

Was Julian Right? A Re-Evaluation of Augustine's and Mani's Doctrines of Sexual Concupiscence and the Transmission of Sin

Part 2

Johannes van Oort (University of Pretoria)*

Abstract

The article focuses on the question: Was Julian of Eclanum (c. 380-454) right in accusing Augustine (354-430) of still being a Manichaean, based on his view of sexual concupiscence and the transmission of (original) sin? In order to find an answer to this (still hotly debated) question, a sketch of Augustine's acquaintance with Manichaeism is first provided. Thereafter follows the (first ever) overview of the Manichaean doctrines of the origin of sexual concupiscence, its distinctive features, and its role in the transmission of sin. The third part of the article focuses on the essentials of Augustine's views of sexual concupiscence and the transmission of original sin, in particular as they were expounded (and further developed) in his controversy with the 'Pelagian' bishop, Julian of Eclanum. It is concluded that, in particular, Augustine's stress on the 'random motion' (*motus inordinatus*) as typical of the sinfulness of the sexual concupiscence is strikingly similar to the Manichaean views on the subject. In this respects, then, Julian seems to be right. Finally, some preliminary remarks are made on early Jewish and Jewish-Christian views of sexual concupiscence and (original) sin which may have influenced not only Mani and his followers, but also Augustine and his precursors in the tradition of Roman North Africa.

Keywords

Augustine – Mani – Julian of Eclanum – Sexual Concupiscence – Random Motion – Original Sin

III: Augustine on sexual concupiscence and the transmission of sin

As regards Augustine on this topic, we should begin by noting that he wrote about the good of marriage (as in *De bono coniugali*). Already in this respect he differs totally from the Manichaeans. Moreover, he was acutely aware of and fiercely opposed their negative view of marriage and abhorrence of procreation.¹ Yet, even in his own lifetime, suspicions were raised concerning Manichaean influence on his own view of sexual concupiscence. Apart from his dualistic doctrine of the two *civitates*,² several modern scholars see a (possible) influence of Augustine's Manichaean past especially in his views on sexuality and the propagation of sin.³ A thorough

* I would like to acknowledge Yolande Steenkamp (UP) for her attentive reading and assistance. This article was completed with the help of the National Research Foundation (NRF) in South Africa; its first part appeared in *JECH* 6, issue 3 (2016) 111-125.

¹ E.g. in *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum*.

² Cf. J. van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon. A Study of Augustine's City of God and the Sources of his Doctrine of the Two Cities*, Leiden etc.: Brill 1991 (repr. Leiden-Boston: Brill 2013), esp. 201-207.

³ Among others: A. Bruckner, *Julian von Eclanum. Sein Leben und seine Lehre*, Leipzig: Hinrichs 1897, 66-68; A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, III, Tübingen: Mohr 1910⁴ (repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1964), 211; E. Buonaiuti, 'The Genesis of St. Augustine's Idea of Original Sin', *HTR* 10 (1917) 162; A. Adam, 'Das Fortwirken des Manichäismus bei Augustin' (1958), in: Adam, *Sprache und Dogma*, Gütersloh: Mohn 1969, 141-166; K. Rudolph, *Die Gnosis. Wesen und Geschichte einer spätantiken Religion*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1977, 394 and 414 (Engl. translation by RMcL Wilson as *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism*, San Francisco: Harper 1987, 370 and 390; see also Rudolph's pertinent remarks in his 'Augustinus Manichaeus: das Problem von Konstanz und Wandel', in J. van Oort a.o. (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*, Leiden-Boston: Brill 2001 (repr. 2012), 1-15); L. Scheffczyk, *Urstand, Fall und Erbsünde. Von der Schrift bis Augustinus*,

comparison with and argumentation from Manichaean sources remain lacking; hence an overview of essential Manichaean texts has just been provided.

In Augustine's own days, it was the Italian Catholic bishop, Julian of Eclanum, who accused him of Manichaeism because of his opinions on sexual concupiscence, marriage and original sin. Julian's criticism even culminated in the venomous remark:

Si mutabit Aethiops pellam suam aut pardus varietatem, ita et tu a Manichaeorum mysteriis elueris.⁴

If the Ethiopian will change his skin or the leopard its spots, only in that case you will be able to cleanse yourself from the Manichaean mysteries.

According to ecclesiastical tradition, Julian was as a 'Pelagian'. It is not my intention to give a sketch of Augustine's controversy with the Pelagians and his views of marriage, sexuality, original sin and baptism which developed in the wake of this controversy. Much excellent work has been done in this regard, ranging from the distant past to the modern day. My focus here falls in particular on parallels and other similarities (perhaps even identities) between Augustine's views and Manichaeism.

It should be noted that Julian, when reproaching Augustine for Manichaeism, did not place a speculative lable on him, but had solid knowledge of what he was talking about.⁵ He knew at least the outlines of the Manichaean myth;⁶ he was acquainted with Manichaean ritual practices;⁷ and he relates that one day he argued about the origin of sin with Augustine's friend Honoratus, 'a Manichaean like you'.⁸ Moreover, he had an intimate knowledge of Mani's *Epistle to Menoch*.⁹ Julian quoted from the work before Augustine had even heard of it.¹⁰ Furthermore, he was well informed about Mani's *Epistula fundamenti*.¹¹

Although in the initial period of the Pelagian crisis, questions concerning sexuality, marriage and the transmission of original sin were not prominent, they were certainly present. As early as in the winter of 411-412, Augustine says in *The Punishment and Forgiveness of Sins and the Baptism of Little Ones* that original sin reveals itself in the disobedient excitation of the members:

Quod igitur in membris corporis mortis huius inoboedienter movetur totumque animum in se deiectum conatur adtrahere et neque cum mens voluerit exurgit neque cum mens voluerit conquiescit, hoc est malum peccati, cum quo nascitur omnis homo.¹²

Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder 1981, 205; W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, London: Darton, Longman & Todd 1984, 679. Etc.

⁴ *Op. imp. c. Iul.* 4,42.

⁵ See e.g. M. Lamberigts, 'Was Augustine a Manichaean? The Assessment of Julian of Aeclanum', in van Oort a.o. (eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West*, 113-136. Cf. *idem*, 'The Philosophical and Theological Background of Julian of Aeclanum's Concept of Concupiscence', in T. Fuhrer (ed.), *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike*, Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag 2008, 245-260 and *idem*, 'Julianus Aeclanensis', *Augustinus-Lexikon*, 3, fasc. 5-6, Basel: Schwabe 2008, 836-847.

⁶ E.g., *Op. imp.* 1,49.

⁷ *Op. imp.* 6,23.

⁸ *Op. imp.* 5,26.

⁹ With Geoffrey Harrison and Jason BeDuhn, 'The Authenticity and Doctrine of (Ps.?) Mani's *Letter to Menoch*' in P. Mirecki & J. BeDuhn (eds.), *The Light and the Darkness. Studies in Manichaeism and its World*, Leiden etc.: Brill 2001, 128-172, I think this letter is best considered to (mainly) be a genuine work of Mani's.

¹⁰ *Op. imp.* 3,166 and 172 ff.; 4,109.

¹¹ *Op. imp.* 3,186.

¹² *De pecc. mer.* 1,57.

The fact, then, that the ardour of concupiscence stirs disobediently in the members of this body of death [cf. Rom 7:24], that it tries to cast down and draw the whole mind to itself, that it does not arise when the mind wants and does not quiet down when the mind wants, is due to the evil of sin with which every human being is born.¹³

Concupiscence as ‘the law of sin’ is present even in little children:

Concupiscentia igitur tamquam lex peccati manens in membris corporis mortis huius cum parvulis nascitur, in parvulis baptizatis a reatu solvitur, ad agonem relinquitur, ante agonem mortuos nulla damnatione persequitur; parvulos non baptizatos reos innectit et tamquam irae filios, etiamsi parvuli moriantur, ad condemnationem trahit.¹⁴

Concupiscence, then, remains in the members of this body of death as the law of sin [cf. Rom 7:23-24]. It is present in the little ones at birth, though its guilt (*reatus*) is removed when little ones are baptised. It remains for the (spiritual) combat (of the adult believer), but it does not punish with damnation those who die before engaging in that combat. It holds unbaptised little ones enmeshed in guilt and draws them to damnation, like children of anger [cf. Eph 2:3], even if they die as little ones.¹⁵

Further on in the same work, Augustine remarks:

... sic eorum per quos nascuntur caro peccati traicit in eos noxam, quam nondum vita propria contraxerunt.¹⁶

... so the sinful flesh of those through whom they are born transmits to them a guilt (*noxam*) which they have not yet contracted in their own life.¹⁷

In support of his view that children are born with original sin, in this work already Augustine invokes Job 14:4-5 (‘None of us is clean from sin, even if one’s life lasts only a single day’¹⁸) and Psalm 50 (51),⁷ (‘See, I was conceived in iniquities and my mother conceived me in transgressions’).¹⁹ Earlier in the work, he had already invoked the virgin birth of Christ, who was conceived ‘without *libido*’:

... sic omnes filios mulieris, quae serpenti credidit, ut libidine corrumperetur, non liberari a corpore mortis huius nisi per filium virginis, quae angelo credidit, ut sine libidine fetaretur.²⁰

Thus all the children of the woman (sc. Eve) who believed the serpent, so that she was corrupted by lust (*libido*), are set free from this body of death only through the Son of the Virgin who believed the angel so that she gave birth²¹ without lust (*libido*).²²

¹³ Transl. mainly in accordance with R.J. Teske, *The Works of saint Augustine. A Translation for the 21st Century*, Part I, Volume 23, *Answer to the Pelagians*, I, Hyde Park, New York: New City Press 1997, 65.

¹⁴ *De pecc. mer.* 2,4.

¹⁵ Transl. mainly in accordance with Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians*, I, 80.

¹⁶ *De pecc. mer.* 3,2.

¹⁷ Transl. mainly in accordance with Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians*, I, 118.

¹⁸ In the Latin translation available to him; cf. LXX.

¹⁹ *De pecc. mer.* 3,13.

²⁰ *De pecc. mer.* 1,56.

²¹ Or: *conceived*.

²² Transl. mainly in accordance with Teske, *Answer to the Pelagians*, I, 65.

Moreover, in this first work against the Pelagians, several issues which engaged Augustine during the rest of his life already appear. Main questions are: Why do believers, who have been regenerated by baptism, not beget regenerated children?²³ Is the soul propagated or not?²⁴

The anti-Pelagian works of the following years do not offer substantially new points of view.²⁵ After that time, Augustine increasingly focuses on the question of how original sin is transmitted. He also asks himself in detail how sin in paradise effected our sexuality, and in what way Adam and Eve could have obeyed the command to multiply if they had not fallen. In this context the best known and, in Western history, most influential expositions are found in Book XIV of his *City of God*. Here, Augustine states first of all that in paradise Adam and Eve, not agitated by ‘the disorders of the body’ (*perturbationes animorum*), lived happily and quietly.²⁶ This condition would have been permanent if they had not fallen. *Libido*, however, became the punishment for the sin of disobedience:

In eius (sc. libidinis) quippe inoboedientia, quae genitalia corporis membra solis suis motibus subdidit et potestati voluntatis eripuit, satis ostenditur, quid sit hominis illi primae inoboedientiae retributum.²⁷

For in its disobedience, which subjected the sexual organs solely to its own impulses and snatched them from the will’s authority, we see proof of the retribution imposed on man for that first first disobedience.²⁸

Post peccatum quippe orta est haec libido.²⁹

It was, in fact, after the sin that this lust arose.³⁰

The most characteristic feature of this sexual concupiscence or *libido* is its random motion:

Cum igitur sint multarum libidines rerum, tamen, cum libido dicitur neque cuius rei libido sit additur, non fere adsolet animo occurrere nisi illa, qua obscenae partes corporis excitantur. Haec autem sibi non solum totum corpus nec solum extrinsecus, verum etiam intrinsecus vindicat totumque commovet hominem animi simul affectu cum carnis appetitu coniuncto atque permixto, ut ea voluptas sequatur, qua maior in corporis voluptatibus nulla est; ita ut momento ipso temporis, quo ad eius pervenitur extremum, paene omnis acies et quasi vigilia cogitationibus obruatur. (...) et cum (libido) tota plerumque menti cohibenti adversetur, nonnumquam et adversus se ipsa(m) dividitur commotoque animo in commovendo corpore se ipsa non sequitur.³¹

We see then that there are lusts for many things, and yet when lust is mentioned without the specification of its object the only thing that normally occurs to the mind is the lust

²³ Cf. *De pecc. mer.* 2,39.

²⁴ Cf. *De pecc. mer.* 2,59.

²⁵ See e.g. *De perfectione iustitiae hominis* (c. 415); *De natura et gratia* (415); *De gestis Pelagii* (417).

²⁶ *DCD* 14,10.

²⁷ *DCD* 14,20.

²⁸ Transl. in accordance with H. Bettenson in *Augustine, Concerning the City of God against the Pagans*, Harmondsworth etc.: Penguin Books 1976, 582.

²⁹ *DCD* 14,21.

³⁰ Transl. Bettenson, *Augustine, City of God*, 583. Cf. e.g. XIV, 23: ‘si libido non fuisset, quae peccato inoboedientiae retributa est’ and the earlier characterization of *libido* in XIV,17 as ‘quaedam inpudens *novitas*’.

³¹ *DCD* 14,16.

that excites the indecent parts of the body. This lust assumes power not only over the whole body, and not only from the outside, but also internally; it disturbs the whole man, when the mental emotion combines and mingles with the physical craving, resulting in a pleasure surpassing all physical delights. So intense is the pleasure that when it reaches its climax there is an almost total extinction of mental alertness; the intellectual sentries, as it were, are overwhelmed.³²

(...) and although on the whole it (sc. the *libido*) is totally opposed to the mind's control, it is quite often divided against itself. It arouses the mind, but does not follow its own lead by arousing the body.³³

Merito huius libidinis maxime pudet, merito et ipsa membra, quae suo quodam, ut ita dicerim, iure, non omni modo ad arbitrium nostrum movet aut non movet, pudenda dicuntur, quod ante peccatum hominis non fuerunt (...) turpis nuditas nondum erat, quia nondum libido membra illa praeter arbitrium commovebat³⁴

It is right, therefore, to be ashamed of this lust, and it is right that the members which it moves or fails to move by its own right, so to speak, and not in complete conformity to our decision, should be called *pudenda* ('parts of shame'), which they were not called before man's sin (...) (Before the Fall,) nakedness was not yet disgraceful, because lust did not yet arouse those members independently of their³⁵ decision³⁶

Pudet igitur huius libidinis humanam sine ulla dubitatione naturam, et merito pudet. In eius quippe inoboedientia, quae genitalia corporis membra solis suis motibus subdidit et potestati voluntatis eripuit, satis ostenditur, quid sit hominis illi primae inoboedientiae retributum.³⁷

Human nature then is, without any doubt, ashamed about lust, and rightly ashamed. For in its disobedience, which subjected the sexual organs solely to its own impulses and snatched them from the will's authority, we see a proof of the retribution imposed on man for that first disobedience.³⁸

Augustine concedes that, in paradise, sexual propagation would indeed have taken place, but without random sexual desire or lust. There would not have been a struggle between *libido* and *voluntas*; instead, the sexual organs would have been entirely obedient to the will.³⁹

This view was developed by Augustine in his other writings and maintained in his controversy with the Pelagians. At first he taught that in paradise there was only a spiritual marriage without any sexuality.⁴⁰ After a brief period of obvious doubt,⁴¹ he adopted the view—

³² Marcus Dodds, in his widespread translation (as in Ph. Schaff, ed., *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, First Series, Vol. II: *St. Augustin's City of God and Christian Doctrine*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1979, 275), plainly renders the just quoted full Latin sentence as: 'So possessing indeed is this pleasure, that at the moment of time in which it is consummated, *all mental activity is suspended*' (my italics).

³³ Transl. Bettenson, *Augustine, City of God*, 577.

³⁴ DCD 14,17.

³⁵ I.e., of the first humans according to the tradition of Gen. 1-3.

³⁶ Transl. Bettenson, *Augustine, City of God*, 578. Perhaps Dodds more literal translation (*Augustin's City of God*, 276) is to be preferred here; in any case, he is more felicitous in his unequivocal rendering of the last quoted Latin sentence: '... nakedness was not shameful, because not yet did lust move those members *without the will's consent*'.

³⁷ DCD 14,20. Cf. e.g. DCD 14,19 (*in fine*), 23 (*in medio*) and 26.

³⁸ Transl. Bettenson in *Augustine, City of God*, 582.

³⁹ Cf. DCD 14,23; 24; 26.

⁴⁰ E.g. *De Gen. c. Man.* 1,20 (c. 388-389).

⁴¹ E.g. *De bono coniug.* 2 (c. 401); *De Gen. ad litt.* 3,33 (c. 410).

mainly brought on by the sharp opposition of Julian—that, in order to carry out the command of Gen 1:28, there should have been sexual union in paradise⁴² and even a certain *libido*; the latter, however, was always under the strict control of the will.⁴³

So far some of the main lines of Augustine's doctrine of sexual concupiscence and the transmission of original sin. One cannot say that significant changes in his view emerged later on. In the struggle with Julian, Augustine felt obliged to articulate his opinions more sharply and, at the same time, increasingly tried to defend himself against the charge of Manichaeism by evoking a number of predecessors in the Catholic Christian tradition.⁴⁴ After all, he only succeeded in respect to his notion of (original) sin, the necessity of baptism and the sinfulness that remains in man even after baptism—not, however, for his opinion that original sin is propagated through random sexual desire. The Pelagians, for their part, and Julian in particular, persisted in arguing that Augustine's understanding of original sin as contaminating posterity via its transmission through the sexual act, should be considered a relapse into Manichaeism. Again and again this accusation crops up in the words quoted from Julian in Augustine's *Against Julian* and, in particular, in the *Unfinished Work*.⁴⁵ But it also occurs, for example, in an earlier work such as *On Marriage and Concupiscence*.⁴⁶ In *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians* (420 or 421) it is already expressed clearly:

Dicunt etiam, inquit (sc. Julian), motum genitalium et commixtionem coniugum a diabolo fuisse repertam et propterea eos qui nascuntur innocentes reos esse et a diabolo fieri, non a Deo, quia de hac diabolica commixtione nascuntur. Hoc autem sine aliqua ambiguitate Manicheum est.⁴⁷

'They (i.e., the Catholics who are in fact Manichaeans) also say', he (Julian) claims, 'that the movement of the sexual organs and the coupling of the spouses was an invention of the devil and that on this account newborn innocents are in fact guilty and are made by the devil, not by God, because they are born of this diabolic coupling. But this is beyond any doubt Manichaean doctrine'.

Much more could be said about Augustine's and Julian's views of sexual concupiscence. It could be pointed out, for example, that Julian assumes the validity of the medical theories of his day, according to which the *summa voluptas* of orgasm was necessary for conception;⁴⁸ this *voluptas*

⁴² E.g. *De Gen. ad litt.* 9,6 (c. 410); *De pecc. mer.* 1,3 and 5; 2,40 (411-412). But without *libido*: *De pecc. mer.* 2,36; *DCD* 14,21 ff. (c. 420); *De nupt. et conc.* 2,36 (c. 420); *De gratia Chr. et de pecc. orig.* 2,40 (425).

⁴³ E.g. *C. duas ep. Pel.* 1,34-35; *c. Iul.* 4,57; 62; 65; 69; *Op. imp.* 2,122; 3,177; etc. See also the newly discovered letter to Atticus, *Ep.* 6*, 5 and 7 (c. 420-421) on the difference between *concupiscentia nuptiarum* (present in sinless paradise) and *concupiscentia carnis* (not present in sinless paradise).

⁴⁴ Best and nearly comprehensive treatment of (possible) predecessors still by Julius Gross in his *Entstehungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas*, I: *Von der Bibel bis Augustinus*, München/Basel: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag 1960, e.g. 114-121 on Tertullian; 121-122 on Cyprian; 230-237 on Ambrosiaster; 237-243 on Ambrose. On these and other pre-Augustinian authors, see also the pertinent remarks by Antoon A.R. Bastiaensen, 'Augustin et ses prédécesseurs latins chrétiens' in J. den Boeft & J. van Oort (eds.), *Augustiniana Traiectina. Communications présentées au Colloque International d'Utrecht, 13-14 novembre 1986*, Paris: Études Augustiniennes 1987, 25-57.

⁴⁵ See, among other places, only *Op. imp.* 1,24 and 115; 3,186-187; 4,45-64.

⁴⁶ E.g. *De nupt. et conc.* 2,38 and 49-50.

⁴⁷ *C. duas ep. Pel.* 1,10. Cf. for the accusation of Manichaeism 1,4 and 42; 2,1-2. In 4,3 Augustine says, that the evil of shameful concupiscence (*malum pudendae concupiscentiae*) is the source of our disorder (*unde confundimur*).

⁴⁸ See, e.g., Galen, *De usu partium* 14,10-11; Soranus, *Gynaecia* 1,37. Cf. *Sap. Sal.* 7,2 and Philo, *Leg. all.* 2,17: '... apart from pleasure (*hedonē*) nothing in mortal kind comes into existence'. Julianus *apud* Aug., *Op. imp.* 5,11: 'vis illa voluptatis, confectrix commixtrixque seminum'.

must be good, or man could never have accomplished the command of Gen 1:28.⁴⁹ Besides, Julian considers sexuality amenable to the will and emphasizes its social function, i.e., the generation of posteriority through the founding of a family.⁵⁰ Augustine, on the other hand, as a ‘new physician’ (*novus physicus*),⁵¹ does not share these views in like manner. He emphasises the fact that sexuality is an enduring impulse, which passion presents itself as ‘concupiscence of the flesh’ (*concupiscentia carnis*) and has to be fought continuously.⁵² The uncontrollable and irrepressible character of sexual concupiscence (*concupiscentia sexualis*) or fleshly lust (*libido carnalis*) reveals itself in particular through its random motion (*motus inordinatus* or *inmoderatus*).⁵³

The foregoing provides the main features of Augustine’s points of view. In sum, it may be concluded that in his writings:

- a. *concupiscentia sexualis* / *libido carnalis*, which is beyond the control of the human will, is referred to in a highly negative way;
- a. this random *concupiscentia sexualis* is a punishment for primordial sin, and is transmitted as original sin by means of the human copulation;
- b. the sinfulness of *concupiscentia sexualis* is pre-eminently manifest in its randomness as *motus inordinatus* or *inmoderatus*.

IV: Conclusions and further remarks on the subject’s wider context in Judaism, Jewish Christianity and the pre-Augustinian African tradition

May Augustine’s view on sexual concupiscence be said to be in accordance with Manichaeism, then? Indeed, to a far-reaching extent our concluding answer should be in the affirmative. There is a large degree of agreement between the Church Father’s opinions and those of Mani’s. Both refer to sexual concupiscence in a highly negative way: it is sinful, a punishment for sin, and sin is propagated through it. The sinful nature of *libido* or *concupiscentia sexualis* is pre-eminently evident in its random motion (ἄτακτος κίνησις; *motus inordinatus*).

Should we also conclude that Julian was right in accusing Augustine of Manichaeism? This question is much harder to answer. The preceding investigation has shown that Julian is correct in pointing out concurrence. Even striking parallelism, however, does not necessarily imply a causal relationship, and this is what Julian thought he had perceived.

In the light of both a topical discovery and new views on the origins and early development of Christianity in Roman Africa, we may try to bring the issue further towards a possible solution. Here, the following brief and tentative observations may be made.

The discovery of the *Cologne Mani Codex*⁵⁴ revealed beyond doubt⁵⁵ that Mani grew up in a Jewish-Christian baptist milieu. Thus, he was subjected to Jewish-Christian influences since

⁴⁹ E.g. *c. Iul.* 5,22 and *Op. imp.* 1,39: ‘ad quorum conciliationem et ministerium et instrumentum pertinet a Deo instituta et benedicta sexuum cum voluptate commixtio’.

⁵⁰ For instance *c. Iul.* 4,7.

⁵¹ According to Julian, *Op. imp.* 5,11.

⁵² See, e.g., *Conf.* 10,42. Cf. *c. Iul.* 4,66-67.

⁵³ *Inordinatus* and *inmoderatus* occur in the *corpus augustinianum* 71 and 125 times resp., usually related to the sexual impulse (*motus, concupiscentia, libido, cupiditas*, etc.) *Libido* and *concupiscentia* (and their related words) occur 1034 and 3032 times resp., usually as (or in connection with) sexual desire. These figures are based on my countings in the original Latin sentences and passages made available to me already in the 1980s by the collaborators of the *Augustinus-Lexikon*.

⁵⁴ Editio princeps: A. Henrichs & L. Koenen, ‘Ein griechischer Mani-Codex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780)’, *ZPE* 5 (1970) 97-216. Further provisional edition by Henrichs and Koenen, *ZPE* 19 (1975) 1-85; 32 (1978) 87-199; 44 (1981) 201-318; 48 (1982) 1-59. Facsimile edition: L. Koenen und C. Römer, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex. Abbildungen und diplomatischer Text*, Bonn: Habelt 1985.

⁵⁵ The evidently earlier (but all too often neglected) indication could be found in an-Nadim’s report from the year 998 CE (on which below).

childhood.⁵⁶ This background may explain several characteristics of his world religion, such as the important place assigned to Jesus;⁵⁷ the abundance of biblical themes in Manichaean texts;⁵⁸ the idea that the true prophet reveals himself in various periods of history.⁵⁹ The Jewish-Christian group of Mani's youth was absolutely averse to marriage and sexuality. The Muslim writer an-Nadim (end of 10th cent.) transmits that Mani's father, shortly after the birth of his son in April 216, joined the sect because of a revelation in which he was commanded to eat no meat, to drink no wine, and to have no intercourse with women.⁶⁰ From the age of four, Mani lived in his father's sect and was educated in its encratic ideal. He must have been familiar with its negative view of marriage and sexuality since his childhood.

These Jewish-Christian baptists—almost certainly (a branch of) Elkesaites⁶¹—were not alone in their views. Elsewhere in Jewish and Jewish-Christian circles there was also disapprobation at sexuality. I only mention here certain tendencies in Qumran and some related 'sects';⁶² the fact that in the Greek *Apocalypse of Moses* (c. 19) it is observed, with reference to sin in paradise, that sexual lust (ἐπιθυμία) is the root of all evil;⁶³ the view expressed in *2 Baruch* (56,6) that the begetting of children and the sexual desire of parents are consequences of Adam's sin.⁶⁴ In *4 Ezra* (3,20 ff.; 4,30 ff.) it is stated that Adam dressed himself with the evil heart (*cor malignum*) by giving in to the evil inclination (*yeṣer hara*), also called 'the grain of evil seed' (*granum seminis mali*, 4,30) and 'the evil thought' (*cogitamentum mali*, 7,92); hence Adam became the cause of

⁵⁶ Jewish Christianity is defined here as that kind of archaic Christianity that was strongly influenced by Judaism. See for a discussion of the disputed term and relevant studies: van Oort, *Jersusalem and Babylon* (n. 2), 228 and 369-370.

⁵⁷ See, e.g., E. Waldschmidt & W. Lentz, *Die Stellung Jesu im Manichäismus* (APAW 4), Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1926; E. Rose, *Die manichäische Christologie*, Wiesbaden: Harassowitz 1979; J. BeDuhn, 'The Manichaean Jesus', in O. Hammer (ed.), *Alternative Christs*, Cambridge: CUP 2009, 51-70.

⁵⁸ A. Böhlig, *Die Bibel bei den Manichäern*, Münster: Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität 1947 (diss. in typoscript), first published in A. Böhlig, *Die Bibel bei den Manichäern und verwandte Studien* (eds. P. Nagel & S.G. Richter), Leiden-Boston: Brill 2012, 21-140; Böhlig, 'Christliche Wurzeln im Manichäismus' (1957/1960) in Böhlig, *Mysterion und Wahrheit*, Leiden: Brill 1968, 202-221 and Böhlig, 'The New Testament and the Concept of the Manichean Myth', in A.H.B. Logan & A.J.M. Wedderburn (eds.), *The New Testament and Gnosis. Essays in honour of Robert McL Wilson*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1983, 90-104 (German text 'Das Neue Testament und die Idee des manichäischen Mythos', in A. Böhlig, *Gnosis und Synkretismus. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur spätantiken Religionsgeschichte*, II, Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck) 1989, 586-611).

⁵⁹ See for instance *Ps. Clem., Hom. 17,4* (eds. B. Rehm, J. Irmscher & F. Paschke, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, I, *Homilien*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1969, 230) and *Rec. 2,47* (eds. B. Rehm & F. Paschke, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, II, *Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1965, 80). Cf. H.J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums*, Tübingen: Mohr 1949, 98-116, 327 f., 335 ff.

⁶⁰ Ibn An-Nadim, *Fihrist al-'Ulum*, ed. G. Flügel, Leipzig: Brockhaus 1862 (repr. Osnabrück: Biblio-Verlag 1969), 327-328; B. Dodge, transl., *The Fihrist of al-Nadim. A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*, I-II, New York-London: Columbia University Press 1970, II, 773-774.

⁶¹ Cf. J. van Oort, 'Elkesaites', *Religion, Past and Present* IV, Leiden-Boston: Brill 2008, 416.

⁶² See e.g., for brief reference, the sub-lemma 'Sectarian Asceticism' (by F.F. Bruce) in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 3, Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House 1972, 680-681; more elaborate (and stressing the 'prophetic' and biblical dimension): B. Thiering, 'The Biblical Source of Qumran Asceticism', *JBL* 93 (1974) 429-444. A. Schremer, 'Celibacy', in J.J. Collins & D.C. Harlow (eds.), *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans 2010, 465-467, rightly stresses the fact that, in Qumran as well as among other Jews in the Second Temple Period, 'practised celibacy' should be considered 'a marginal phenomenon' (466).

⁶³ See L.S.A. Wells, 'The Books of Adam and Eve', in R.H. Charles (ed.), *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, II, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1913 (repr. 1977), 146: 'And when he (the serpent) had received the oath from me (sc. Eve), he went and poured upon the fruit the poison of his wickedness, which is lust, the root and beginning of every sin ...'; cf. M.D. Johnson, 'Life of Adam and Eve', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2, London: Darton, Longman & Todd 1985, 279. In a note, Johnson refers to *ApMos* 25:3 where it runs in his translation (283): 'and you (Eve) shall confess and say, "LORD, LORD, save me and I will never again turn to the sin of flesh"'.⁶⁴

⁶⁴ See e.g. R.H. Charles, '2 Baruch', in *idem* (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, II, 513; A.F.J. Klijn, '2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1, London: Darton, Longman & Todd 1983, 641.

a hereditary propensity to commit sin, which sin is present in all his descendants.⁶⁵ Rabbinical sources reveal that this *yeṢer bara'* was specifically associated or even identified with sexual desire and lust.⁶⁶ As far as I am aware, rabbinic writings make no mention of sin being transmitted by means of the sexual act. Erik Peterson, however, pointed out several years ago that in Jewish-Christian circles baptism was seen as a washing away of the sin of ἐπιθυμία (*concupiscentia*) or יצר הרע (*yeṢer bara'*).⁶⁷ In Roman Africa infant baptism appears to have been known to Tertullian and Cyprian and is therefore obviously based here on an ancient tradition. The sermon *De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima*, traditionally handed down under Cyprian's name but probably older and certainly containing many archaic Jewish-Christian tenets,⁶⁸ speaks of 'the sin of our first birth' (*delictum primae natiuitatis*) which is washed away in baptism and—in connection with this *delictum*—the Latin sermon speaks of *libido* and *concupiscentia* which must be combatted.⁶⁹

All these facts point in the direction of an earlier tradition which Augustine could have evoked for his views on *concupiscentia sexualis*, original sin and baptism. If, moreover, the view is correct that in African Christianity several Jewish and—connected with it—several archaic Jewish-Christian elements were originally strongly present and made their influence felt right down to Augustine's days,⁷⁰ it seems possible that this is the most influential source of the church father's doctrines.

However, much more research is required, in particular of the pre-Augustinian Christian tradition in Roman North Africa.⁷¹ For the time being, we may conclude that Julian displayed keen insight in claiming that Augustine's views concurred with those of the Manichaeans. It seems that we may detect a relic of Augustine's Manichaean past in his strong emphasis on the random motion (*motus inordinatus*) as typical of the sexual concupiscentia by which sin is transmitted.

⁶⁵ See e.g. G.H. Box, 'IV Ezra' in Charles (ed.), *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, II, 563 ff.; cf. B.M. Metzger, 'The Fourth Book of Ezra', in Charlesworth (ed.), *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1, 529 ff.

⁶⁶ Cf. H.L. Strack & P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, IV/1, München: Beck 1928 (repr. 1975), 466-483. See further, among others: G.H. Cohen Stuart, *The Struggle in Man between Good and Evil. An Inquiry into the Origin of the Rabbinic Concept of YeṢer bara'*, Kampen: Kok 1984; J. Cook, 'The Origin of the Tradition of the יצר הרע and יצר הטוב', *JJS* 38 (2007) 80-91.

⁶⁷ E. Peterson, 'Die Behandlung der Tollwut bei den Elchasaiten nach Hippolyt' (1947), later in Peterson, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis*, Rom-Freiburg-Wien: Herder 1959, 221-235.

⁶⁸ On this sermon, see e.g. J. Daniélou, 'Le traité *De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima* et le judéochristianisme latin avant Tertullien', *VC* 25 (1971) 171-181 and *idem*, *The Origins of Latin Christianity*, London / Philadelphia: Darton, Longman & Todd / The Westminster Press 1977, 63-92. Daniélou argues (on the whole convincingly, in my view) for a date of composition before Cyprian and in Roman Africa. A pre-Cyprianic date is contested on linguistic grounds by A.P. Orbán ('Die Frage der ersten Zeugnisse des Christenlateins', *VC* 30, 1976, 214-238), whose arguments are endorsed by e.g. Ronald E. Heine, 'The beginnings of Latin Christian Literature', in F. Young a.o. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, Cambridge: CUP 2004, 131. Acceptance of their view, however, would mean that typical Jewish-Christian elements were still prominent in the fourth century.

⁶⁹ *De cent.* (ed. R. Reitzenstein, repr. in J.-P. Migne's *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina, Supplementum*, I, ed. A. Hamman, Paris: Éditions Garnier Frères 1958), 54,5-7: '... renouati per lauacrum uitale et delicto primae natiuitatis purgati uiuamus'; cf. for instance 62,30 ff. ('... renatus ex aqua et spiritu eras a natiuitate purgatus'; 63,1 ff. ('ad deprimentam libidinis aciem praedixit dicens: *Vtatur unus quisque uas in sanctimonio et honore, non in passione concupiscentiae sicut et gentes, quae ignorant deum*' [1 Thess. 4:4]; 64,11f. ('si ab opere iniusto per lauacrum uitale renouatus es ...') See for some other examples from Jewish-Christian milieus the so-called Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies and Recognitions* (e.g. *Ps. Clem., Hom.* 3,17 & 20; 11,26; *Rec.* 9,7,4-5 [ed. Rehm & Paschke, *Pseudoklementinen*, II, 261]: '... et ut in aqua regenerati per opera bona, ignem vetustae natiuitatis extinguere. prima enim nostra natiuitas per ignem concupiscentiae descendit, et ideo dispensatione divina secunda haec per aquam introducitur, quae restinguat ignis naturam ...').

⁷⁰ Cf. van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon* (n. 2), esp. 365-371.

⁷¹ I hope to come back to this matter elsewhere, also discussing the views of P.F. Beatrice, whose groundbreaking book *Tradux peccati. Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale*, Milano: Vita e Pensiero 1978, recently became available for the English speaking world in the magnificent (and slightly updating) translation by Adam Kamesar: *The Transmission of Sin. Augustine and Pre-Augustinian Sources*, New York etc.: Oxford University Press 2013.