library. DECRET (1970: 333, n. 3; 1978: II 138, n. 124; 2001: 344, n. 7) repeatedly claimed that BARONIO edited the text from "un manuscrit de saint Gervais (Paris)". This is mistaken. Both BARONIO and LABBÉ (whose independent edition seems unknown to DECRET) are quite clear that the codex belongs to the *collegium Gervasianum*, without anybody being "saint". OORT 2017: 85, 88, 94 apparently follows DECRET (without however saying so).

<sup>42</sup> There is no indication at all that the Codex Gervasianus was ever kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale (the claim by OORT [2017: 88, n. 17]: "The final conclusion seems to be that the MS Gervais is no longer there [i.e., in the BN]", is, accordingly, unfounded).

<sup>43</sup> To be precise, in 1857 (BEESON 1906: XXXIV).

in **R**. In addition, a certain Hugo is known (BEESON 1906: XXXIII) to have become prior of Saint Saulve around 1145, which nicely matches the date of the writing. According to LABBÉ, the Codex Gervasianus was a *vetus codex*, hence a mediaeval manuscript. To this circumstantial evidence pointing to an identification of the Codex Gervasianus with **R**, BEESON added an apparently decisive observation: “Eine Vergleichung der Texte von Labbé und Baronio zeigt, daß beide dieselbe Vorlage gehabt haben müssen, und die Collationierung nur eines Teiles der HS Rouen 470 [my **R**] beweist, daß sie mit dem oben genannten Codex Gervasianus identisch ist”.

One might even go a step further. According to BARONIO, he had received the text he used from LE FÈVRE, who had it copied (personally or by order?) from the Codex Gervasianus. Nicolas LE FÈVRE was the most important of BARONIO’s correspondents in France, who transmitted to him several unedited texts (QUANTIN 2009: 84–100). Luckily, several of their letters are extant, including one written in February 1591 by LE FÈVRE to BARONIO (ALBERICIUS 1759: 226; cf. QUANTIN 2009: 89–91):

Fragmenta, quae requiris mitto. Nactus sum B. Augustini Commonitorium quomodo agendum sit cum Manichaeis, qui convertuntur; & quos poenitet huius nefandi erroris; subjicitur incerti auctoris, antiqui tamen & Mavi [*sic*] aequalis narratio; quod Maves [*sic*] non sit auctor huius haeresis [...]. Ad finem narrationis habentur: Explicit liber S. Salini [*sic*] episcopi, & Martyris scriptus tempore Hugonis prioris. Quae potius ad Monasterii nomen, cuius usui volumen conscriptum fuit, in quo ultimo loco posita sunt, quam ad auctorem refero.

I send the fragments you need. I got hold of St. Augustine’s *Commonitorium quomodo agendum sit...* . After that follows an account by an unknown author, who however is ancient and a contemporary of Mani: *Quod Manes non sit auctor huius haeresis...* . At the end of this account, there is: “Explicit liber S. Salini [*sic*] episcopi, & Martyris scriptus tempore Hugonis prioris”. I take these words placed at the very end of the manuscript as referring to the monastery for the use of which it had been written, rather than to the author of the work.

The date of this letter, 1591, matches the palaeographic date of the **V** manuscript. The contents LE FÈVRE mentions refer to no. 5 and no. 6 of the dossier manuscripts, which are contained in **V**. **V** is undoubtedly a direct descendant of **R**, the Codex Gervasianus. The scribe of **V** even copied (f. 24r) part of the colophon of **R**: in **R**, the single word “explicit”, followed by a period, is on the last line of the text body. After a blank line, one finds in partly red letters “Liber Santi [*sic*] Salvii episcopi et martiris. Scriptus tempore Hugonis prioris”. A request to the reader to pray for Hugo and several religious formulae follow suit. After some more blank lines, we read “De libro ipso scripsit Rodulfus primos V quaterniones”. In **V**, however, we just read at the end of the last page with a dossier text: “Explicit liber Sancti Salvii episcopi et martyris, scriptus tempore Hugonis prioris”. This is highly significant. What LE FÈVRE describes is not the colophon

of **R** – it is the end of that part<sup>44</sup> of **V** (“Explicit liber...”, not just “Liber...”; and according to LE FÈVRE, this is placed at the very end, which is not true for **R**, which has additional text).

The pressmark Vat. Reg. Lat. refers to manuscripts which entered the Vatican library when the huge collection of Christina, Queen of Sweden, was acquired. There is no complete modern catalogue of these manuscripts, but thanks to a personal communication from Eva NYLANDER – who knows the history of Christina of Sweden’s book collection better than anybody – I learned that Vat. Reg. Lat. 562 was bought in 1650 by Christina from Alexandre PETAU. In all likelihood, Alexandre PETAU had inherited the manuscript from his father Paul PETAU who had died in 1614. Paul PETAU, in turn, was a close friend of Nicolas LE FÈVRE; so close, in fact, that Nicolas LE FÈVRE included him in his will: “Item, je laisse et donne à Monsieur Petau, conseiller en la cour, mon bon ami, mes œuvres de Baronius” (TRAUBE, DELISLE 1903: 12, n. 1). DELISLE (1903: 21 f.; cf. TRAUBE, DELISLE 1903: 12, n. 1) argued in an unrelated context that some manuscripts of LE FÈVRE ended up in PETAU’s collection (though in LE FÈVRE’s will, he explicitly left his manuscripts to somebody else, viz. to DE THOU). Therefore, it does not seem far-fetched to assume that “mes œuvres de Baronius” refers to LE FÈVRE’s notes and copies related to his support of BARONIO (rather than to a printed edition of BARONIO’s works). Following this logic, **V** is LE FÈVRE’s own copy of the part of **R** he was interested in. Accordingly, it must be either the exemplar or a sibling of the very manuscript LE FÈVRE mailed to BARONIO and on which the latter based his edition<sup>45</sup>.

This also has one further important consequence. Scholars claim that the editions of BARONIO and LABBÉ are based on the Codex Gervasianus while MAI’s is based on **V**. In the case of LABBÉ and MAI, this is undisputed. But BARONIO was never in Paris: he only indirectly used the Codex Gervasianus. What he had in front of him was the text Nicolas LE FÈVRE had mailed from Paris, and that was a very near relative of **V**.

So far, so good – everything seemingly falls into place. Unfortunately, there is potentially conflicting evidence which requires brief consideration. As both BARONIO and LABBÉ expressly refer to the Codex Gervasianus, their respective text is certainly based on the same manuscript (even if, in the case of BARONIO, only indirectly). As BARONIO published before LABBÉ, but LABBÉ offers parts not included in BARONIO, it is clear that both of them provide evidence independent from one another. Whenever their text diverges, hence, this

---

<sup>44</sup> In **V**, this can be found at the end of f. 24r. On f. 25r, another text starts, by the same hand.

<sup>45</sup> I must stress, though, that I failed to identify the hand of **V** in any of the manuscripts of LE FÈVRE kept in Paris (yet this does not mean much, as **V** could be “written to order”, just as any other LE FÈVRE manuscript).

must be due to mistakes by either of the two<sup>46</sup>, whenever they agree, this should (at least at first sight) be good evidence regarding the contents of the Codex Gervasianus. However, such comparisons are only feasible for FRG. 3 and 4 and the *Commonitorium quomodo*, as BARONIO provides just these texts. My own comparison here is limited to the texts I have worked on, i.e. FRG. 3 and 4.

The first name in the third fragment is given by BARONIO just as “C.”, while LABBÉ has “conversus”. Following the stemmatic method, one must logically suppose that their common exemplar either had just “C.” or perhaps “C” with a lacuna or an unclear abbreviation; at any rate something which LABBÉ likely expanded on his own devices. The problem is: both **R** and **V** have a clearly written “Cresconius”! It is very difficult to explain how BARONIO and LABBÉ ended up bungling this (I might add that for anyone interested in Canon Law – which is certainly true for both – “Cresconius” is not an obscure name one might misread, as there is one very famous Cresconius, the author of the *Concordia Canonum*).

There is a more disturbing observation to make. In FRG. 2 (i.e., Felix’s anathema), there is a phrase lacking from two manuscripts (**PT**), probably due to a *saut du même au même* (→ p. 164). Oddly, this very same line, “et ipsas iterum in masculos contra feminea daemonia”, is also absent from LABBÉ’s text. (This part is not included in BARONIO’s edition, so we cannot compare.) In **R**, one finds these eight words clearly written, and they do not coincide with a line of **R** (which would have provided an easy explanation, viz. LABBÉ skipping this line while copying from the manuscript).

And this is not even the most mysterious thing: LABBÉ’s edition of AUG. epist. 79 has the wrong *cancer* for *cantrum* and the probably correct *solvere* for *solve*, both variants absent from **R** – but present in the closely related manuscripts **AL**.

Should we therefore assume that it was premature to identify **R** with the Codex Gervasianus and rather assume a reconstructed **g**, with the abbreviation “C.” instead of “Cresconius”, featuring a lacuna also detectable in other manuscripts and contaminated, furthermore, with variants from yet another family of manuscripts? Well, such an idea is impossible to refute, but I think it is not very likely. For this to be the case, **g** would need to be a copy of **R**, as both feature the notice about the prior Hugo and Saint-Saulve, and of the two, **R** cannot be the apograph (because, according to palaeographic observations, **R** was indeed written under the prior Hugo). There is not only the colophon – both BARONIO and LABBÉ have the telltale mistake *patrem* for *nepotem*, only to be found in **R** and its apograph **V**. Further, apart from *solvere*, not any one of the differences found in **g** can go back to a later corrector, for no one would replace “Cresconius” by “C.” nor would anybody remove a clearly correct line, or insert

---

<sup>46</sup> For example, LABBÉ has “Candidum, qui [...] Thipasa”, just like all extant manuscripts (so BARONIO’s mistaken version “Candidam, quae [...] Thipasae” cannot go back to the Codex Gervasianus).

the ungrammatical *cancer* where *cancrum* belongs. So if **g** had existed, it was a degenerate copy of **R**. But then, we are not only faced with the phantom **g**, but also the problem of LE FÈVRE's copy of **g**: we would need to assume a **v** as well, distinct from **V** (as **V** has "Cresconius", "cancrum", "solvere"<sup>47</sup>, and the line missing in LABBÉ is present there). All of this is highly improbable.

My guess is that both BARONIO and LABBÉ deliberately removed the name of "Cresconius", as they believed that fragments 2–4 all belonged together: in FRG. 2, a Felix is speaking, in FRG. 4 as well, whom at least BARONIO explicitly (and LABBÉ, as it seems, implicitly) identified with the Felix of FRG. 2; hence, they had to edit out "Cresconius" from FRG. 3. This they did by conjecture and without alerting their readers. The loss of "et ipsas iterum in masculos contra feminea daemonia" could have happened at many stages; possibly LABBÉ introduced it when he copied from the manuscript, or, perhaps, it was the typesetter's fault (it will be remembered that the book appeared only after LABBÉ's death, who never had a chance to check any galley proofs). Admittedly, *cancer* and *solvere* are not that easy to explain. It must be noted that LABBÉ's version of AUG. epist. 79 teems with textual mistakes not found in any of the manuscripts<sup>48</sup>; perhaps *cancer* and *solvere* came into being by sheer coincidence? There is a good chance that these questions could be answered by a diligent collation of the *Commonitorium quomodo*. This much longer text is contained, after all, not only in both BARONIO's and LABBÉ's editions but also in all manuscripts except **A**. Yet such an analysis is beyond the scope of this article.

#### (8) SOME BACKGROUND ON MINUTES AND MANICHEES

It has already been mentioned that the provenance of the first two declarations is well-known (they come from *Contra Felicem*), while the other two are not transmitted in any other context. Given the relationship of FRG. 1 and FRG. 2, one might conjecture that there is a similar link between FRG. 3 and FRG. 4 which is, however, not the case (→ p. 180). Let us first have a look at two passages of *Contra Felicem* which will help a great deal to make sense of FRG. 3 and FRG. 4.

*Contra Felicem* comprises the minutes of a "discussion" between Augustine and the Manichaean Felix (*PCBE* I, pp. 417 f., s.v. Felix 20). I have put "discussion" in quotes, because in truth, this was a show trial. From the very outset, there was not the slightest doubt regarding the outcome: the day before, Felix's books had been confiscated (c. Fel. I 12). At that point in time, he was still

---

<sup>47</sup> However, much later the Maurini added the variant *solvere* in the margin of **V**, probably from LABBÉ's edition.

<sup>48</sup> I did not indicate these in the apparatus because of their limited helpfulness and the ensuing clutter, but here they are: *qui tecum locuti sunt* (instead of *quid ... fuerint*); missing *autem* after *dicitis*; *timuit* for *timebat*; *quid tu gloriaris* (instead of *et tu gloriaris*); *disputes* for *disputans*; *putaveris* for *putaveras*.

unfazed, proclaiming that he was willing to be burned together with his books if anything wrong was to be found in them. Yet when discussion had actually started, much of Felix's defiance was gone; he acknowledged the fact that he was helpless against the power of a bishop and the laws of the emperor (c. Fel. I 12). After much discussion of theological issues, an exhausted Felix asks for an intermission at the end of the first day (c. Fel. I 19–20):

FELIX dixit: Dilationem peto, ut possim respondere.

AUGUSTINUS dixit: Quando? Cras intermissus sufficit?

FELIX dixit: Intermitte mihi tres dies, id est hodie et cras et perindie, aut usque ad diem, qui est post dominicum, id est pridie idus Decembris.

AUGUSTINUS dixit: Video te dilationem ad respondendum petiisse. Humanum est ut concedatur tibi. Sed si respondere non potueris ad praestitutum diem, quid fiet?

FELIX dixit: Ero victus.

AUGUSTINUS dixit: Quid, si fugeris?

FELIX dixit: Reus ero civitatis huius et ubique et legis meae.

AUGUSTINUS dixit: Immo hoc dic: Si fugero, sic habear, tamquam si anathema-vero Manichaeum.

FELIX dixit: Hoc dicere non possum.

AUGUSTINUS dixit: Ergo aperte nobis dic, quia fugere cogitas, et nemo te tenet.

FELIX dixit: Non fugio.

AUGUSTINUS dixit: Ut video, non vis quasi victus abscedere. Sed saltem hoc dic: Si fugero, victus sum.

FELIX dixit: Dixi.

AUGUSTINUS dixit: Et unde apparebit te fugisse propter gesta?

FELIX dixit: Iube, ut quem elegero, cum ipso sim.

AUGUSTINUS dixit: Elige tibi aliquem de praesentibus istis fratribus, qui ad cancellum stant.

FELIX dixit: Sim cum illo, qui est in medio.

AUGUSTINUS dixit: Sicut tibi elegisti, usque ad diem cum illo eris?

FELIX dixit: Etiam, et ego hoc consentio.

BONIFACIUS dixit: Praestabit Christus, ut si cum illo veniam, christianus est.

Augustinus episcopus ecclesiae catholicae Hipponeregiensis, his in ecclesia coram populo gestis subscripsi.

Felix christianus, cultor legis Manichaei, his in ecclesia coram populo gestis subscripsi.

Felix: Please give me a respite, so that I can answer.

Augustine: When? Is a respite until the day after tomorrow enough?

Felix: Give me three days, i.e., today, tomorrow, and the day after, or [better still] until the day after Sunday, i.e., the day before the Ides of December.

Augustine: I see, you've asked for a respite in order to answer. It's only decent to concede that. However, in case you cannot answer on the agreed day, what will happen?

Felix: I shall be defeated.

Augustine: What happens if you run away?

Felix: I shall be guilty in this city, and everywhere, and according to my own law.

Augustine: Better say the following: "If I run away, I shall be considered as if I had anathematised Mani".



Felix: I can't say that.

Augustine: So admit to us candidly that you're thinking about running away. Nobody will stop you.

Felix: I don't run away!

Augustine: I see. You don't want to leave in your condition of being virtually vanquished. But say at least the following: "If I run away, I shall be vanquished".

Felix: Consider it said.

Augustine: For the purpose of the *gesta*, how shall it be established that you ran away?

Felix: Tell me to choose somebody, and I shall stay with that person.

Augustine: Choose any of the brothers here present who stand at the bar.

Felix: I shall be with the one in the middle.

Augustine: The one you have chosen, are you going to be with him until the determined day?

Felix: Indeed. I confirm also that.

Boniface: Christ shall grant that he is a Christian when I return with him!<sup>49</sup>

I, Augustine, Bishop of the Catholic Church of Hippo Regius, have signed these *gesta* in the church before the people.

I, Felix, a Christian, a follower of the teachings of Mani, have signed these *gesta* in the church before the people.

Note Felix's restive signature (which seems to imply that the teachings of Mani make one a *real* Christian!). Felix seems to refer to Boniface's comment, but he cannot have signed immediately afterwards (as by then, there was no finished neat protocol to sign, which first had to be created from the stenographer's notes). Chronologically, Felix's signature is therefore likely to belong to the very start of the *second* day of discussion (note "in the church before the people", which matches the setting of the second day). Also during this second day, Felix again and again raised various points in order to defend Mani, only to be refuted just as often by Augustine. There is no discernable development. The end of the second day of discussion therefore comes as a complete surprise to any reader of the minutes as we have them (c. Fel. II 22):

Post haec cum multis verbis inter se agerent,

FELIX dixit: Dic iam, quid vis faciam?

AUGUSTINUS dixit: Ut anathemes Manichaeum, cuius sunt tantae istae blasphemiae; sed si ex animo facis, tunc fac. Nemo enim te cogit invitum.

FELIX dixit: Deus videt, si ex animo facio; non enim homo potest videre. Sed hoc peto, ut confirmes me.

AUGUSTINUS dixit: In quo vis ut confirmem te?

---

<sup>49</sup> My translation of Boniface's utterance is little more than a paraphrase of its likely content. Grammatically, there are problems which might either be due to the oral origin or to later scribal corruptions (*ut* with indicative; superfluous *si*, which perhaps should be changed to *sic*, as Clemens WEIDMANN suggests). Also note that ZYCHA prints *Sed cum illo* (instead of the straightforward conjecture *Sim cum illo*). Besides, *cras intermissus* is problematic, as *cras* as a noun should be neuter.



FELIX dixit: Prior tu anathema, ut et ego postea anathemem.

AUGUSTINUS dixit: Ecce manu mea etiam scribo; volo enim, ut et tu manu tua scribas.

FELIX dixit: Sed sic anathema, ut spiritum ipsum, qui in Manichaeo fuit et per eum ista locutus est, anathemes.

Augustinus accepta charta scripsit haec verba: Augustinus ecclesiae catholicae episcopus iam anathemavi Manichaeum et doctrinam eius et spiritum, qui per eum tam execrabiles blasphemias locutus est, quia spiritus seductor erat, non veritatis, sed nefandi erroris; et nunc anathemo supra dictum Manichaeum et spiritum erroris ipsius.

Et cum eandem chartam Felici dedisset, etiam ille manu sua haec verba scripsit: Ego Felix, qui Manichaeo credideram, nunc anathemo eum et doctrinam ipsius et spiritum seductorem, qui in illo fuit, qui dixit deum partem suam genti tenebrarum miscuisse et eam tam turpiter liberare, ut virtutes suas transfigureret in feminas contra masculina et ipsas iterum in masculos contra feminea daemonia, ita ut postea reliquias ipsius suae partis configat in aeternum globo tenebrarum. Has omnes et ceteras blasphemias Manichaei anathemo.

Augustinus episcopus his in ecclesia coram populo gestis subscripsi.

Felix his gestis subscripsi.

Later on, after they had exchanged numerous words:

Felix: Tell me, what do you want me to do?

Augustine: I want you to anathematise Mani, who is at the origin of these numerous blasphemies. But if you want to do it out of your own free will, do it now! For nobody forces you to do so against your will.

Felix: God sees if I do it out of my own free will, as man cannot see such a thing. But I ask this of you: lend me your support!

Augustine: In which way are you asking for my support?

Felix: You go first and anathematise, then I follow suit and anathematise.

Augustine: Look, I am going to write by my own hand, and I want you to also write by your own hand.

Felix: But make your anathema in a way that you anathematise the very spirit that was in Mani and through which he said these things.

Augustine was given a piece of paper and wrote the following words: [...]

And after he had passed this piece of paper to Felix, he, too, wrote the following by his own hand: [...]

I, Augustine, Bishop, have signed these *gesta* in the church before the people.

I, Felix, have signed these *gesta*.

The underlined passages constitute FRG. 1 and FRG. 2, respectively, of FRG. Manich. renunt., though the text in ZYCHA's edition is clearly better than the one which can be reconstructed by using the dossier manuscripts only<sup>50</sup> (still I left out the translation to save some space).

<sup>50</sup> In § 2, the dossier manuscripts have the patently mistaken *deum patrem suam* instead of *deum partem suam*; since *suam* is now orphaned, they add a *naturam* after *miscuisse* (→ p. 164). Both leave out *tam* before *turpiter* and write *transfiguret* instead of *transfigureret*. They add a *demonia* after *masculina* and reverse the word order of *suae partis* to *partis suae*. I have mentioned earlier how the pseudo-*incipit* of the dossier version came into being (→ p. 163).

Note that the subscription of Augustine takes place, once again, “in the church before the people”, so certainly at the next big public event occurring after the final minutes were created from the notes of the stenographers. Not so in the case of Felix: while he signed the first protocol “in the church before the people” (doubtless at the start of the second discussion which took place several days after the first), he apparently subscribed the *gesta* of the second day at a much less formal occasion, to finally get it over with. It is certainly significant that he no longer calls himself a Christian<sup>51</sup>.

(9) PRELIMINARY REMARKS PERTAINING TO BOTH  
FRG. MANICH. RENUNT. 3 AND 4

We have seen that FRG. Manich. renunt. 1 and 2 stem from the same work, c. Fel. There, they are not continuous (i.e., some text between them has been removed). FRG. Manich. renunt. 3 and 4 are not part of c. Fel., nor can they be some part of c. Fel. that was later lost, as there is no Cresconius in c. Fel. (FRG. Manich. renunt. 3), and the Felix of FRG. Manich. renunt. 4 was a Manichaean layperson (“Hearer”), as he prayed with the Elect Eucharistus, while Augustine’s Felix was an Elect himself (cf. DECRET 1970: 334 f., who also adduces further excellent arguments against this identification). These two fragments do not belong together despite the suggestion by J. LIEU and S. LIEU (1981; → p. 180).

FRG. Manich. renunt. 4 is certainly of African provenance, as the three mentioned place names indicate. The only hint regarding the origin of FRG. Manich. renunt. 3 is the name of the signee, Cresconius, which was hugely popular in Roman Africa (RIEDLBERGER 2010: 28 f.). This does not prove that Cresconius signed his declaration in Africa (he could be, for example, one of those African Manichaean refugees who came to Italy after the Vandal invasion), but this seems the most straightforward explanation.

It is difficult to ascertain the date of these two fragments. They must belong to a period when African Manichaeans had very good reasons to publicly recant their beliefs. After Diocletian’s persecution, legislation against Manichaeans resumed only in 371 (RIEDLBERGER 2020: 428 f.), focusing on outlawing their assemblies. It gained further traction in the 380s with Theodosius I’s enactments, and I would suggest 381 (the date of his earliest, and already quite comprehensive anti-Manichaean law, cf. RIEDLBERGER 2020: 437–448) as the lower *terminus*. In the 430s, the Vandals completed the conquest of Africa, triggering a mass flight of Africans, including many Manichaeans (cf. LEO M. serm. 16, 5). From 477, King Hunerich eradicated African Manichaeism by either burning its adherents

---

<sup>51</sup> HUMFRESS (2007: 251) confuses the sequence: “By the close of their next session, Felix had abjured Mani and his ‘blasphemies’, and had signed the acts as Felix *Christianus*”. It is exactly the other way around.

or selling them into slavery (RIEDLBERGER 2020: 485; 487, n. 147). There are no later references to Manichaeans in Africa<sup>52</sup>. So the upper limit could be as late as 477, but I think it is reasonable to lower it by several decades to around 430 as there is no clue of an earlier Vandal persecution of them, and their number was dramatically reduced during the invasion<sup>53</sup>. Given these factors, the timeframe I would suggest for both FRG. Manich. renunt. 3 and 4 is 381–430<sup>54</sup>.

(10) COMMENTARY TO FRG. MANICH. RENUNT. 3: CRESCONIUS

I repeat this text here:

Ego Cresconius unus ex Manichaeis scripsi, quia, si discessero, antequam gesta subscribantur, sic sim habendus, ac si Manichaeum non anathemaverim.

J. LIEU and S. LIEU offered a striking interpretation of this phrase in a 1981 article, though they fail there to offer a translation. However, in his later book, S. LIEU (1992: 200) renders it as:

I, Cresconius, one of the Manichaeans, have written [this] because if I should depart before the proceedings have been signed, so I should be considered as if I had anathemised Mani.

But this is certainly mistaken, as LIEU ignores the *non* before *anathemaverim*. It is also lacking from the Latin text he cites (S. LIEU 1992: 201, n. 36), although every earlier edition (and every extant manuscript) correctly features the *non*. This must be an error of LIEU's. Most curiously, in the earlier joint article LIEU gives the correct text including *non* (J. LIEU, S. LIEU 1981: 174 f.), which (as already remarked) he and his wife do not translate. Despite including the *non*, his interpretation was already then based on an understanding which ignores it! They (J. LIEU, S. LIEU 1981: 175) claim: "the opening sentence implies that Cresconius is very anxious to make a statement of some sort which would establish his conversion lest he should 'depart' before the official *gesta* were

---

<sup>52</sup> Accordingly, I find OORT's (2017: 93) suggestion, "it might be possible that the text dates from Vandal or even Byzantine times", scarcely convincing.

<sup>53</sup> DECRET (1978: I 194), too, thinks that 430 should be retained as upper limit, though I do not find his argument compelling: he believes that there was a formal obligation imposed by the Catholic Church to disclose all known fellow-Manichaeans, and that the Catholic Church would not have been capable of enforcing this after 430. But the idea of such a *formal* obligation is purely speculative and implausible. And even if: in case anybody else (like, theoretically, the Homoean Vandals) chose to persecute Manichaeans, they, too, would surely have taken care to discover clandestine members.

<sup>54</sup> All of the proper names mentioned in FRG. Manich. renunt. 3 and 4 can be found in *PCBE* I (sometimes in an incorrect version, as MANDOUZE uses MAI's poor edition, so he has, e.g., Candidus, not Candida). I do not indicate these entries as they do not add anything new to the discussion.

properly signed”. They connect this with the idea that Cresconius needed to rush his conversion because of some inheritance squabble, an idea which is flawed (RIEDLBERGER 2020: 487–489).

SHAW (2011: 341) also offers a translation of FRG. Manich. renunt. 3:

I, Cresconius, a member of the Manichaeans, have written this, because if I depart [i.e. die] before the public records are signed, I will still be held to be one, as if I had not abjured my identity as a Manichaean.

This is scarcely more convincing. He ignores the subjunctive *sim*, and *discedere* in the poetical meaning of “to die” would be quite surprising. My understanding, which I already have suggested elsewhere (RIEDLBERGER 2020: 488 f.), is the following: *scribere* requires a complement, hence *quia* must introduce a direct object clause, as it regularly does in late Latin. The word *discedere* could be understood either in its regular sense (cf. the discussion about running away between Augustine and Felix) or in its technical juristic sense (“withdraw” from an earlier statement/decision, i.e., “changing one’s mind”). So my translation would be:

I, Cresconius, one of the Manichaeans, have written what follows: “If I should withdraw before the *gesta* have been subscribed, I shall be considered as if I had not anathematised Mani”.

It should be clear what is going on: Cresconius has already publicly anathematised Mani, but he is not finished yet. Just as in the case of Felix, proper *gesta* must be created based on the minuted account of his anathema. Only when Cresconius has added a subscription to *this document* is his conversion concluded. However, producing this neat copy takes a few days, and if Cresconius “withdraws” in the meantime (i.e., avoids subscribing by either running away or changing his mind), he continues to be a Manichaean notwithstanding the public anathema.

This two-step procedure (public recanting plus later subscribing the official *gesta*) is confirmed by other evidence, such as Bishop Leo’s statement on procedure during his anti-Manichaean persecution (LEO M. epist. 7, 1: “Quos potuimus emendare, correximus et, ut damnarent Manichaeum cum praedicationibus et discipulis suis, publica in ecclesia professione et manus suae subscriptione compulimus” – “Those we could improve, we corrected. We forced them to damn Mani together with his doctrines and disciples by way of a public declaration in the church and a hand-written subscription”) and the beginning of the early 6<sup>th</sup> century pseudo-Augustinian anathematismata (CPL<sup>3</sup> 534: “Capitula S. Augustini, quae debeant publica voce relegere et manu propria subscribere, in quibus suspicio est, quod Manichaei sunt” – “The declarations by Saint Augustine which those who are under suspicion of being Manichaeans must read out publicly and subscribe in their own hand-writing”).

However, I must admit that there are no direct parallels for any such disclaimer as I suggest we can detect here (“I understand my conversion is void if I do not complete it by subscribing the final *gesta*”). I assume its function is to make it completely clear to the converts that they have a choice (allegedly, at least). They can still cancel the conversion process if they want to, and they have to confirm that they have been given a few days to think it through. Again, the case of Felix with the discussion about free will in his decision provides a parallel<sup>55</sup>.

There is also, however, one intriguing difference between c. Fel. and Cresconius’s statement. Augustine suggested to Felix that he declare an elopement of his as being tantamount to a renunciation of Mani (“Imo hoc dic: Si fugero, sic habear tamquam si anathemavero Manichaeum” → p. 173), while Cresconius’s written declaration claims the opposite. If Cresconius withdraws, he will be considered as having *not* renounced Mani. Yet this difference is easily explained: Augustine wants to avoid an escape by Felix, and in order to prevent this, he encourages him to pronounce something against which Felix cannot act if he has the slightest sense of honour. In the case of Cresconius, we are faced with a more straightforward legal procedure: he signs that he has understood that this is not the final signature.

#### (11) COMMENTARY TO FRG. MANICH. RENUNT. 4: FELIX

Again, I repeat my text and translation:

Felix conversus ex Manichaeis dixi sub testificatione dei me omnia vera confiteri, de quo scio. Esse Manichaeos vel Manichaeas in partes Caesarienses Mariam et Lampadium, uxorem Mercurii argentarii, cum quibus etiam apud electum Eucharistum pariter oravimus; Caesariam et Lucillam filiam suam; Candidum, qui commoratur Thipasa; Victorinam Hispanam, Simplicianum Antonini nepotem, Paulum et sororem suam, qui sunt Hippone. Quas etiam per Mariam et Lampadium scivi esse Manichaeas. Hoc tantum scio. Quod si aliud inventum fuerit me scire supra quam dixi, me reum ego ipse confiteor.

I, Felix, converted from the Manichaeans, have said with God as witness that I will truthfully confess everything that I know. The following are male or female Manichaeans: in the region of Caesarea, Maria and Lampadia, the wife of Mercurius, the silversmith (together with these, we also prayed with the Elect Eucharistus), Caesaria and her daughter Lucilla. Candidus, who lives in Tipasa. Victorina the

---

<sup>55</sup> I cannot make sense of DECRET’s interpretation (1978: II 170 f., n. 69). He claims that all of this is very similar to the case of Augustine’s Felix. He even thinks “cette souscription de Felix est d’ailleurs fort semblable à celle de Cresconius”, with reference to “Felix christianus, cultor legis Manichaei, his in ecclesia coram populo gestis subscripsi”, which is in my opinion quite different (it is a confirmation by signature of acts, of which we have numerous other examples). DECRET thinks that Cresconius confirms by his signature that, if he is going to run away, he avows to be a Manichaean – but is “Cresconius unus ex Manichaeis” not already clear enough? He also thinks that then the worldly powers would intervene – but cf. below for *CTh.* XVI 5, 41.

Spaniard, Simplicianus, the grandson of Antoninus, Paulus and his sister, who are in Hippo. I have learned through Maria and Lampadia that also these ladies are Manichaeans. I only know as much. If however it should transpire that I have knowledge of anything beyond what I have said, I myself acknowledge my felony.

Another problematic suggestion of J. LIEU and S. LIEU was to understand Felix not as a proper name, but as a predicative: “happily converted away from...”, with Cresconius still being subject. This is clearly wrong<sup>56</sup>:

- Cresconius, the subject of § 3, *wrote* his statement (*scripsi*), the subject of § 4 however writes that he *pronounced* his statement (*dixi*). This cannot be a continuous text.
- Felix is a run-of-the-mill African name (*PCBE* I lists no fewer than 104 people of that name). By necessity, any ancient reader would take *Felix* as a name.
- In the context, “happily” does not make much sense. The preoccupation with voluntariness of conversions means that something like *libenter, sua sponte*, or *ultro* might be expected, but neither *felix* nor *feliciter* carries this meaning.
- J. LIEU and S. LIEU construe a continuous text because they claim that Cresconius had to rush his conversion due to a case of succession. As this is wrong in the first place (→ p. 178), the further step (i.e., the need to “explain away” Felix) no longer applies.
- While *felix* does appear as a predicative (*ThLL* VI 1, 443, 59–80), a predicative should always go with the verb (i.e., “as a happy person I have said”), not with a participle referring to the subject. If J. LIEU and S. LIEU wish to claim such an extraordinary thing, it would have been necessary for them to cite corroborating linguistic evidence. Yet the only reference they give (J. LIEU, S. LIEU 1981: 176) is a footnote pointing to the whole chapter of KÜHNER and STEGMANN devoted to adjectives in a predicative function. This is hardly convincing<sup>57</sup>.

Grammatically, there are two problems: first, the plural *omnia vera* is picked up by the singular *de quo*. This might easily be explained by a substandard language use of Felix. Less straightforward to understand is the second issue: the list of people, comprised of *both* women and men, is picked up at the end as “Quas [...] esse Manichaeas”. As the feminine form is unexpected and cannot have come into being as a banalisation, and as it is palaeographically beyond doubt, as confirmed by both *quas* and *Manichaeas*, it is out of the question to

---

<sup>56</sup> Neither does DECRET (1990: 144, n. 21) accept the suggestion of J. LIEU and S. LIEU, although his counterarguments do not always seem completely clear.

<sup>57</sup> Their reference is KÜHNER, STEGMANN 1976: II 1, 234–239. Yet the problem is certainly not whether predicatives generally exist in Latin; the issue at stake is rather if they can be combined with a *participium coniunctum*. The only cases KÜHNER, STEGMANN (1976: II 1, 17 f. and 772) refer to are instances which would, as a verbal phrase, require a copula, such as “hunc virum optimum iudicatum”.

remove this editorially. Neither can it refer to the people mentioned immediately before, as these, Paul and his sister, are a man and a woman. We can also exclude the solution of changing *Paulum* to *Paulam*, as the relative pronoun *qui* refers to these two people. Therefore, either the names of some more ladies fell out before *Quas etiam*, or some later “corrections” were introduced in order to accommodate earlier writing mistakes (so, perhaps *quae* was “corrected” to *qui* after *Paulam* became *Paulum*, but this is of course pure speculation and not the simplest solution). None of the people mentioned can be identified otherwise. The list runs as follows:

- (1) Maria of Caesarea, direct contact of Felix, prayed with Eucharistus, knows more female Manichaeans.
- (2) Lampadia of Caesarea, direct contact of Felix, prayed with Eucharistus, knows more female Manichaeans; she is identified as being the wife of the silversmith (or banker/moneychanger?) Mercurius.
- (3) Mercurius of Caesarea, silversmith (or banker/moneychanger?), husband of Lampadia, apparently *not* a Manichaean.
- (4) Eucharistus, a Manichaean Elect, probably of Caesarea; he is likely already known to the authorities, as his being Manichaean is already assumed in the declaration.
- (5) Caesaria, probably of Caesarea, mother of Lucilla.
- (6) Lucilla, probably of Caesarea, daughter of Caesaria.
- (7) Candidus, probably of Caesarea, though living in Tipasa.
- (8) Victorina from Spain, probably of either Caesarea or Hippo.
- (9) Simplicianus, probably of either Caesarea or Hippo, grandson (or nephew) of Antoninus.
- (10) Antoninus, grandfather (or uncle) of Simplicianus, apparently *not* a Manichaean (or alternatively already dead).
- (11) Paulus of Hippo.
- (12) The unnamed sister of Paulus, also of Hippo.

Some items in this list warrant further comment. First, *Victorinam Hispanam*. This might either be one woman, “Victorina the Spaniard”, or two women, “Victorina” and “Hispana”. Clearly, there is philologically or palaeographically no sound<sup>58</sup> way to distinguish between these two alternatives. But the exceedingly rare onomastic evidence for Hispanus/Hispana strongly suggests that Hispana is a toponymic adjective, not a proper name. In *PLRE* I to III, there is just one Hispanus (*PLRE* II, p. 566) from around 500, living in the Visigothic kingdom.

---

<sup>58</sup> But cf. OORT 2017: p. 93: “Whereas Baronio and [...] Migne read ‘Victorinam Hispanam’ as one name [...] the reproduction from the Vatican codex [...] clearly reads ‘Victorinam, Hispanam’, thus revealing two ladies”. Yet the punctuation a 16<sup>th</sup> c. scribe preferred is of no evidentiary value regarding the sense intended by the original late antique author.



*PCBE* cannot add to this: there, we again encounter the same Hispanus (*PCBE* IV/1, p. 1017) plus one Hispana (*PCBE* I, p. 562), but she is a phantom – she is *our* alleged Hispana from the *Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus*.

Secondly, Simplicianus. All mediaeval manuscripts except **R** confirm *nepotem*, just **R** – on which all so far available editions are based – has the incorrect *patrem*.

Thirdly, the toponyms. Felix mentions three cities: Caesarea, Tipasa, and Hippo. The problem is that for the majority of listed people, it is not clear to which place (if any) they belong. The only sure thing is that Candidus is alone to have a connection with Tipasa. Note that Felix explicitly says that he lives/stays (*commorari*) there, so Tipasa is surely not his hometown (i.e., the town of which he holds the citizenship). This is, I guess, rather Caesarea (which is some 20 km away and can easily be reached in a few hours' walk). I am not sure whether I understand Felix correctly, but I think he says that he is going to list all Manichaeans in the region of Caesarea, i.e., “esse Manichaeos vel Manichaeas in partes Caesarienses” refers not just to Maria and Lampadia, but also to the following names including Candidus (who, for now, stays in Tipasa). The last indication, Hippo, is more problematic, as this city is far off from Caesarea (more than 600 km, equalling several weeks of walking). It would make sense to assume that this is the reason why Felix has no first-hand knowledge but must refer to what Maria and Lampadia told him. But note that Maria and Lampadia referred to some women, which does not match Paulus (!) and his sister in Hippo<sup>59</sup>. Finally, Victorina and Simplicianus. Do they belong to the Caesarea list? Or does “qui sunt Hippone” also refer to them? There is no way to decide<sup>60</sup>.

Fourthly, “quod si [...], me reum ego ipse confiteor”. This of course recalls the account of Augustine and the other Felix (“Quid, si fugeris? – Reus ero civitatis huius, et ubique, et legis meae”). This is a declaration by which the speaker clearly expresses his understanding that any noncompliance is not just undesirable, but a clear violation with potentially grave consequences.

---

<sup>59</sup> OORT 2017: 92, n. 30: “‘Hippone’ is ‘from Hippo’ and not ‘at Hippo’ as, for instance, stated in the relevant articles (‘Maria 2’ etc.) in PAC”. Yet “in Hippo” is indeed *Hippone* in Latin, while “from Hippo” would require in post-classical Latin (from the times of Sallust and Livy!) a preposition (HOFMANN, SZANTYR 1972: 102). More interesting is *Tipasa* in the sense of “in Tipasa”, as one might rather expect *Tipasae*, as the locative in the 1<sup>st</sup> declension doggedly stood its ground through much of Late Antiquity, and the ablative was still rare as late as the 5<sup>th</sup> c. (LÖFSTEDT 1956: II 76–78). Yet in this unkempt text, nothing should surprise us; it could also easily be a later copying mistake.

<sup>60</sup> OORT (2017: 93, n. 34) is more optimistic: “In my view, there is no reason to read the text as stating that four of the denounced Manichaeans live *at* Hippo; it is only said that the two last mentioned (Paul and his sister) come *from* Hippo”. Again, OORT misinterprets the meaning of a town in the ablative in a late antique text (location, not provenance) and the evidentiary value of punctuation in manuscripts or editions (naught).

OORT offers an onomastic discussion of these names although his reasoning does not seem to be compelling. He claims (OORT 2017: 92): “From the name Mercury we may possibly infer that, like her husband, the *auditrix* Lampadia came from a pagan background”. The underlying assumption that there were no mixed marriages is wrong; and besides, Mercurius could possibly be named after the 3<sup>rd</sup> century saint and martyr of that name (would anybody assume that names such as Martinus or Dionysius indicate a pagan upbringing?). Equally unconvincing is his surprising result (p. 94): “Future research may perhaps corroborate the impression that – either after becoming a Manichaean in their adult years, or already as a child descending from ‘Hearers’ – the female Manichaeans were (re)named with names highly symbolic to the ‘Religion of Light’, such as Lampadia, Lucilla, and Candida”. First, OORT ignores the fact that we are dealing with a denunciation. If it were as easy as that to track down Manichaeans (just check for females with names relating to light, especially if they assumed such names only later), there would be no way they could hide. Secondly, this alleged practice does not find any corroboration elsewhere: Manichaean women do not show a specific onomastic (OORT himself, p. 86, cites the famous cases of Eusebia and Margarita). Thirdly, all of these are well-attested African names which are also used by non-Manichaeans (as a quick *PCBE* check reveals). Fourthly, even in our sample, the majority of women do not bear such a name (Maria, Caesaria, Victorina), given that, fifthly, there is no Candida, but a Candidus (which is clear to OORT, p. 92, but forgotten in the sweeping statement at the end of his article). OORT (p. 90) even gave his paper a gender spin: “In all likelihood the text underwent some ‘masculinisation’ in the course of its tradition”. In actuality, all of this “masculinisation” is due to the misreadings of one person we can clearly identify, namely Angelo MAI.

To understand Felix’s declaration, we must quickly review the late antique perception of Manichaeans. In a way, there is much common ground with our own modern view of some of the more problematic cults, and of secret societies. Manichaean Hearers were required to support their Elect (who for religious reasons were not permitted to work themselves), which was interpreted as exploitation by outsiders (and in some cases might really have been exactly that, cf. RIEDLBERGER 2020: 414 f.). In addition to this concern, there was a constant fear of the clandestine Manichaean who lived in the midst of an orthodox community while secretly repairing to the occult ceremonies of his cult. Around 400, after the detection of several African Manichaeans, the Roman bishop Anastasius established that no incoming Africans would be accepted as clerics except if they could produce a “clearance certificate”, i.e., a document signed by five bishops vouchsafing for their trustworthiness (LIB. pontif. p. 87, 6–11). In one letter, Augustine mentions in passing a former Manichaean by the name of Theodosius, “per quem Manichaei nonnulli sunt proditi” – “by whom quite a few Manichaeans have been revealed”. This treason merited Theodosius a return to the Catholic

Church (in this letter, Augustine asks how Theodosius is doing as a Catholic, expressing his hope that the Manichaeans uncovered by Theodosius have also been corrected in the meantime). The letter in question is AUG. epist. 222 from 427, one of the four letters to Quodvultdeus which comprise no. 1 of our dossier. Yet the best parallel is provided by another letter by Augustine, namely epist. 236. A certain Victorinus from Malliana (near Caesarea) used to act for years as a sub-deacon of the Catholic Church, while clandestinely being a Manichaean Hearer and indoctrinating the unsuspecting, probably already in Malliana and certainly later in Hippo. During an interrogation before Augustine, Victorinus admitted to all of this and asked for forgiveness. He wanted to give up his Manichaean ways and remain a Catholic cleric. A horrified Augustine stripped him of his membership of the clergy and had him flogged and expelled from Hippo. It is not clear how and why Victorinus came to Hippo in the first place which is, after all, quite far from Malliana<sup>61</sup>. This letter AUG. epist. 236 is addressed to Deuterius, Bishop of Caesarea, warning him of Victorinus. Augustine reports Victorinus's demotion and advises Deuterius not to grant Victorinus admittance to the procedure of penance, except "si et alios, quos illic novit esse, manifestaverit vobis non solum Mallinae sed in ipsa tota omnino provincia" – "if he also reveals to you the others of whom he knows there, not only in Malliana, but outright in the whole province itself [Mauretania Caesariensis]". We do not know anything else about this incident. The chronological bracket is large, stretching from 411 to 430<sup>62</sup>.

By comparing these episodes, we have a likely backdrop to our FRG. Manich. renunt. 4: Theodosius could return to the Catholic Church, but only after ratting out his former co-Manichaeans. The same was expected of Victorinus before he could undergo penance. My guess is that Felix, too, wanted to return to the fold of the Church. His denunciation is probably before a bishop given that Victorinus was expected to confess to Deuterius (not to worldly authorities). A requirement to reveal fellow-Manichaeans can be found in imperial laws only much later (Justinian's *CI*. I 5, 16 of the late 520s) and even then applies only to former Manichaeans who had lapsed again as well as to members of the civil or military state service (*militia*). An official testimony on known clandestine

---

<sup>61</sup> Perhaps Victorinus preached Manichaeism only there, far from his home community. But then again, Augustine seems to assume that Victorinus knows Manichaeans in that region, i.e., Victorinus was according to him also a Manichaean in his earlier years. The interpretation of DECRET (1974: 155), namely that Augustine went over Deuterius's head and had Victorinus exiled from Malliana is certainly wrong (Augustine, after all, writes to Deuterius to warn him of the returning Victorinus, who accordingly was banished from Hippo). A discussion of various ideas can be found in his later book (DECRET 1978: I 195; II 140 f., n. 132).

<sup>62</sup> For the argument, cf. *PCBE* I, p. 1199, s.v. Victorinus 12. DECRET (2001: 343 and nn. 4 and 5) suggests precisely 418, but his reasoning depends on his unconvincing claim that Victorinus was banished from Malliana, not from Hippo (cf. DECRET 1978: II 140 f., n. 132; 171, n. 70: following this logic, Augustine must have been near that place to intervene, and one such trip took place in 418).

fellow-Manichaeans might be considered by a modern observer as “treason”, but this of course has nothing at all to do with the legal concept of a *delatio*<sup>63</sup>.

*Otto Friedrich University of Bamberg*  
*peter.riedlberger@uni-bamberg.de*

ORCID: 0000-0003-4381-7830

### ABBREVIATIONS

- CCSL Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina.  
 CPL<sup>3</sup> E. DEKKERS, E. GAAR, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, Steenbrugge <sup>3</sup>1995.  
 CSEL Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.  
 CI. *Codex Iustinianus*.  
 CTh. *Codex Theodosianus*.  
 PCBE I A. MANDOUZE, *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, vol. I: *Prosopographie de l’Afrique chrétienne (303–533)*, Paris 1982.  
 PL Patrologia Latina.  
 PLRE *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vols. I–III, Cambridge 1970–1992.  
 PLS II A. HAMMAN, *Patrologiae cursus completus... Series Latina. Supplementum*, vol. II, Paris 1960–1962.  
 ThLL *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALBERICIUS 1759: R. ALBERICIUS, *Venerabilis Caesaris Baronii [...] epistolae et opuscula*, I, Roma 1759.  
 BEESON 1906: C.H. BEESON (ed.), *Hegemonius. Acta Archelai*, Leipzig 1906.  
 CHATELAIN 1988: É. CHATELAIN, *Notice sur les manuscrits du Collège de Maître Gervais*, Paris 1988.  
 DAUR 2005: K.D. DAUR, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Epistolulae LVI–C*, Turnhout 2005 (CCSL 31A).  
 DECRET 1970: F. DECRET, *Aspects du manichéisme dans l’Afrique romaine. Les controverses de Fortunatus, Faustus et Felix avec saint Augustin*, Paris 1970.  
 ——— 1974: F. DECRET, *Mani et la tradition manichéenne*, Paris 1974.  
 ——— 1978: F. DECRET, *L’Afrique manichéenne (IVe–Ve siècles). Étude historique et doctrinale*, vol. I: *Texte*, vol. II: *Notes*, Paris 1978.  
 ——— 1990: F. DECRET, *Du bon usage du mensonge et du parjure. Manichéens et Priscillianistes face à la persécution dans l’empire chrétien (IVe–Ve siècles)*, in: M.-M. MACTOUX, É. GENY

---

<sup>63</sup> OORT 2017: 94: “it fits well with the *modus operandi* prescribed in the (virtually contemporary) Theodosian laws”, referring (p. 94, n. 38) to several laws, but specifically to CTh. XVI 5, 9. Likewise DECRET (1990: 144) who calls Felix’s testimony a “délation” with a note (n. 22): “Contraire au droit romain, le recours à la délation figure déjà dans législation de Théodose contre les Manichéens”, pointing to the same CTh. passage. Cf. also DECRET 2001: 347. For the actual meaning of *delatio* etc. in this context cf. RIEDLBERGER 2020: 454–457. It is unconvincing to adduce imperial laws in the context of these name lists as the only imperial constitution explicitly referring to the fashion of how Manichaeans may convert is exceedingly modest in its demands. A *simplex confessio* is enough and protects converts against any disadvantages threatened by the laws (CTh. XVI 5, 41 of 407, Honorius to the African proconsul). By this indulgent law, the emperor certainly diverges from the wishes of the Catholic bishops who would have preferred a more taxing procedure in order to combat fake conversions (cf. RIEDLBERGER 2020: 479, 551).

- (eds.), *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque*, vol. IV: *Religion*, Paris 1990, pp. 141–149.
- 2001: F. DECRET, *Des manichéens de Maurétanie Césarienne au Ve siècle. L'exemple de Caesarea et Tipasa: un billet de délation*, in: C. HAMDOUNE (ed.), *Ubique amici. Mélanges offerts à Jean-Marie Lassère*, Montpellier 2001, pp. 341–348.
- DELISLE 1903: L. DELISLE, *Deux lettres de Nicolas Le Fèvre au Père Sirmon, 1596–1599*, s. I. 1903.
- DIVJAK et al. 1996–2002: J. DIVJAK et al., *Epistulae*, in: Augustinus-Lexikon, vol. II, Basel 1996–2002, coll. 893–1057.
- ESCRIBANO PAÑO 2014: M.V. ESCRIBANO PAÑO, *Fraus maligna y simulatio fallax: delatar maniqueos en la época de la hipocresía*, in: F. MARCO SIMÓN, F. PINA POLO, J. REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ (eds.), *Fraude, mentiras y engaños en el mundo antiguo*, Barcelona 2014, pp. 281–294.
- FINOCCHIARO 2009: G. FINOCCHIARO, *La biblioteca di Cesare Baronio*, in: L. GULIA (ed.), *Baronio et le sue fonti*, Sora 2009, pp. 133–150.
- GOLDBACHER 1923: A. GOLDBACHER, *S. Aureli Augustini operum sectio II. S. Augustini epistulae. Pars V. Praefatio editoris et indices*, Wien 1923.
- HOFMANN, SZANTYR 1972: J.B. HOFMANN, A. SZANTYR, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. Verbessertes Nachdruck, München 1972.
- HUMFRESS 2007: C. HUMFRESS, *Orthodoxy and the Courts in Late Antiquity*, Oxford 2007.
- KÜHNER, STEGMANN 1976: R. KÜHNER, C. STEGMANN, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre*, vol. I, Hannover<sup>5</sup>1976.
- KUKULA 1898: R.C. KUKULA, *Die Mauriner Ausgabe des Augustinus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Literatur und der Kirche im Zeitalter Ludwigs XIV. III. Theil. II. (Schluss)*, Wien 1898.
- J. LIEU, S. LIEU 1981: J. LIEU, S. LIEU, “*Felix conversus ex Manichaeis*”: *A Case of Mistaken Identity*, JTS XXXII 1981, pp. 173–176.
- LIEU 1992: S. LIEU, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*. 2. [sic] edition, revised and expanded, Tübingen 1992.
- LÖFSTEDT 1956: E. LÖFSTEDT, *Syntactica. Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins. Zweiter Teil. Syntaktisch-stilistische Gesichtspunkte und Probleme*, Lund 1956. [originally from 1933]
- OORT 2017: J. VAN OORT, *Manichaean Women in a Pseudo-Augustinian Testimony: An Analysis of the North African Testimonium de Manichaeis sectatoribus*, VChr LXXI 2017, pp. 85–94.
- PERRIN 2007: M.-Y. PERRIN, *Le témoignage des ralliés. Une arme de la polémique doctrinale entre chrétiens dans l'antiquité tardive*, in: D. TOLLET (ed.), *La religion que j'ai quittée*, Paris 2007, pp. 65–86.
- QUANTIN 2009: J.-L. QUANTIN, *Baronius et les sources d'au-delà des monts. La contribution française aux Annales*, in: L. GULIA (ed.), *Baronio et le sue fonti*, Sora 2009, pp. 51–101.
- RIEDLBERGER 2010: P. RIEDLBERGER, *Philologischer, historischer und liturgischer Kommentar zum 8. Buch der Johannis des Goripp nebst kritischer Edition und Übersetzung*, Groningen 2010.
- 2020: P. RIEDLBERGER, *Prolegomena zu den spätantiken Konstitutionen. Nebst einer Analyse der erbrechtlichen und verwandten Sanktionen gegen Heterodoxe*, Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt 2020.
- SHAW 2011: B.D. SHAW, *Sacred Violence. African Christians and Sectarian Hatred in the Age of Augustine*, Cambridge 2011.
- TRAUBE, DELISLE 1903: L. TRAUBE, L. DELISLE, *Un feuillet retrouvé du recueil écrit sur papyrus de lettres et de sermons de saint Augustin*, Paris 1903.
- WILLIAMS JACKSON 1938: A.V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, *The Doctrine of the Bolos in Manichaean Eschatology*, JAOS LVIII 1938, pp. 225–234.