

Julian of Aeclanum: a Plea for a Good Creator

Julian of Aeclanum was certainly one of the most vehement and most aggressive opponents of Augustine's doctrine of original sin. His sharp criticism of Augustine's views on the sin of Adam and its consequences for humanity urged the bishop of Hippo again and again to defend his own position¹). Through Augustine's response, not only are many fragments of various letters and one book authored by Julian²) but also the first six books of his work *Ad Florum* (eight in all) known to us³). Death prevented Augustine from refuting the two last books of *Ad Florum* but the texts of Julian preserved in the work of the bishop of Hippo are extensive enough to form an idea of the "Pelagian" views of the bishop of Aeclanum⁴).

Julian, as is known, was born in Apulia around the year 380⁵). He was the son of Juliana and Memor or Memorius, bishop of an unknown see⁶). Julian had two sisters⁷). As a young man, he married

¹) Augustine's works *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* (2 books); *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* (4 books); *Contra Iulianum* (6 books) and *Opus imperfectum* (6 books) are the result of his controversy with Julian of Aeclanum.

²) For the collection of the fragments, see A. BRUCKNER, *Die vier Bücher Julians von Aeclanum an Turbantius. Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik Julians und Augustins* (Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche 8), Aalen, 1973 (= Berlin, 1910) and with some minor alternations, CCL 88, p. 335-402. Concerning the critical edition, see also Y.-M. DUVAL, *Iulianus Aeclanensis restitutus. La première édition "incomplète" de l'œuvre de Julien d'Eclane*, in *Revue des Études augustiniennes* (REA) 25 (1979), p. 162-170; M. LAMBERIGTS, *Some Remarks on the Critical Edition of the Preserved Fragments of Julian of Aeclanum*, in *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale* (RTAM) 54 (1987), p. 238-239.

³) In *Opus imperfectum* Augustine always quotes the text of Julian before refuting it. With respect to that, J. MAUSBACH, *Die Ethik des heiligen Augustinus II*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1903, p. 18-19 noted: "Es gibt kaum eine polemische Schrift in der Weltliteratur, die den Argumenten des Gegners so ehrlich und weitherzig Raum gönnt, wie Augustins letztes Werk gegen Julian"; see also S. KOPP, *Aurelius Augustinus. Schriften gegen die Semipelagianer* (Sankt Augustinus. Der Lehrer der Gnade), Würzburg, 1955, p. 25.

⁴) Augustine's carefully copying of Julian's texts enabled scholars to assign different commentaries on Scripture, after comparing style and language with that of Julian's *Ad Florum*, to the bishop of Aeclanum; for a survey, see L. DE CONINCK, CCL 88, *Introduction*, p. XII-XXX.

⁵) "Non enim quia te Apulia genuit"; *Opus imperfectum* VI, 18, PL 45, col. 1542.

⁶) Julian's father is called Memor in Paulinus, *Carmen* 25, v. 201. 213. 215. 219. 220. 225. 238. 239. 241, CSEL 30, p. 244-245. Augustine mentions the name Memorius in his letter to the father of Julian; see *Epistula* 101, CSEL 34, p. 539. In *Contra Iulianum* I, 12, PL 44, col. 647 one will find the name Memor.

⁷) See Marius MERCATOR, *Commonitorium lectori adversus haeresim Pelagii et*

Titia⁸), who probably was the daughter of Aemilius, the bishop of Beneventum⁹). On the occasion of Julian's marriage, Paulinus of Nola wrote an *epithalamium*¹⁰). Concerning the duration of this marriage, we do not know anything but, if we may believe Augustine, during their controversy, Julian lived in continence¹¹).

When Augustine wrote a letter to Memor, Julian's father, in 408/409¹²), sending at the latter's request a copy of his sixth book *De musica*, the bishop of Hippo also mentioned the name of Julian, who was deacon at that time. In this letter, Augustine asked Memor to send his son to him¹³). Julian himself mentioned in his *Ad Florum* that he visited Carthago where he met a certain Honoratus¹⁴), but neither Julian nor Augustine spoke of a personal meeting.

During the time when Innocent was bishop of Rome (before march 417), Julian was appointed bishop of Aeclanum¹⁵), where he worked caring for the poor¹⁶).

Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani, ACO I, 5, p. 9: "Quorum sane post obitum sanctorum hominum merito tu duas sorores tuas talibus disciplinis tui oris erudisti".

⁸) See the *incipit* of Paulinus, *Carmen* 25, CSEL 30, p. 238: "Titiam clarissimam feminam uxorem eius".

⁹) See P. BROWN, *Religion and Society in the Age of St. Augustine*, London, 1972, p. 214.

¹⁰) See J.A. BOUMA, *Het Epithalamium van Paulinus van Nola. Carmen XXV met inleiding, vertaling en commentaar*, Assen, 1968.

¹¹) "Si talem duxisti vitam coniugalem, desine te tuis experimentis in disputatione committere"; *Contra Iulianum* III, 28, PL 44, col. 716; "Ut prius hoc malo bene uteris in coniuge, nunc illi adverseris in te"; III, 46, PL 44, col. 725; "Qua etiam continens (...) nimium delectaris"; V, 46, PL 44, col. 810; see also *Opus imperfectum* III, 177, CSEL 85, I, p. 477.

¹²) For the date of this letter, see A. GOLDBACHER, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponiensis episcopi epistulae* V, CSEL 58, p. 29-31.

¹³) "Nam superiores quinque vis filio nostro et *condiacono* Iuliano, quoniam et ipse iam commilitat, digni lectione vel cognitione videbuntur. Quem quidem non audeo dicere plus amo quam te, quia nec veraciter dico, sed tamen audeo dicere plus desidero quam te. Mirum videri potest, quem ad modum, quem pariter amo, amplius desiderem; sed hoc mihi facit spes amplior videndi eum; puto enim, quod, si ad nos te iubente vel mittente venerit, et hoc faciet, quod adulescentem decet, maxime quia nondum curis maioribus detinetur, et te ipsum mihi expeditius adportabit"; *Epistula* 101,4, CSEL 34, p. 543.

¹⁴) "Nam cum ante hos annos essemus *Carthagini* a quodam mihi *Honorato* nomine necessario tuo, Manichaeo aequo, sicut epistolae vestrae indicant, id ipsum propositum est"; *Ad Florum* V, 26, PL 45, col. 1464. Concerning this Honoratus, see A. MANDOUZE, *Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne* (303-533), Paris, 1982, p. 564.

¹⁵) See Prosper, *Chronicum*, PL 51, col. 598; Marius MERCATOR, *Nestorii capitula et sermones a Mario Mercatore translati*, ACO I, 5, p. 60; id., *Commonitorium super nomine Caelestii*, ACO I, 5, p. 68. See also R. AUBERT, art. *Eclane*, in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* 14, Paris, 1960, col. 1406-1407.

¹⁶) "Hic Iulianus eleemosynis tempore famis et angustiae indigentibus prorogatis

We do not know if Julian knew Pelagius personally. During the controversy with Augustine, Julian only occasionally mentions Pelagius' name¹⁷). Testimonies concerning the eventual contacts between Julian and Pelagius contradict each other. According to Mercator, Julian remained in communion with Innocent although the bishop of Rome had condemned Celestius and Pelagius¹⁸). Prosper, on the other hand, maintained that as early as 413 Pelagius, together with Celestius and Julian, reacted against the doctrine of grace¹⁹). However, if we consider the facts that Pelagius was a friend of Paulinus of Nola²⁰), the author of an *epithalamium* for Julian; that, as early as 417, Augustine warned against the Pelagians living in Campania²¹); and further that immediately after the publication of the *Epistula Tractoria*, 19 bishops from southern Italy refused to sign that letter, we can be certain that there existed an important group of bishops in southern Italy, who sympathized with Pelagius²²).

However, from 418 on, Julian became an obstinate opponent of Augustine's doctrine of original sin. Since he was convinced that he defended the Christian truth, Julian refused to sign the *Tractoria* and also preferred to go into exile rather than to submit to Augustine's doctrine of original sin. Employing his familiarity with classical authors such as Cicero, master of rhetoric and dialectics²³) (just as Pelagius and

multos miserationis specie nobilium praecipueque religiosorum illicens haeresi quae sociavit"; Gennadius, *De viris illustribus* 46, ed. RICHARDSON, p. 78.

¹⁷) See e.g. *Ad Florum* IV, 88, PL 45, col. 1389; IV, 112, PL 45, col. 1405.

¹⁸) "Praedicti sane Caelestius et Pelagius non tunc primo (a) Zosimo videntur esse damnati, sed ab eius decessore Innocentio, a quo et Iulianus fuerit ordinatus quique post illorum damnationem usque ad praedicti Innocentii episcopi excessum e vita in eius communione permanens et perseverans in sincera sententia et communicans damnatori praedictorum, ipse quoque sine dubio Pelagium Caelestiumque damnavit"; *Commonitorium super nomine Caelestii*, ACO I, 5, p. 68.

¹⁹) "Hac tempestate Pelagius Brito dogma nominis sui contra gratiam Christi, Caelestio et Iuliano adiutoribus, exseruit, multosque in suum traxit errorem"; *Chronicum*, PL 51, col. 591. See also Augustine's remark in *Contra Iulianum* I, 13, PL 44, col. 648: "Cui Ecclesiae praesidentem beatum Innocentium si audire voluisses, iam tunc periculosam iuventutem tuam Pelagianis laqueis exuisses".

²⁰) See O. WERMELINGER, *Rom und Pelagius. Die theologische Position der römischen Bischöfe im pelagianischen Streit in den Jahren 411-432 (Päpste und Papsttum 7)*, Stuttgart, 1975, p. 227-228; G.R. EVANS, *Neither a Pelagian nor a Manichee*, in *Vigiliae Christianae* 35 (1981), p. 234-235.

²¹) See Augustine, *Epistula* 186.

²²) "... quam decem et octo velut episcopi participes eius erroris (...) ausi sunt Thessalonicam scribere"; *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum*, I, 3, CSEL 60, p. 423.

²³) See N. CIPRIANI, *Aspetti letterari dell' Ad Florum di Giuliano d'Eclano*, in *Augustinianum* 15 (1975), p. 125-167.

Celestius had done²⁴)), sometimes referring to other Christian authors, such as Serapion of Thmuis²⁵) and John Chrysostom²⁶), (although through the use of translations, a fact that relativizes the statement of Gennadius: "Iulianus episcopus (...) graeca et latina scholasticus"²⁷), Julian focused all of his energies on the refutation of Augustine.

In this short contribution, I would like to draw attention to a somewhat underestimated²⁸) although specific idea in Julian's theology, namely his view of and belief in God's activity as a good creator. According to Julian, the idea of *peccatum originale* directly criticizes God Himself, whom he saw as a good creator. We believe that in this idea there can be found one of the fundamental reasons why Julian could not accept such a doctrine of inherited guilt.

For Julian, there could be no doubt that God had created and still

²⁴) Concerning Pelagius and Caelestius, see G. de PLINVAL, *Pélage, ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme. Étude d'histoire littéraire et religieuse*, Lausanne, 1943, p. 217; A. ZUMKELLER, *Aurelius Augustinus. Schriften gegen die Pelagianer II* (Sankt Augustinus. Der Lehrer der Gnade), Würzburg, 1964, p. 20.

²⁵) See N. CIPRIANI, *L'Autore dei testi pseudobasiliani riportati nel C. Iulianum (I, 16-17) e la polemica agostiniana di Giuliano d'Eclano*, in *Congresso internazionale su S. Agostino nel XVI centenario della conversione* (Roma, 15-20 settembre 1986). *Atti. I. Cronaco del Congresso. Sessioni generali. Sezione di studio I. (Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum" 24)*, Roma, 1987, p. 439-449.

²⁶) Julian used the translation by Anianus of Celada; see our detailed comparison in M. LAMBERIGTS, *Julianus van Aeclanum. Een kritische biografie*, Leuven, 1984 (onuitgegeven licentiaatsverhandeling), p. 71-72. Concerning the pelagian sympathy for Chrysostom, see, among others, Ch. PIETRI, *Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440)* (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 25), Paris-Roma, 1976, v. I., p. 450; id., *Esquisse de conclusion. L'aristocratie chrétienne entre Jean de Constantinople et Augustin d'Hippone*, in *Jean Chrysostome et Augustin. Actes du colloque de Chantilly 22-24 septembre 1974* édité par Ch. KANNENGISSER (Théologie Historique 35), Paris, 1975, p. 289-305.

²⁷) See *De viris illustribus* 46, ed. RICHARDSON, p. 78; for the value of Gennadius' testimony, see B. CZAPLA, *Gennadius als Litterarhistoriker. Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung der Schrift des Gennadius von Marseille "De viris illustribus"* (Kirchengeschichtliche Studien IV, 1), Münster, 1898, p. 101-103; for Julian's knowledge of Greek, see p. 102, n. 1; cf. also A. BRUCKNER, *Julian von Eclanum. Sein Leben und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pelagianismus (Texte und Untersuchungen 15,3)*, Leipzig, 1897, p. 77-78. Some small traces of Julian's knowledge of Greek, one can find in *Ad Florum* I, 71, CSEL 85, I, p. 199; III, 145, CSEL 85, I, p. 451; V, 15, PL 45, col. 1445; V, 43, PL 45, col. 1480; V, 60, PL 45, col. 1494. Personally we are convinced that Julian's knowledge of Greek was deepened during his stay in the East; see our argumentation in M. LAMBERIGTS, *De polemiek tussen Julianus van Aeclanum en Augustinus van Hippo. Een bijdrage tot de theologiegeschiedenis van de tweede pelagiaanse controverse (418-430)*, Leuven 1988 (Doctoral Dissertation, inedited), Deel I: *Julianus van Aeclanum*. Volume I: Tekst, p. 36-37; Volume II: Voetnoten, p. 48-50.

²⁸) See e.g. BRUCKNER, *Julian von Eclanum*, p. 127.

creates a good reality²⁹). Already in the first fragment of his *Ad Turbantium*, Julian remarked that people who recognize the existence of free will and confess that God Himself is the creator of the universe, are called "Caelestianus et Pelagianus"³⁰). This assertion already indicates that, for Julian, the only aim of using these names was to make defenders of the orthodox faith suspect and to confuse simple people³¹). Julian himself wanted to defend the orthodox faith which — based on Scripture, professed in the Confession, emphasized by Tradition, taught in the catechesis, treated by the Fathers — maintained that God had created the whole universe, including human beings³²). Such a belief was, in a certain way, the minimum which the middle class who was neither educated nor familiar with Scripture must believe³³). The catholic faith *knows* that God has created all natures (i.e. every substance as far as their created state is concerned). Every substance only exists thanks to God's creative benevolence³⁴). God has created everything *ex nihilo*³⁵). This was the free act of God. From God's perspec-

²⁹) See e.g. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 1; 15; 16; 30; 23; 24; 25; 26; 28; 29; 30; 33; 35; 36; 45; 55 etc., *CCL* 88, p. 340; 344; 345; 346; 347; 348; 351; 353-354. According to Julian God's justice presupposes a good creation. Concerning Julian's view of justice, see A.E. MC GRATH, *Divine Justice and Divine Equity in the Controversy between Augustine and Julian of Aeclanum*, in *Downside Review* 101 (1983), p. 312-319; LAMBERIGTS, *De polemiek tussen Julianus van Aeclanum en Augustinus van Hippo* I, I, p. 253-268; I, II, p. 198-209. Concerning the close relationship of justice with creation, see e.g. *Ad Florum* I, 122, *CSEL* 85, I, p. 137; II, 7, *CSEL* 85, I, p. 167; II, 144, *CSEL* 85, I, p. 267; III, 104, *CSEL* 85, I, p. 424; IV, 136, *PL* 45, col. 1430; V, 15, *PL* 45, col. 1447; VI, 16, *PL* 45, col. 1535.

³⁰) "Quia liberi confessor arbitrii et Dei conditoris, Caelestianus et Pelagianus vocatur; quo simplices iniquo sermone perterriti, ut ab invidia nominis exuantur, etiam sanam fidem deserunt, credituri procul dubio, nec liberum esse in hominibus arbitrium nec Deum nascentium conditorem..."; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 1, *CCL* 88, p. 340-341.

³¹) *Ibidem*. See also *Epistula ad Rufum*, frg. 28, *CCL* 88, p. 340.

³²) "(Dicunt) Deum bonum nascentium conditorem, per quem facta sunt omnia, eiusque opus esse filios hominum"; *Epistula ad Rufum*, frg. 12, *CCL* 88, p. 338; "Auctorem Deum caeli et terrae omniumque quae in eis sunt ac per hoc et hominum, propter quos cuncta facta sunt"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 16, *CCL* 88, p. 344. On this theme in general, see A. HAMMAN, *L'enseignement sur la création dans l'Antiquité Chrétienne*, in *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 42 (1968), p. 1-23; 97-122.

³³) "Simplices, qui aliis occupati negotiis, nihil de eruditione ceperunt, sola tamen fide ad Ecclesiam Christi pervenire curarunt, ne facile obscuris quaestionibus terreantur, sed credentes Deum verum conditorem esse hominum ..."; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 158, *CCL* 88, p. 373.

³⁴) "Deus, qui hoc appellari nomine voluit, ut omnipotentissimus, ita etiam iustissimus creditur; (...) ut conditor benignissimus hominum, ita meritum expunctor aequissimus; omne quod facit bonum valde est"; *Ad Florum* I, 122, *CSEL*, 85, I, p. 136-137.

³⁵) "Deo, omnium quae sunt ex nihilo conditore"; *Ad Florum* I, 37, *CSEL* 85, I, p. 27; "Gratiam ergo Christi multiplicem confitemur: primum munus eius est, quod facti

tive, there was the possibility to create or not to create the reality but from the moment that He did so, the created reality had to exist in the way which God wanted it to exist. Not only to exist but also to exist in a particular way was necessary for the created reality³⁶).

The universality of God's creative activity is closely connected with the goodness of God. A good God creates a good reality³⁷) was the conviction that Julian held based on Scripture (*Gen.* 1,31; *1 Tim.* 4,4)³⁸). According to Julian, every human being, as a substance created by God³⁹), in his nature cannot be corrupted precisely because God Himself is the creator of humanity⁴⁰). Human beings are in God's image, good creations referring to a good creator.

Further, since God is the creator of the whole of humanity, all are equal: reward or damnation do not refer to anyone's origin but to their

ex nihilo sumus"; I, 94, CSEL 85, I, p. 109. In Julian's eyes, also creation is a form of grace. One will find the same idea in the works of Pelagius; see G. GRESHAKE, *Gnade als konkrete Freiheit. Eine Untersuchung zur Gnadenlehre des Pelagius*, Mainz, 1972, p. 54-81.

Concerning the topic of "creatio ex nihilo", see HAMMAN, *L'Enseignement sur la création*, p. 21-23; for a good historical background, see G. MAY, *Schöpfung aus dem Nichts. Die Entstehung der Lehre von der creatio ex nihilo* (*Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 48), Berlin-New York, 1978; cf. also H.A. WOLFSON, *The Meaning of "ex nihilo" in the Church Fathers, Arabic and Hebrew Philosophy, and St. Thomas*, in *Mediaeval Studies in Honor of J.D.M. Ford*, ed. by U.T. HOLMES Jr. and A.J. DENOMY, Cambridge, 1948, p. 355-370; E.P. MEIJERING, *God Being History. Studies in Patristic Philosophy*, Amsterdam-Oxford-New York, 1975, p. 53 f.; 136-140.

³⁶) "Et ut a grandibus inchoemus exemplis, ut Deus faceret mundum, a possibili venit ei, non a necessario; id est, omnipotentiae eius possibile fuit creare quae condidit, necessarium tamen non fuit, videlicet non est ab aliquo coactus ut faceret, sed fecit quia voluit, quod non fecisset profecto si nolisset. At hoc quod auctori adfuit a possibili, in opere a necessario factum est, id est, non fuit mundo possibile esse et non esse, qui esse ab omnipotente iuebatur, sed cogeatur existere, cui omnipotens mandabat essentiam. Transiit ergo in necessitatem conditi, quod venerat de possibilitate condentis. Fecit etiam diversas naturas diversasque species in naturis, custodito eo ordine qui a rerum fluebat exordio, ut alia essent necessaria, alia possibilia. Quidquid ergo habent creaturae naturaliter, a necessariis parte sortitae sunt"; *Ad Florum* V, 45-46, PL 45, col. 1481-1482.

³⁷) "Omnis creatura Dei bona sit et nulla substantia sit quam non summus fecerit Deus, nisi ipse Deus qui non est ab aliquo factus"; *Epistula ad Rufum*, frg. 1, CCL 88, p. 337; "Deum bonum nascentium conditorem, per quem facta sunt omnia, eiusque opus esse filios hominum"; frg. 12, CCL 88, p. 338; see also e.g. *Ad Florum* I, 54, CSEL 85, I, p. 51; I, 122, CSEL 85, I, p. 137.

³⁸) See *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 26, CCL 88, p. 347 (*Gen.* 1, 31); *Ad Florum* IV, 55, PL 45, col. 1371 (*1 Tim.* 4, 4); V, 15, PL 45, col. 1447 (*Gen.* 1, 31); VI, 16, PL 45, col. 1535 (*Gen.* 1, 31; *1 Tim.* 4, 4 and *Eccl.* 39, 21).

³⁹) See e.g. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 211, CCL 88, p. 380; frg. 239, CCL 88, p. 384; *Ad Florum* I, 40, CSEL 85, I, p. 30.

⁴⁰) Cf. *Ad Florum* I, 122-123, CSEL 85, I, p. 137; I, 130, CSEL 85, I, p. 141; VI, 26, PL 45, col. 1562. For a parallel in Pelagius, see *Pro libero arbitrio*, in Augustine, *De peccato originali* 14, CSEL 42, p. 175.

way of living⁴¹). From ontological point of view, all are born *sine reatu, innocens*⁴²). This is necessary because otherwise, the *malum* would belong to the essence of human nature. In this case, human beings would not be able to transcend this evil and therefore would not be responsible for it. In a certain way, the goodness of creation is the condition for morality and this goodness must, in a Christian perspective, refer to a good creator who is presupposed⁴³). So, it is clear that Julian was convinced that, within the premises of Christian faith (i.e. a good God who created a good humanity), it was impossible for sin to exist on the level of creation⁴⁴).

Besides, Julian emphasized that God's creative activity is permanent. God is the creator of children, born today⁴⁵). In the procreation of human beings God and man work together. Man offers in a certain way the *materia* to God and God Himself creates and forms the human body. This is not only the fact in Adam's case but in the case of every human being who comes into existence⁴⁶). It is exactly due to this

⁴¹) See Julian's exegesis of *Rom.* 9 in *Ad Florum* I, 131 ff., *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 143 ff. Julian's startpoint is clearly expressed in I, 131: "Comprimit igitur gentium magister Iudaeorum tumorem et ostendit non in seminibus humani generis, sed in moribus esse distantiam, ut se illi agnoscerent, nisi fideles esse curassent, nulla praerogativa circumcisi generis vindicandos, siquidem Iacob et Esau una seminis exceptione concepti et una vi parientis effusi diversos nimium exitus pro meritorum diversitate pertulerint".

⁴²) "Quibus praesidiis innocens rerum omnium natura defenditur, quae ita manens, ut condita est, nullo crimini probatur obnoxia"; *Ad Florum* III, 158, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 462.

⁴³) "Malum igitur naturale esse non potest ac per hoc nec rea ulla naturaliter creatura nec malus auctor malae quippe non exstantis invenitur naturae, sed sicut omnis creatura, in quantum conditur, bona est, ita et Deus, naturarum auctor bonarum, nullo operis sui crimine maculatus per omnia bonus probatur"; *Ad Florum* III, 159, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 463. See also *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 17a, *CCL* 88, p. 345; *Ad Florum* I, 54, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 51.

⁴⁴) Here we must emphasize that Julian equalizes *peccatum originale* to *peccatum naturale*, that means that for Julian, evil belongs to nature as an integrated part of it, while for Augustine, evil is more accidental and thus healable, as is indicated by the notion *natura vitata*; cf. M. STROHM, *Der Begriff der "natura vitata" bei Augustin*, in *Theologische Quartalschrift* 135 (1955), p. 184-203.

⁴⁵) "Qui nascuntur hodie, (...) istos opus Dei esse"; *Epistula ad Zosimum*, frg. 4, *CCL* 88, p. 335.

⁴⁶) "Qui enim primum fecit ex pulvere, omnes fabricatur ex semine. Sicut ergo tunc limus qui assumptus est, materia, non auctor fuit, ita nunc vis illa voluptatis, confectrix commixtrixque seminum, non explet divinae operationis vicem, sed de thesauris naturae offert Deo, unde ille hominem dignetur operari"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 56, *CCL* 88, p. 354; "Unum Deum, auctorem rerum omnium, bonam hominum non solum fecisse primum, sed etiam facere in unoquoque nascente naturam"; *Ad Florum* III, 154, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 458; see also e.g. *Commentarius in Canticum*, frg. 11, *CCL* 88, p. 401; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 239, *CCL* 88, p. 384; *Ad Florum* II, 29, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 183; III, 144, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 450; V, 14, *PL* 45, col. 1443-1444.

believe in the permanent creative activity of God that Julian could not accept that the qualification *natura bona* was limited to the creation of Adam. God is the creator of all human beings and if He does not act in that way, no one would be born⁴⁷).

According to Julian, God is the creator of the human body and soul. It is precisely in the creation of the soul that God manifests his permanent creative activity. Every human being receives a newly created soul. Such a statement implies that the soul has nothing to do with nor refers to the flesh or to the human seeds⁴⁸). Thanks to the gift of soul, human beings become *imago Dei*, rational beings, surpassing all other living beings, plants and animals⁴⁹). The gift of the *ratio*, one expression of the *multiplex gratia Christi*⁵⁰), enables us to know and thus to do what God wants us to do. Because of this *ratio*, human beings have, in a certain way, a point of contact with God⁵¹).

From these statements it is already evident that, according to Julian, it is impossible to speak of an inherited guilt. How can there be guilt in children created by God, not only receiving the *forma corporis*, but more importantly, a new soul from the same God: what children are, what they possess, is a gift of the creator⁵²).

Moreover, the *dignitas opificis* is a guarantee of the human beings

⁴⁷) "Nec sine Deo operatore existere posse nascentes"; *Ad Florum* IV, 76, *PL* 45, col. 1382.

⁴⁸) "Per ingressum animae? Sed nihil debet semini corporali, quae nova a Deo conditur"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 75, *CCL* 88, p. 359; see also *Ad Florum* II, 25, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 179; II, 28 *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 182; III, 44, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 384.

Flesh and soul possess a different substance; see *Ad Florum* IV, 40, *PL* 45, col. 1360. Moreover, procreation has only to do with the flesh: "Per generationem vero substantia carnis suboli sola participat, quia non anima de anima, sed caro de carne trahitur"; *Ad Florum* II, 61, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 207.

⁴⁹) "Ut viventibus sensu ita sentientibus ratione praestamus, quae impressa est animo, ut conditoris imago doceretur, ad cuius aequae respicit dignitatem arbitrii concessa libertas"; *Ad Florum* I, 94, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 109.

⁵⁰) See *Ad Florum* I, 94, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 109.

⁵¹) The notion *imago Dei* refers either to the human soul in general or to the rational part of the soul, the *mens*; see *Ad Florum* I, 37, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 27; VI, 26, *PL* 45, col. 1562.

⁵²) "Hinc potius suos (...) approbat, quod ante proprium voluntatis obsequium hoc quod in eis fecit beneficiorum sublimat augmentis"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 242, *CCL* 88, p. 384; see also *Epistula ad Rufum*, frg. 12, *CCL* 88, p. 338; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 25, *CCL* 88, p. 346; frg. 30, *CCL* 88, p. 348; *Ad Florum* I, 123, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 137.

innocence⁵³) since there is no crime in God⁵⁴). Since God does not create human beings in order that they might be lost⁵⁵), Julian was convinced that even if there was anything evil in parents, simply the fact that God Himself creates human beings was already an argument in favor of the absence of sin in the newborn children⁵⁶).

Julian also emphasized that the ability to sin presupposed that one could already use one's mind (i.e. that one was an adult). Therefore, in children, in whom this mind was not yet active, there was no space for moral activity and thus, for sin⁵⁷). Here we must also mention that Julian made a strict distinction between the order of creation and the order of morality. The *res arbitrii* had nothing to do with the *conditio seminum*⁵⁸). Guilt could not be passed on through the *semina*⁵⁹). Julian

⁵³) "Deum vero nascentium conditorem ita dicimus, ut quoniam certum est Deum catholicorum, qui verus est, nihil facere posse, quod malum est, ipsius opificis dignitate homines, qui ab eo fiunt, ante voluntatis usum de manibus eius iniqui et rei nullo modo exire credantur..."; *Ad Florum* III, 124, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 440; "Dicimus itaque tam bonum esse opus Dei in nascente, ut ea quae substantiae eius sunt naturalia opus emendatore non habeant, quoniam, quicumque censuerit, id quod a Deo factum confitetur, aliter fieri debuisse, illum sine dubio reprehendit, quem corrigendae in alteram formam creaturae confitetur artificem"; *Ad Florum* III, 162, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 467.

⁵⁴) "Nullum est in Deo crimen. Non igitur creat malos, quoniam, si mali essent natura, Deus eos creare non posset..."; *Ad Florum* III, 136, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 443.

⁵⁵) See e.g. *Ad Florum* I, 129, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 141; I, 54, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 51; I, 130, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 141; IV, 118, *PL* 45, col. 1411; V, 59, *PL* 45, col. 1492.

⁵⁶) "Cur non ipso filii munderunt effectum, ut a pollutionibus, quae dicuntur, maiestate opificis expientur"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 214, *CCL* 88, p. 381.

⁵⁷) "Ideo in parvulis non esse delictum, quia sine voluntate, quae in eis nulla est, esse non potest"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 18, *CCL* 88, p. 345; "Nec iustos nasci parvulos nec iniustos, quod futuri sunt actibus suis"; frg. 17b, *CCL* 88, p. 360. The fact that children are not able to sin, is, according to Julian, a fundamental objection against the existence of natural sin; see e.g. *Ad Florum* I, 60, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 57; I, 112, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 130; II, 18, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 174; II, 20, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 175; II, 28, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 182; II, 38, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 190; II, 42, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 193; II, 116, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 248; II, 131, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 258; II, 141, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 264; II, 161, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 283; II, 197, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 310; II, 203, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 315; II, 221, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 333 etc.

⁵⁸) "Quid fieri potest ut res arbitrii conditioni seminum misceatur?"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 260, *CCL* 88, p. 396; see also *Ad Florum* II, 123, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 253; VI, 9, *PL* 45, col. 1515.

⁵⁹) "Quando adulteri gignunt, nascitur homo de virtute seminum, non de turpitudine flagitiorum"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 71, *CCL* 88, p. 358; "In tantum sexuum coniunctio suboli participat, in quantum qui coniuges sunt fiunt parentes; si autem aliquid inter se voluerint agere petulantibus vel in illicitos adulteriorum aberrare concubitus, hoc ad filios non potest attinere, qui de vi seminum, non de vitiorum obscaenitate nascuntur. Igitur ad nascentes generantur non flagitia, sed semina pervehuntur; vim autem seminum Deus instituit et (...) benedixit"; *Ad Florum* II, 40-41, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 192. Cf. also *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 74, *CCL* 88, p. 358; *Ad Florum* V, 12, *PL* 45, col. 1442.

would not accept the idea that the moral activity of parents harms children. This is, in a certain way, the inner consequence of Julian's conviction that God Himself is the creator of all human beings, on the one hand, and of his belief that everyone is responsible for his own way of living on the other hand⁶⁰). For little children, these two elements imply first, that they were not able to act morally and therefore, were not able to sin and, second, that the sin of the parents did not harm them⁶¹).

Seen from this perspective, it becomes clear why Julian maintained that it was impossible to reconcile the idea that God creates every human being with the idea that every child is born guilty. Whoever believed in the existence of a *peccatum naturale*, denied that either God created reality or that God was good⁶²). According to Julian, Augustine criticized God's creative activity or denied that He created humanity⁶³).

According to Julian, "natural" had the status of substance. In other words, it was necessary and immutable. Therefore, the doctrine of *peccatum naturale* gave sin a substantial character. Since *substantia* or *natura* referred to creation as such, God Himself must be involved with that natural sin which contradicts either His *bonitas* or His creative efficacy. In Julian's eyes, the doctrine of natural sin endangered a crucial point in the Christian doctrine, namely that we believe in a God who is the good creator of a good reality⁶⁴). Julian reproached Augus-

⁶⁰) "Quod fiunt parentes, ad naturam pertinet, quae Deo gaudet auctore; quod autem impii sunt, ad studiorum pravitatem, quae unicuique de libera voluntate contingit"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 55, CCL 88, p. 354; see also frg. 75, CCL 88, p. 359.

⁶¹) "Alienis peccatis alterum obnoxium non teneri"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 264, CCL 88, p. 386; "Parentum peccatis reos per naturam filios non teneri atque ita non transire ad posteros crimina generantur, quamvis ex eis nati sunt"; *Ad Florum* III, 18-19, CSEL 85, 1, p. 361.

⁶²) See e.g. *Epistula ad Rufum*, frg. 3, CCL 88, p. 337; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 24a, CCL 88, p. 346; frg. 78, CCL 88, p. 360.

⁶³) "Si parvulus, qui voluntatis usum non habet, nec quidquam ostendit praeter instituta naturae, scelere plenus esse dicatur, atque habere malum a necessario, quod alter a possibili capit; sine dubio is auctor criminis, qui auctor arguitur"; *Ad Florum* V, 59, PL 45, col. 1492; cf. also III, 161, CSEL 85, 1, p. 466.

⁶⁴) "Ergo iure dicitur, confitearis necesse est, naturale quod Manichaeus finxerat, sed tu nomine commutato originale vocas, interiisse peccatum. Nec hoc ea catholica fides credit antiquitus, quae non dubitat et parvulos a Deo fieri, et malum ab eo nihil fieri: ac per hoc opera Dei ante liberae voluntatis usum, naturae praeiudicio nec rea, nec sub diaboli iure constituit"; *Ad Florum* V, 9, PL 45, col. 1436; cf. also e.g. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 77-78, CCL 88, p. 360; frg. 301, CCL 88, p. 391; *Ad Florum* IV, 55, PL 45, col. 1371; VI, 16, PL 45, col. 1535.

tine for saying that God created evil people, born with guilt, condemned without any personal sin but only for the fact that they were God's creation⁶⁵). God created *figula irae* and *perditionis vasa*, unable to act. God wanted the destruction of humanity! He punished innocent beings which He Himself had created. They stay *sub potestate diaboli* because God created them. They are responsible for God's crimes⁶⁶)! Moreover, to Julian the convinced creationist, it was unintelligible how a newly created soul could be guilty. Julian was offended with Augustine's silence in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia II* in view of this argument against original sin⁶⁷). According to Julian, sin was the result of a moral activity, thus situated on the level of *anima*. Augustine was drawn to situate *peccatum originale* in the soul but this soul was God's gift par excellence⁶⁸).

For Julian, it was clear that Augustine's God had nothing in common with his own God⁶⁹). Augustine could not defend that the

⁶⁵) "Diligens ergo lector intendat, quod pronuntiasti Deum esse factorem malorum et tales cum condere, qui sine propriae merito voluntatis eant in condemnationem prorsus omnes"; *Ad Florum I*, 114, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 132; "Sensa mea dicis esse reprobanda, sed Dei opera damnanda; me male disputare, sed Deum nequiter creare pronuntias; me errare clamas, illum saevire..."; *I*, 119, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 135; "Sed precor, ne tibi tantum arroges, ut putes nobis liberum non esse cum honore Dei nascentum innocentiam contueri, cum tibi liceat et libeat cum accusatione Dei a reatu, quem dicis libidinis libidinantum membra purgare"; *Ad Florum II*, 31, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 184-185; cf. also *III*, 154, *CSEL*, 85, 1, p. 457f.; *IV*, 56, *PL* 45, col. 1372.

⁶⁶) "Creat igitur malum Deus, et puniuntur innocentes, propter quod facit Deus et a diabolo possidentur, quia hoc facit Deus, et imputat hominibus crimen manuum suarum Deus, et, quod persuasit diabolus tenuiter, sollerter et perseveranter fingit et propagat et custodit et format Deus et fructum ab homine bonitatis reposcit, cui malum ingenuit Deus, et postea tota lege mentitur, quia iustus sit dominus et qui tot crimina capit, adhuc vocatur Deus?"; *Ad Florum III*, 128-135, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 442-443.

⁶⁷) "Hunc ergo de opere meo priore contextum in hoc secundo libro suo sibi, licet cum interpolatione, proposuit; nam et commemoratam a me formationem corporis et ingressum animae, quam novam in unoquoque a Deo conditam tam ratio quam legis sacrae ecclesiaeque catholicae confirmat auctoritas, ut spero, arte praeteriit"; *Ad Florum II*, 25, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 179; see also *II*, 28, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 182; *II*, 61, *CSEL*, 85, 1, p. 182; *IV*, 5, *PL* 45, col. 1340.

⁶⁸) Concerning Augustine's reaction and his wrestling with the problem of the origin of the soul, see LAMBERIGTS, *De polemiek tussen Julianus van Aeclanum en Augustinus van Hippo ... Deel II: Volume I: Tekst*, p. 72-78; *Volume II: Voetnoten*, p. 68-78.

⁶⁹) "Ceterum pietas explanavit et ratio Deum meum neminem in contumeliam formare, sed imaginem suam, id est omnes homines bonos condere, qui etiam demolitos studiorum privitate reformare remediorum desiderat largitate. (...) Ceterum in vestra nihil potest tale resonare, quae dicit sine iustitia, sine iudicio, sine misericordia Deum conditorem malorum formare quos puniat, atque ob hoc punire, quod eos ex Adam ipse formaverit"; *Ad Florum I*, 129-130, *CSEL* 85, 1, p. 141.

christian God created guilty little children⁷⁰). Of course, Augustine would react against this accusation⁷¹) but, according to Julian, instead of acquitting God, Augustine, still defending the existence of original sin, accused God Himself⁷²). Therefore, Julian believed that the bishop of Hippo was still a Manichee or was at least influenced by that heresy⁷³) since both doctrines defended the existence of a *malum naturale* and condemned human nature⁷⁴).

We have already mentioned that, for Julian, God was also the creator of the human body. On this point, we must draw attention to Julian's conviction that God had instituted marriage. Therefore, this divine institution was good⁷⁵). The basis for this statement was to be found in Scripture⁷⁶). For Julian, God who had commanded human beings to propagate, had created them in such a way that they were able to do this. The good God formed the members of the human body.

⁷⁰) See already Julian's startpoint in the controversy; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 1, CCL 88, p. 340-341.

⁷¹) See e.g. *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II, 8, CSEL, 42, p. 260.

⁷²) "Ais quippe credere te quidem conditorem Deus, sed malorum hominum, ac per hoc infitiaris dogmati tuo, cum negas te asserere diabolum hominum conditorem"; *Ad Florum* III, 124, CSEL, 85, 1, p. 440; "Times operi diaboli aliquam deputare substantiam, verum non times Deo non aliquod sed magnum crimen impingere"; III, 126, CSEL 85, 1, p. 441.

⁷³) See e.g. *Ad Florum* I, 1, CSEL 85, 1, p. 5; I, 2, CSEL 85, 1, p. 6; I, 75, CSEL 85, 1, p. 9091; II, 102, CSEL 85, 1, p. 233; II, 110, CSEL, 85, 1, p. 242; III, 21, CSEL 85, 1, p. 363; III, 29, CSEL 85, 1, p. 367; III, 35, CSEL 85, 1, p. 374; III, 166, CSEL 85, 1, p. 469; IV, 5, PL 45, col. 1342; IV, 18, PL 45, col. 1346; IV, 67, PL 45, col. 1377-1378; IV, 71, PL 45, col. 1379; IV, 94, PL 45, col. 1394; IV, 130, PL 45, col. 1427; V, 2, PL 45, col. 1433 etc.

From the very beginning, Julian has seen the controversy as a struggle against Manichaeism; see *Dicta in quadam disputatione publica*, CCL 88, p. 336; *Epistula ad Rufum*, frg. 1, CCL 88, p. 336-337; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 1, CCL 88, p. 340; *Epistula ad Romanos*, frg. 1, CCL 88, p. 396.

On the correctness of this reproach, see EVANS, *Neither a Pelagian nor a Manichee*, p. 232-244; LAMBERIGTS, *De polemiek tussen Julianus van Aeclanum en Augustinus van Hippo, passim*.

⁷⁴) The core of Julian's criticism can be summarized as following: "Ambo igitur, tu et Manichaeus, pariter malum naturale firmatis, id est ambo malam naturam hominum aequae dicitis, sed ille fidelius, tu fraudulentius"; *Ad Florum* III, 154, CSEL 85, 1, p. 458.

⁷⁵) "Dicimus (...) has, quae nunc aguntur in orbe terrarum, a Deo nuptias institutas, nec reos esse coniuges, sed fornicatores et adulteros condemnandos"; *Epistula ad Romanos*, frg. 9, CCL 88, p. 397; cf. also *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 230, CCL 88, p. 383; *Ad Florum* II, 39, CSEL 85, 1, p. 191; II, 122, CSEL 85, 1, p. 253; IV, 27, PL 45, col. 1352.

⁷⁶) See *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 26-29, CCL 88, p. 347-348; Julian quotes *Gen.* 1, 28 in frg. 27; *Gen.* 2, 18 in frg. 26; *Gen.* 2, 24, in frg. 28; 3, 20 in frg. 26. *Gen.* 2, 24 is also quoted in frg. 37, CCL 88, p. 350; frg. 79, CCL 88, p. 361; *Epistula ad Rufum*, frg. 19, CCL 88, p. 339; *Ad Florum* II, 59, CSEL 85, 1, p. 206.

He who made the bodies also distinguished the sexes and what He intended to join in action, he distinguished in kind. This dissimilarity of the members was the cause of the union. Therefore, according to Julian, the fruits of these goods: bodies, sexes and union could not be bad⁷⁷). We can say that, for Julian, the corporal division of human beings into man and woman was the condition that enabled sexual intercourse⁷⁸).

The task of sexual intercourse was fertility. On the corporeal level, it was the fundamental reason for the institution of marriage⁷⁹). According to Julian, the Catholic Church always believed that God instituted and blessed marriage and that the *membra naturae* were His work⁸⁰). The Church recognized that sexual intercourse and its fruit belonged to the creator of the body⁸¹). The crucial question in the discussion was the qualification of *concupiscentia*. In Julian's eyes, *concupiscentia* was also created by God⁸²) because sexual intercourse

⁷⁷) "Deus (...) bonus, per quem facta sunt omnia, ipse corporis nostri membra formavit. (...) Qui autem corpora fecerat, divisit et sexum: divisit in specie, quod in operatione coniungeret; fecitque causam coniunctionum dissimilitudo membrorum. (...) Ab ipso igitur commixtio corporum, a quo est origo corporum"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 24a-b, CCL 88, p. 346; "Motum genitalium, id est ipsam virilitatem sine qua non potest esse commixtio, a Deo dicimus institutam"; *Epistula ad Romanos*, frg. 10, CCL 88, p. 397; cf. also *Ad Florum* I, 70, CSEL 85, 1, p. 78; II, 39, CSEL 85, 1, p. 191; III, 142, CSEL 85, 1, p. 447; III, 167, CSEL 85, p. 470; III, 212, CSEL 85, 1, p. 504; IV, 6, PL 45, col. 1342. See also M. MESLIN, *Sainteté et mariage au cours de la seconde querelle pélagienne. Saint Augustin et Julien d'Eclane*, in *Études carmélitaines*, 31 (1952), p. 298.

⁷⁸) Cf. *Epistula ad Romanos*, frg. 10, CCL 88, p. 397.

⁷⁹) "Deus igitur (...) maris creator et feminae, convenientia generationibus membra formavit. (...) Ita gigni corpora de corporibus ordinavit, quorum tamen efficientiae potentia operationis intervenit, omne quod est ea administrans virtute, qua condidit. Si igitur non nisi per sexum fetus, non nisi per corpus sexus, non nisi per Deum corpus: quis ambigat fecunditatem Deo iure reputari?"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 28, CCL 88, p. 347; "Tu vero (...) qui dicis: 'Eos qui de parentibus qualibuscumque nascantur non negamus adhuc esse sub diabolo, nisi renascantur in Christo (= *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I, 1), ostende ergo nunc quid suum diabolus cognoscat in sexibus, per quod fructum eorum, ut dicis, iure possideat. Diversitatem? sed haec in corporibus est quae Deus fecit; commixtione? sed non minus benedictionis quam institutionis privilegio vindicatur: vox enim Dei est: 'Relinquet homo patrem et matrem et adhaerebit uxori et erunt duo in carne una' (*Gen.* 2, 24), vox Dei est, 'Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram'. (*Gen.* 1, 28) An forte ipsam fecunditatem? sed ipsa est instituti causa coniugii"; frg. 29, CCL 88, p. 348.

⁸⁰) See *Ad Florum* IV, 112-113, PL 45, col. 1405-1406.

⁸¹) Cf. *Ad Florum* IV, 117-119, PL 45, col. 1411-1413; V, 9, PL 45, col. 1438.

⁸²) "Ista corporum commixtio cum calore, cum voluptate, cum semine, a Deo facta et pro suo modo laudabilis approbatur"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 41, CCL 88, p. 350; "Merito igitur (...) concupiscentiae origo definitur in igne vitali, quo collecto necesse est ut ei reputetur concupiscentia carnalis, per quem constitit vita carnalis. (...) Huius itaque appetitus non in genere suo, non in specie, non in modo culpa est, sed in excessu: quia

was always coupled with *concupiscentia*⁸³). *Concupiscentia* was a *necessary instrument* for the *virilitas propagationis*⁸⁴). Moreover, the presence of the *concupiscentia* in animals as well as in human beings was proof of the fact that this *concupiscentia* was not a *malum*. God, who had also created animals, had constituted them so that they regularly were excited by this *naturalis voluptas* to sexual intercourse⁸⁵). Of course, there is a difference between human beings and animals *qua forma* but the body of both was created out of the same *materies*⁸⁶). So, from the moment that one accepts that animals are God's work and that human bodies are formed from the same material, the conclusion is evident: "Libidinem ut pecorum, istam hominum fecit Deus"⁸⁷). *Concupiscentia* belonged to the bodily nature, it was *naturalis*⁸⁸).

According to Julian — and here he completely disagreed with Augustine —, the *concupiscentia* as a *natural quality* of human nature was innocent. Otherwise one would be criticizing God's creating activity since He Himself was "responsible" for this sexual desire⁸⁹).

genus eius et species ad Conditoris operam pertinent, modus eius ad arbitrium honestatis, excessus ad vitium voluntatis"; frg. 45, CCL 88, p. 351; see also *Ad Florum* II, 39, CSEL 85, I, p. 191; III, 182, CSEL 85, I, p. 481; IV, 67, PL 45, col. 1377; V, 5, PL 45, col. 1435. On this point, see also M. ABEL, *Le Praedestinatus et le pèlagianisme*, in RTAM 35 (1968), p. 16 and P. LANGA, *San Agustín y el progreso de la teología matrimonial*, Toledo, 1984, p. 254.

⁸³) To indicate sexual desire, Julian uses the words: 1. *concupiscentia*: so e.g. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 38, CCL 88, p. 350; frg. 40, CCL 88, p. 350; frg. 44, CCL 88, p. 351; frg. 45, CCL 88, p. 351; frg. 62, CCL 88, p. 356; frg. 63, CCL 88, p. 356; frg. 144a-b, CCL 88, p. 370; *Ad Florum* II, 32, CSEL 85, I, p. 185; IV, 38, PL 45, col. 1357-1359; 2. *voluptas*: *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 36, CCL 88, p. 349; frg. 41, CCL 88, p. 350; frg. 48, CCL 88, p. 351; frg. 125, CCL 88, p. 367; frg. 144b, CCL 88, p. 370; frg. 224, CCL 88, p. 382; 3. *libido*: *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 47, CCL 88, p. 351; frg. 127, CCL 88, p. 367; frg. 128, CCL 88, p. 368.

Julian does not distinguish between activity and passivity, desire and experience.

⁸⁴) "Et quamvis iam pro concupiscentia vel voluptate carnis, quae etiam libido dicitur, quae sexibus ob virilitatem propagationis inserta est, primo illo opusculo eatenus disputaverim, ut docerem illam nihil aliud esse quam unam de instrumentis corporis rationabilibus et irrationabilibus aequae inditam ad Dei operam pertinentem, qui carnem nostram in sensibus affecisset ..."; *Ad Florum* III, 167, CSEL 85, I, p. 470; see also III, 212, CSEL 85, I, p. 504.

⁸⁵) Cf. *Ad Florum* IV, 38, PL 45, col. 1358.

⁸⁶) "Ut enim imaginem Dei mentis ratione suscepimus: ita communionem pecudum carnis affinitate sentimus; cuius licet sit forma diversa, est tamen de materia elementorum una substantia..."; *Ad Florum* IV, 39, PL 45, col. 1359.

⁸⁷) *Ad Florum* IV, 41, PL 45, col. 1360; see also II, 122, CSEL 85, I, p. 253.

⁸⁸) See *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 63, CCL 88, p. 356; frg. 130, CCL 88, p. 368; *Ad Florum* III, 209, CSEL 85, I, p. 502; IV, 67, PL 45, col. 1377; V 5, PL 45, col. 1435.

⁸⁹) "Fecit ergo corpora Deus, distinxit sexuum corporum Deus, fecit membra genitalia Deus, indidit affectum quo sibi haec corpora miscerentur Deus, dedit etiam vim

Within the limits of marriage, *concupiscentia* is used in a decent way, namely, for procreation and in that case, *reatus* must be excluded⁹⁰). Moreover, in Julian's hierarchical view of human beings, the gift of rationality (cf. *imago Dei*) enabled humans to control and to govern the body⁹¹). This implied that *concupiscentia*, being one of the *instrumenta mediocria* of the body⁹²), could also be held under control precisely because it was an aspect of the inferior part of the human being (i.e. the body). Julian was convinced that God required the *homo rationalis* to moderate the *concupiscentia*, use it *cum honestate* and in full respect toward this *concupiscentia*⁹³).

On this point, Julian, convinced that elements such as sexual difference, sexual intercourse, and fertility as a result of this intercourse were wanted and planned by God, reproached Augustine for not being able to give one good argument for the existence of original evil in children. If marriage is good, if its fruit as the work of God cannot be

seminum Deus, operatur in secretis naturae de materia seminum Deus"; *Ad Florum* IV, 40, *PL* 45, col. 1360.

⁹⁰) See *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 44-48, *CCL* 88, p. 351. In frg. 44-45, Julian refers to the idea of *ignis vitalis*; on this Stoic idea, see M. POHLENZ, *Die Stoa. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, Göttingen, 1948, p. 81f; 215-216; M. SPANNEUT, *Permanence du Stoïcisme. De Zénon à Malraux*, Gembloux, 1973, p. 51; 108; BRUCKNER, *Julian von Eclanum*, p. 137.

⁹¹) "Hominem sufficere ingenitis sibi motibus dare leges"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 233, *CCL* 88, p. 383; see also frg. 116, *CCL* 88, p. 366; cf. also BRUCKNER, *Julian von Eclanum*, p. 136. On this point, there is a difference between Julian and Pelagius, for whom *concupiscentia* has a negative connotation: "Duo namque sunt ex omnibus vitia, quae maxime homines decipiunt sui voluptate, gula scilicet ac libido, quae deponere eo difficilius est, quo eis uti dulcius est; et tamen haec vitia tam molesta, tamque delectatione sui periculosa, ita a multis calcari vidimus, ut tota aetate virgines permanserint in summa abstinencia. Ut de illis taceam, quae post deliciarum longum fluxum, et inveteratum usum libidinis, castitati ac temperantiae se dederint; et utrumque vitium, contraria sibi virtute mutaverint"; *Epistula ad Demetriadem* 18, *PL* 30, col. 32. On this difference, see also F. KLASSEN, *Die innere Entwicklung des Pelagianismus. Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1882, p. 195f. However, according to Pelagius, *concupiscentia* has not the character of a coercion: "Notandum quod homo membra sua cui velit parti exhibeat per arbitrii libertatem"; *Expositio in Romanos* VI, 13, ed. SOUTER, p. 51; see also VI, 19, ed. SOUTER, p. 53; VII, 22.23, ed. SOUTER, p. 59-60; *De natura* in Augustine, *De natura et gratia* 63, *CSEL* 60, p. 279-280.

See also de Plinval, *Pélage*, p. 150-152.

⁹²) "Item deorsum de libidine loquens, sine qua coniugum non potest esse commixtio, quam nos naturalem et ad Dei operam pertinentem non ut magnum aliquod bonum, sed ut sensum corporum, quae sunt a Deo facta, defendimus ..."; *Ad Florum* III, 142, *CSEL* 85, I, p. 447; cf. also V, 16, *PL* 45, col. 1449.

⁹³) See e.g. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 47, *CCL* 88, p. 351; frg. 94, *CCL* 88, p. 363; *Ad Florum* IV, 41, *PL* 45, col. 1360.

bad, born as it is by good agency out of good, where then should original evil, if it has been destroyed by so many premises, be situated⁹⁴)? The crucial question was precisely how to reconcile a positive attitude toward marriage and all the elements realizing that (bodily) marriage with the existence of the *malum originale*.

Of course, Julian knew that Augustine interpreted the presence of *concupiscentia carnis* as a sign of the existence of original sin⁹⁵) but Julian did not accept such an explanation. According to him, God was not only the creator of the *caro* but also of the *sensus carnis* to which the *concupiscentia* belongs⁹⁶).

Moreover, presuming that intercourse passes down original sin, Augustine must reproach parents for (spiritual) infanticide⁹⁷). Worse than that, parents, having intercourse, do not possess any guilt. Children, the fruit of that intercourse, were born with guilt⁹⁸). Parents, employing *concupiscentia*, are sinless, while children, God's work, are guilty⁹⁹).

Moreover, Augustine recognized that intercourse, in view of procreation, was sinless¹⁰⁰). If that was true, the result of intercourse (i.e. children) must also be without any guilt¹⁰¹). If one presumes here that the intention of married parents is good, then the result must also be good. Otherwise, Augustine must admit that God did not institute

⁹⁴) "Si coniugium bonum, si homo fructus coniugii bonus, si hic fructus opus Dei malus esse non potest, qui per bonum ex bono nascitur, ubi igitur originale malum, quod tot praeiudiciis interemptum est?"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 64, CCL 88, p. 357; see also frg. 68, CCL 88, p. 357; *Ad Florum* IV, 68, PL 45, col. 1378-1379.

⁹⁵) On Augustine's position during the controversy with Julian, see LAMBERIGTS, *De polemiek tussen Julianus van Aclanum en Augustinus van Hippo...*, II, I, p. 79-144; II, II, p. 78-150.

⁹⁶) "Necesse esset ad eundem spectare auctorem sensum carnis, ad quem etiam carnis natura respiceret"; *Ad Florum* IV, 69, PL 45, col. 1379.

⁹⁷) "(...) parentes comparans parricidis, in eis asserens esse causam ut filii cum damnatione nascantur"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 202, CCL 88, p. 379.

⁹⁸) "Cur autem de malo quod ei adiacet atque inest membris eius reus non sit fidelis, et ex eo malo tamen qui nascitur reatum trahat ..."; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 212, CCL 88, p. 380.

⁹⁹) "Munus dicit (= Augustine) piorum, existentiam filiorum sed hoc constituit sub diabolo, quod Deum dare confirmat, id est filios. Libidinem autem quae est in pudenda commixtione membrorum, diabolicam vocat, quam in parentibus esse non abnuit, quos tamen absolvit a culpa; (...) quod agunt, inquit, parentes diabolicam est, sed rei non sunt"; *Ad Florum* V, 7, PL 45, col. 1437; see also *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 81, CCL 88, p. 361; *Ad Florum* II, 31, CSEL 85, I, p. 184-185; II, 33, CSEL 85, I, p. 186; IV, 95, PL 45, 1394.

¹⁰⁰) See *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I, 13, CSEL 42, p. 226, quoted in *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 222, CCL 88, p. 378.

¹⁰¹) *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 222, CCL 88, p. 382.

marriage since marriage would be seen as a situation in which original sin was passed down¹⁰²).

Julian did not accept Augustine's distinction between *bonum conubii* and *malum concupiscentiae*. Whatever was good must share its praise with that without which it cannot exist¹⁰³). Since *concupiscentia* was necessary for procreation, the one who wanted to defend the goodness of *nuptiae corporales* must recognize that it was not a deficiency but a natural good¹⁰⁴). On the contrary, Augustine's qualification of *concupiscentia* as *diabolica* condemned marriage¹⁰⁵). In such a view, one must admit that the devil, the *causa concupiscentiae*, enabled procreation¹⁰⁶) and thus, in a certain way, instituted bodily marriages.

Of course, Julian knew that in Augustine's view the *vis voluptatis* did not form the *semina*¹⁰⁷) but even in that case, Augustine's exposé was incoherent. How could Augustine explain that children, God's gift, created out of *semina*, were born *sub iure diaboli*?¹⁰⁸) Even if the devil had originated *concupiscentia*, this *concupiscentia* could not have any evil influence on the *semina*, which was God's work!¹⁰⁹)

¹⁰²) Cf. *Ad Florum* II, 27, CSEL 85, I, p. 181; II, 28, CSEL 85, I, p. 182; II, 39, CSEL 85, I, p. 191.

¹⁰³) "Fieri non posse ut quod bonum est non habeat communem cum eo laudem, sine quo esse non potest"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 190, CCL 88, p. 378.

¹⁰⁴) Julian identifies *concupiscentia naturalis* with *concupiscentia carnalis*; see *Ad Florum* V, 5, PL 45, col. 1435-1436.

¹⁰⁵) "Dicunt etiam (...) 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..."; *Epistula ad Romanos*, frg. 3, CCL 88, p. 397.

¹⁰⁶) "Ego (= Augustine) enim (non) eos (sicut calumniaris) assevero peculium diaboli (... nec) diabolo coniugia (...) ulla transcribo, (nec) eum genitalium commentor artificem, (nec) excitatorem virorum (... nec) fecundatorem mulierum (nec) conditorem assero parvulorum"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 257, CCL 88, p. 386; see also *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 32, CCL 88, p. 349; frg. 36, CCL 88, p. 349; frg. 80, CCL 88, p. 361; frg. 115, CCL 88, p. 366; frg. 262, CCL 88, p. 386; *Ad Florum* I, 62, CSEL 85, I, p. 58; I, 65, CSEL 85, I, p. 63; II, 228, CSEL 85, I, p. 329.

¹⁰⁷) See *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II, 26, CSEL 85, I, p. 278-279, quoted in *Ad Florum* V, 11, PL 45, col. 1440.

¹⁰⁸) Cf. *Ad Florum* V, 7, PL 45, col. 1437.

¹⁰⁹) "Semina ergo a Deo fieri confitetur, in quibus esse dicit diabolicum malum; et non erubescit credere a Deo fieri malum, quod innocentibus imputetur. Libido nihil attinet, inquit, ad semina, quia facta est a diabolo: huic autem libidini serviunt coniuges; semina autem et parvulos de seminibus facit Deus. Sed nec rei sunt, inquit, nec puniuntur parentes, qui agunt opus diaboli: sceleri autem et suppliciis destinantur parvuli, quos condidit Deus; impunitumque est quod fecit diabolus, id est libido; per quod docetur bona, quae nec supplicium meretur: sed accusatur damnaturque quod facit Deus; per quod docetur esse scelestum, quippe quod a supplicio, nec auctoris sui potest pudore

Finally, Julian did not admit that *concupiscentia* was the result of Adam's sin since *concupiscentia* (in its broad sense) caused sin¹¹⁰). Next, the way of procreation was not changed because of the first sin¹¹¹). God ordered Noah to procreate with the same words that he spoke to Adam¹¹²). This is unintelligible if the *voluptas* was truly *diabolica*¹¹³). Further, it is nonsensical to suppose that *concupiscentia* would be a *poena peccati*. Even as punishment, this *concupiscentia*, an *opus pudendum*, was God's work¹¹⁴). Moreover, as *illecebra et fomes peccati*, this punishment stimulated to sin. God's punishment increased sin¹¹⁵). Here once again, Julian reacted precisely because he could not reconcile his view of God with Augustine's position.

The different texts prove that Julian's reaction against the doctrine of original sin was deeply influenced by his conviction that a good God had created a good reality. Julian was probably the most convinced defender of *concupiscentia carnis* within marriage¹¹⁶) but one must not forget that this defense had a theological basis. It was an inner consequence of his belief in the goodness of created reality. Moreover, Julian was shocked by the idea that sexuality, belonging to parents, caused guilt in children, precisely because the soul, in his creationistic view, owed nothing to the *semina* although the creation of the body was also God's work.

defendi; credaturque hoc divinitas facere, quod nec extrema possit sustinere captivitas"; *Ad Florum* V, 12-13, *PL* 45, col. 1442.

¹¹⁰) Cf. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 137, *CCL* 88, p. 369; frg. 144-145, *CCL* 88, p. 370-371; *Ad Florum* VI, 25-26, *PL* 45, col. 1351.

¹¹¹) "Nec hoc, quod tu putas, intellexit apostolus nec alia prorsus in paradiso fuit condicio commixtionis quam qualis nunc in coniugiis agitur, quae a se instituta Deus tam ipsorum conditione sexuum et qualitate membrorum quam frequentata benedictione perdocuit"; *Ad Florum* I, 70, *CSEL* 85, I, p. 78; cf. also *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 140, *CCL* 88, p. 370; frg. 161, *CCL* 88, p. 374; *Ad Florum* V, 8, *PL* 45, col. 1438.

¹¹²) "(Quid est ergo quod iste adiungit et dicit de Noe et filiis eius, quod) similiter benedicti sint ut Adam et Eva dicente Deo, 'Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram et dominamini eius' (*Gen.* 9,1). (...) Non enim dubitatur de hac ad Noe et filios eius corporum commixtione dictum, cuius iam usus inoleverat, 'Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram' (*Gen.* 9,1)"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 36, *CCL* 88, p. 349-350.

¹¹³) See *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 38ff., *CCL* 88, p. 350; *Ad Florum* V, 10, *PL* 45, col. 1439.

¹¹⁴) See *Ad Florum* IV, 31-32, *PL* 45, col. 1354.

¹¹⁵) Cf. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 165-166, *CCL* 88, p. 374-375; frg. 168, *CCL* 88, p. 375; frg. 173, *CCL* 88, p. 375-376.

¹¹⁶) See among others, N.P. WILLIAMS, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin. A Historical and Critical Study*, London, 1927, p. 343; J.CI. GUY, Fr. REFOULÉ, *Chrétiens des premiers temps* (*Chrétiens de tous les temps* 12), Paris, 1965, p. 42.

However, the question arises whether such a view could be reconciled with the negative connotation of *concupiscentia* in Scripture or with the depreciation of *concupiscentia* in the fourth and fifth centuries¹¹⁷) but, on the other hand, one must recognize that Julian probably was right when reacting against Augustine's view concerning the transmission of original sin. On this point, we agree with Solignac, when he writes: "En particulier, son (= Augustine) explication de la transmission du péché d'Adam par la concupiscence sexuelle semble inacceptable, et la formule 'user bien d'un mal' pour justifier l'acte conjugal est pour le moins malheureuse. Julien d'Eclane n'avait pas tort de le contredire sur ces points"¹¹⁸).

Of course, while emphasizing the important role in Julian's theology of God as a good creator of human beings, we do not forget a crucial point of the discussion between Julian and Augustine. Did Adam's sin harm humanity or not? On this point, one must recognize that according to Julian, the sin of Adam did not cause such a disaster as it did in Augustine's view. Moreover, Julian no longer followed the traditional view in which the sin of Adam was considered as the cause of death, sufferings, concupiscence, and so forth¹¹⁹). In Julian's eyes, they were not punishments for the sin of Adam but they belonged to our natural constitution. In other words, they did not possess a theological connotation of punishment. One must even admit that Julian's answer on the fundamental problem of suffering and death was very simple and insufficient as based on an historical reading of *Genesis*. How is it conceivable that a good God creates human beings in such a way that they are unhappy precisely because of their suffering and

¹¹⁷) See F. BÜCHSEL, art. 'Ἐπιθυμία, in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* III, Stuttgart, 1967(2), p. 167-173; E. SCHMITT, *Le mariage chrétien dans l'œuvre de saint Augustin. Une théologie baptismale de la vie conjugale (Études augustiniennes)*, Paris, 1983, p. 129-136; Th. MACKIN, *What is Marriage? Marriage in the Catholic Church*, New York-Ransey, 1982, p. 80-126.

¹¹⁸) Art. *Pélagé et pélagianisme*, in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 12, 1, Paris, 1986, col. 2935.

¹¹⁹) See J. GROSS, *Entstehungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas I. Von der Bibel bis Augustinus (Geschichte des Erbsündendogmas. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Problems vom Ursprung des Übels I)*, München-Basel, 1960, p. 312: "Wie immer man dieses psychologische Rätsel lösen mag, in einem Punkte wenigstens hat Augustinus nach seiner Bekehrung seine Meinung nie geändert und sich mit vollem Recht gegen die Pelagianer auf die Ueberlieferung berufen: stets hat er im Tode und in die Südhafteigkeit der geschichtlichen Menschheit Straffolgen der Ursünde gesehen. Die Leugnung dieser Grosskirchlichen Tradition durch die Pelagianer dürfte eine der Hauptursachen ihres Misserfolgs gewesen sein".

death? How to reconcile human suffering with God's omnipotence? How to explain intellectual, mental deficiencies within a creationist view? Further, we must also recognize that Augustine during the pelagian controversy first of all reacted against *inimici gratiae*. According to Augustine, the pelagians endangered the crucial position of Christ, the *mediator*. They did not talk about the necessity of daily prayers, first of all the Lord's prayer. They underestimated the fundamental sinfulness of every human being, even if he was baptized. In a certain way, they defended the meritoriousness of grace etc.¹²⁰).

However, as we have seen, one may not neglect that also Julian's reaction was inspired by a sincere conviction. His belief in a good creator stimulated him to react against Augustine's doctrine of original sin.

MATHIJS LAMBERIGTS

¹²⁰) See LAMBERIGTS, *De polemiek tussen Julianus van Aecclanum en Augustinus van Hippo* ..., II, I, p. 268-383; II, II, p. 287-427.