

AUGUSTINE AND JULIAN OF AECLANUM ON ZOSIMUS

When one reads Augustine's description of Zosimus' attitude towards Pelagius and Pelagianism, comparing it with Zosimus' first interventions in this affair on the one hand, and Julian of Aeclanum's complaints on the other hand, one cannot but feel uncomfortable. One has in fact the impression that Augustine did not tell the whole truth to his readers, who were, as we will see, probably not the best audience to hear the (whole) truth¹. I would not dare to say that Augustine deliberately should have lied, but it is clear that his presentation of the historical events was only one side of the coin and that there was, in a certain sense, an element of truth in some of Julian's accusations against both Zosimus and Augustine². Being convinced that an objective presentation of the Pelagian con-

¹ Before Jerome knew of the final condemnation of Pelagius and Caelestius by Zosimus, he was very severe on Zosimus and said what he really thought of him, but Jerome was an exception; see *Epistula* 142, CSEL 56, pp. 291-292; see also D. DE BRUYNE, *La correspondance échangée entre Augustin et Jérôme*, in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*, 31 (1932) 233-248, esp. pp. 245-246. The other sources, such as PROSPER AQUITANUS, *Chronicum integrum*, a. 418, PL 51, 592; *Contra collatorem* 21,1, PL 51, 271; *Auctoritates* 5, PL 51, 207 and MARIUS MERCATOR, *Commonitorium super nomine Caelestii*, ACO I,V, p. 66 and *Commonitorium lectori adversus haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani*, ACO I,V, p. 20 are in line with Augustine. I wish to thank P. Carefoote and C. Shirima for their appreciated help.

² Good surveys for this period in the Pelagian history are e.g. W. MARSCHALL, *Karthago und Rom* (Päpste und Papsttum 1), Stuttgart, 1971, pp. 127-160; Ch. MUNIER, *Introduction, La crise pélagienne II. De gratia Christi et de peccato originali libri II. De natura et origine animae libri IV*. Introduction, traduction et notes par J. PLAGNIEUX et F.-J. THONNARD (Oeuvres de saint Augustin 22), s.l., 1975, pp. 9-24; A. DE VEER, *La démarche d'Albine, Pinien et Mélanie*, in *o.c.*, pp. 24-40; 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, esp. pp. 134-219 and Ch. PIETRI, *Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l'Eglise de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440)* (Bibliothèque de l'Ecole française d'Athènes et de Rome 224), Rome-Paris, 1976, esp. pp. 1222-1244. The recent study of B.R. REES, *Pelagius. A Reluctant Heretic*, Woodbridge, Suffolk-Wolfeboro, New Hampshire, 1988 does not deal that much with Zosimus.

trovery is valuable for a better understanding of this unfortunate dispute, first I will present in this article Augustine's view on Zosimus, then Zosimus' preserved letters and fragments about this controversy and finally Julian's accusations. Confronting Augustine's and Julian's view with each other, I will examine to what extent Julian's reaction was right and why Augustine's report was presented in the way in which it was.

I. AUGUSTINE

In his *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*, an answer to Albinus, Pinianus and Melania, people well known to both Augustine and Pelagius, Augustine discussed Zosimus' attitude towards Pelagius and Caelestius at great length. He first dealt with Caelestius and on the basis of that account, he tried to prove that also Pelagius still was a heretic.

According to Augustine, after he had heard Caelestius, Zosimus did not condemn him immediately, although Caelestius, while recognizing the necessity of baptism for children, explicitly denied the existence of original sin³. Zosimus showed his mercy. He wanted to postpone his decision in order to give Caelestius the possibility to change his view⁴, for Caelestius had expressed his willingness to correct himself if he should have erred. Zosimus hoped that his own attitude would inspire Caelestius to condemn the objections made by the deacon Paulinus of Milan and to agree with Innocent's letters to Africa⁵. During the two months Zosimus was waiting for an answer from Africa, Augustine continues, Caelestius was given *sub quadam medicinali sententiae lenitate* the opportunity to

³ "Caelestius quippe adiungit et dicit: 'in remissionem autem peccatorum baptizandos infantes non idcirco diximus, ut peccatum ex traduce firmare videamur. Quod longe a catholico sensu alienum est, quia peccatum non cum homine nascitur, quod postmodum exercetur ab homine, quia non naturae delictum, sed voluntatis esse monstratur. Et illud ergo confiteri congruum, ne diversa baptismatis genera facere videamur, et hoc praemunire necessarium est, ne per mysterii occasionem ad creatoris iniuriam malum antequam fiat ab homine tradi dicatur homini per naturam"; *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,6, CSEL 42, p. 170.

⁴ "Sed multum misericors memoratae sedis antistes, ubi eum vidit ferri tanta praesumptione praecipitem tamquam furem, donec, si posset fieri, respisceret, maluit eum sensim suis interrogationibus et illius responsionibus colligare quam destructa feriendo sententia in illud abruptum, quo iam propendere videbatur, impellere."; *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,7, CSEL 42, pp. 170-171.

⁵ "Hanc eius praelocationem venerabilis papa Zosimus tenens egit cum homine, quem falsae doctrinae ventus inflaverat, ut ea quae illi a diacono Paulino fuerant obiecta damnaret atque ut sedis apostolicae litteris, quae a sanctae memoriae suo praecessore manaverant, praeberet assensum."; *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,8, CSEL 42, p. 171. On Paulinus, see esp. A. PAREDI, *Paulinus of Milan*, in *Sacris Erudiri*, 14 (1963) 206-230.

come to his senses, for if he really would fulfill his promise, i.e. that he would obey Innocent's letter, he would be healed. Moreover, Augustine concluded, after Africa's answer it was clear that the judgment on Caelestius had been just⁶.

Also for Pelagius' case, closely linked to the one of Caelestius, Augustine did not see any reason for changing his mind. In fact, Pelagius had successfully misled the bishops in Diospolis and therefore seemed to be set free. But since he was well known in Rome, his attempt to mislead the Roman church failed⁷. Indeed Zosimus recalled the judgment of Innocent (*imitandus praecessor*) about the acts of Diospolis. Zosimus also had taken into account the "*praedicanda in Domino Romanorum fides*"⁸, for the Romans unanimously reacted against Pelagius' error. In fact, they knew Pelagius since he had lived for a long time in their city and they were familiar with his doctrine⁹. Augustine then mentioned that the added documents would reveal Innocent's attitude towards Diospolis. He also brought to the attention of his readers the answer of the African Council (1 May 418) to Zosimus¹⁰. Especially Innocent's rather negative judgment of Pelagius' attitude at Diospolis was the principle subject of a long *excursus*¹¹. Augustine's conclusion was clear: "You see what his successor, the blessed pope Zosimus, had to recall, as he in fact did, in order to affirm without hesitation the predecessor's judgment of Pelagius"¹². No word was said about any hesitation on the side of Zosimus: the pope acted in total confirmity with his predecessor; he took into account the firm faith of the Romans etc. In other words Zosimus followed the policy as was delineated by Innocent.

Augustine then presented a detailed comparison of the positions of both Pelagius and Caelestius. This comparison clearly revealed a deep

⁶ *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,8, CSEL 42, p. 171.

⁷ "Unde etiam Pelagius, si se ipsum et sua scripta sine dolo cogitat, non recte dicit eadem sententia se non debuisse retineri. Fefellit enim iudicium Palaestinum, propterea ibi videtur esse purgatus; Romanam vero ecclesiam, ubi eum esse notissimum scitis, fallere usquequaque non potuit, quamvis et hoc fuerit utcumque conatus; sed, ut dixi, minime valuit."; *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,9, CSEL 42, pp. 171-172; same accusation of misleading in e.g. II,11, CSEL 42, p. 173; II,13, CSEL 42, p. 175; II,14, CSEL 42, p. 176; II,17, CSEL 42, p. 178; II,19, CSEL 42, pp. 179-180.

⁸ *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,9, CSEL 42, p. 172.

⁹ *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,9, CSEL 42, p. 172.

¹⁰ *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,9, CSEL 42, p. 172.

¹¹ *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,10, CSEL 42, pp. 172-173.

¹² "Videtis quid successor eius sanctus papa Zosimus recolere debuerit, sicut recoluit, ut in eo sui praecessoris iudicium remota cunctatione firmaret."; *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,10, CSEL 42, p. 173.

agreement between both teachings¹³ and therefore the several condemnations by the African council, the Apostolic See (Innocent and Zosimus), the whole Roman Church and the Roman Empire (Honorius' rescript of 30 April 418) were really justified¹⁴. The way in which Pelagius had tried to defend his case in Rome, was the subject of *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,19-24¹⁵. Augustine did not conceal from his addressees the fact that Pelagius was, for a certain time, successful in his attempt of deception but Pelagius had it not in his power permanently to deceive the Roman See¹⁶. In fact both the rescripts of the African council (1 May 418) and the industry of faithful brethren in Rome, who had discovered other suspect opinions of Pelagius¹⁷, drove Zosimus to insert these opinions in the letter he sent to the whole Church¹⁸.

When Augustine then was confronted with the complaint of Julian of Aeclanum and eighteen of his colleagues that Zosimus and the Roman clergy had been guilty of betrayal, he vehemently reacted for their accusations were serious one's: "Driven by the fear of a command, they were not ashamed to be guilty of the crime of prevarication, so that, contrary to their previous judgment, through which they with proceedings had assented to the catholic doctrine, they later pronounced that human's nature is evil"¹⁹. They even maintained that the final condemnation of Caelestius and Pelagius under Zosimus meant a change in standpoint. Whether this change was considered as a change in comparison with the one defended

¹³ *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II, 11-17, CSEL, pp. 173-179.

¹⁴ "Quae cum ita sint, profecto sentitis in tam nefandi erroris auctores episcopalia concilia et apostolicam sedem universamque Romanam ecclesiam Romanumque imperium, quod Deo propitio christianum est, rectissime fuisse commotum, donec resipiscant de diaboli laqueis."; *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,18, CSEL 42, p. 179.

¹⁵ CSEL 42, pp. 179-183.

¹⁶ "Visus est tamen ad tempus aliquid dicere, quod fidei catholicae conveniret; sed illam sedem usque in finem fallere non praevaluit."; *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,24, CSEL 42, p. 183.

¹⁷ Augustine repeated that Pelagius was well known in Rome and that he had already been engaged in discussions and disputes during his stay there; cf. *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,24, CSEL 42, p. 183.

¹⁸ "Alia quoque ipsius (=Pelagius) in urbe Roma (...) cura fidelium fratrum prolata potuerunt, quae litteris suis, quas conscripsit per orbem catholicum perferendas, papa Zosimus execranda sicut legere potestis, attexuit."; *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,24, CSEL 42, p. 183.

¹⁹ "(Quin etiam) Romanos clericos (arguunt, scribentes eos) iussionis terrore percussos non erubuisse praevaricationis crimen admittere, ut contra priorem sententiam suam, qua gestis catholico dogmati affuerant, postea pronuntiarent malam hominum esse naturam."; *Epistula ad Rufum*, frg. 2a, CCSL 88, p. 337.

by Innocent or as a change in Zosimus' own position is not very clear in the preserved fragments²⁰. In his reply, *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5-8²¹, Augustine discussed at great length this accusation. He first of all stated that the fact that Pelagius and Caelestius were treated with more leniency than the stricter discipline of the Church required, had caused a false hope among the Pelagians who thought that the teachings of both heretics could be made acceptable to some people in Rome²². With explicit reference to the exchange of letters between Rome and Africa, Augustine denied that Zosimus had ever taught that people are born without any taint of original sin²³. It was Caelestius himself who had uttered some hesitations about this doctrine²⁴. That Caelestius' *Libellus* had been first acquitted, was the result of the catholic procedure not to define with the greatest accuracy as heresies opinions, which are not totally in conformity with the truth, but only reject them after they are detected and demonstrated. Moreover, Caelestius had approved of the letters of Innocent²⁵. Further, people in Rome were waiting for the letters of Africa in order to be sure that Caelestius' changed attitude was sincere, for Africa had been the province in which his craftiness had become more evidently known²⁶. According to Augustine, these letters made clear that Caelestius' general approval of Innocent's letters was not sufficient and that a more explicit condemnation of Caelestius' own mistakes was to be required. Otherwise people could have the impression that Caelestius' *Libellus* was considered by Rome as orthodox rather than that he had had to correct his own position²⁷. But Caelestius refused to undergo a new inquiry²⁸

²⁰ Cf. *Epistula ad Rufum*, frg. 2b, CCL 88, p. 337.

²¹ CSEL 60, pp. 463-468.

²² "Immo vero Pelagiani spe falsa putaverant novum et execrabile dogma Pelagianum vel Caelestianum persuaderi quorundam Romanorum catholicis mentibus posse, quando illa ingenia quamvis nefando errore perversa, non tamen contemptibilia, cum studiose corrigenda potius quam facile damnanda viderentur, aliquanto lenius, quam severior postulabat ecclesiae disciplina, tractata sunt."; *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, p. 463.

²³ Cf. *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, pp. 463-464.

²⁴ "Sed cum hoc Caelestius in suo libello posuisset, inter illa dumtaxat, de quibus se adhuc dubitare et instrui velle confessus est"; *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, p. 464.

²⁵ *Ibidem*; cf. also II,6, CSEL 60, pp. 465-466; II,8, CSEL 60, p. 468.

²⁶ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, p. 464.

²⁷ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, pp. 464-465.

²⁸ "Tunc ergo cum eius praesentia posceretur, ut certis ac dilucidis responsionibus vel astutia hominis vel correctio dilucesceret et nulli ambigua remaneret, se subtraxit et negavit examini."; *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, p. 465; cf. also II,7, CSEL 60, p. 467.

and thus the condemnation followed. Augustine insisted on the fact that the Roman clergy should have to be accused of treason if they should have approved the doctrine of Caelestius and Pelagius, condemned by Innocent²⁹. The reality, Augustine continued, was that Innocent stood on the side of Africa, that Zosimus never maintained the Pelagian doctrine concerning infants and that he urged Caelestius during the latter's inquiry to follow Innocent's letters. The only thing one could admit was that Zosimus was very lenient during this talk with Caelestius but he did so because he wanted to correct Caelestius, not to approve his error. Finally however Zosimus condemned Pelagius and Caelestius³⁰. Whatever the Pelagians should maintain, it was clear to Augustine that the *Gesta* and other writings were the testimonies that proved that the bishop of Hippo had told the truth³¹ and that Innocent had been on the side of the African bishops³².

Also in his letter to Optatus Augustine presented both Innocent and Zosimus as if they had taken the same position towards Pelagius and Caelestius. Both, according to Augustine, had condemned them in such a way that only through repentance they could be reconciled with the Church³³.

²⁹ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, p. 465; cf. also II,8, CSEL 60, p. 468.

³⁰ "Nunc vero cum primitus beatissimi papae Innocentii litterae episcoporum litteris respondentis Afrorum pariter hunc errorem, quem conantur isti persuadere, damnaverint, successor quoque eius sanctus papa Zosimus hoc tenendum esse, quod isti de parvulis sentiunt, numquam dixerit, numquam scripserit, insuper etiam Caelestium se purgare molientem ad consentiendum supra dictis sedis apostolicae litteris crebra interlocutione constrinxerit, profecto quidquid interea lenius actum est cum Caelestio servata dumtaxat antiquissimae et robustissimae fidei firmitate correctionis fuit clementissima suasio, non adprobatio exitiosissima pravitatis. Et quod ab eodem sacerdote postea Caelestius et Pelagius repetita auctoritate damnati sunt, paululum intermissae iam necessario proferendae ratio severitatis fuit, non praevaricatio prius cognitae vel nova cognitio veritatis."; *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, p. 465; cf. also II,7, CSEL 60, p. 467.

³¹ "Sed quid opus est nos de hac re loquendo diutius inmorari, cum extent hinc atque inde gesta et scripta directa, ubi possint cuncta illa quemadmodum acta sint vel cognosci vel recognosci?"; *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,6, CSEL 60, p. 465.

³² See Augustine's argumentation in *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,6-8, CSEL 60, pp. 465-468.

³³ "Cuius vel auctores vel certe acerrimi notissimique suasores cum Pelagius et Caelestius extitissent, conciliorum episcopaliū vigilantia in adiutorio salvatoris, qui suam tuetur ecclesiam, etiam a duobus venerabilibus antistitibus apostolicae sedis, papa Innocentio et papa Zosimo, nisi correcti etiam egerint paenitentiam, toto Christiano orbe damnati sunt, de quibus exempla recentium litterarum, sive quae specialiter ad Afros sive quae universaliter ad omnes episcopos de memorata sede manarunt, ne forte ad vestram sanctitatem nondum pervenerint, vobis curavimus mitti ab eis fratribus, quibus et has

Basing himself on the publication of Zosimus' *Tractoria*, Augustine was even convinced that he could maintain that also the successor of Innocent defended the same position as the Africans³⁴.

In *Contra Iulianum* Augustine just repeated the above mentioned elements. Zosimus thus was in continuity with Innocent who had chosen the side of the Africans not only in the question of freedom and free will, but also concerning baptism of children³⁵. Augustine repeated that Zosimus had been too lenient for Caelestius but Zosimus had done so because Caelestius had shown his willingness to correct himself and had promised to be in agreement with Innocent's letters³⁶.

Elsewhere Augustine clearly admitted that the writings of the African council prompted Zosimus to send his *Tractoria* to the bishops all over the world, but Augustine's description was too general to give detailed information about the historical facts³⁷.

litteras, ut tuae venerationi dirigerent, dedimus."; Augustine, *Epistula* 190,22, *CSEL* 57, p. 157.

³⁴ After having quoted part of Zosimus' letter, Augustine concluded: "In his verbis apostolicam sedis tam antiqua atque fundata, tam certa et clara est catholica fides, ut nefas sit de illa dubitare Christiano."; Augustine, *Epistula* 190,23 *CSEL* 57, pp. 159-160.

³⁵ "Quid enim potuit ille vir sanctus Africanis respondere conciliis, nisi quod antiquitus Apostolica Sedes et Romana cum caeteris tenet perseveranter Ecclesia? Et tamen eius successorem (Zosimum) crimine praevaricationis accusas, quia doctrinae apostolicae et sui decessoris sententiae voluit refragari. (...) Sancto Innocentio vide quid respondeas, qui nihil aliud de hac re sapit, quam quod isti in quorum te conventum, si tamen prodest aliquid, introduxi: cum his etiam ipse considet, etsi posterior tempore, prior loco. De miseris parvulis ab originali malo, quod trahitur ex Adam, per Christi gratiam liberandis, unam cum eis tenet christianam veramque sententiam: qui omne praeteritum vitium, primi scilicet hominis, qui libero arbitrio est in profunda demersus, Christum dixit sui lavacro purgasse baptismatis (*Ep.* 181,7 inter *Ep. Aug.*); qui denique parvulos definivit (*Ep.* 182,5 inter *Ep. Aug.*), nisi manducaverint carnem Filii hominis, vitam prorsus habere non posse (*Jh.* 6,54)."; *Contra Iulianum* I,13, *PL* 44, 648.

³⁶ See *Contra Iulianum* VI,37, *PL* 44, 842; in *Retractationes* II,50, *CCSL* 57, p. 129 Augustine only mentioned that the Pelagian heresy was condemned by Innocent and Zosimus, with the cooperation of the African councils.

³⁷ "Quod enim scriptum est ad papam Innocentium, Romanae urbis episcopum, de concilio provinciae Carthaginensis et de concilio Numidia et aliquanto diligentius a quinque episcopis et quae ipse ad tria ista rescripsit, item quod papae Zosimo de Africano concilio scriptum est eiusque rescriptum ad universos totius orbis episcopos missum et quod posteriore concilio plenario totius Africae contra ipsum errorem breviter constituimus et supra memoratum librum meum, quem modo ad vos scripsi, haec omnia et in praesentia legimus cum ipsis et per eos misimus vobis."; Augustine, *Epistula* 215,2, *CSEL* 57, pp. 389-390.

II. ZOSIMUS

Can the attitude of Zosimus towards Caelestius be described in terms of *benignitas* in order to convert Caelestius?³⁸ Was Zosimus *lenius* because of a clement attitude? The letters *Magnum pondus*³⁹ and *Postea-quam a nobis*⁴⁰ present us with a rather different view. According to Zosimus, after a serious examination of Caelestius' position, as the Africans should see in the accompanying documents⁴¹, Caelestius was acquitted of the charge of heresy⁴². Zosimus could not understand why people in Africa did not recognize Caelestius' former *Libellus* as a testimony of the man's orthodoxy and why they trusted unexamined rumours⁴³. Zosimus acquitted Caelestius from every heresy although Caelestius had explicitly denied that infants were born with original sin⁴⁴. Of course Caelestius was open to condemnation of all eventually heretical statements in his own

³⁸ It may be underlined that both Caelestius and Pelagius really wanted to obey to the Apostolic See; cf. MUNIER, *a.c.*, p. 17. According to DE VEER, *a.c.*, p. 28, Zosimus might have shown sympathy for Pelagius because Zosimus was "grec d'origine et, peut-être à cause de cela, sympathique aux idées défendues par les Orientaux."; see also J. FERGUSON, *Pelagius. A Historical and Theological Study*, Cambridge, 1956, p. 103.

³⁹ *Epistula 45, Collectio Avellana, CSEL 35,1*, pp. 99-103.

⁴⁰ *Epistula 46, Collectio Avellana, CSEL 35,1*, pp. 103-108.

⁴¹ "Omnia igitur, quae prius fuerunt acta, discussimus, sicut gestorum huic epistolae cohaerentium instructione discetis, et intromisso Caelestio libellum eius, quem dederat, fecimus recitari. Nec hoc contenti, utrum haec, quae scripsisset, corde loqueretur an labiis, saepenumero exploravimus, cum de occultis animarum solius Dei nostri possit esse iudicium, cui non tantum cogitata sed et cogitanda iam praesto sunt. Quid voces eius teneant, compendiosius duximus a sanctitate vestra legenda cognosci."; *Magnum pondus 3, Collectio Avellana, CSEL 35,1*, p. 100.

⁴² "Unde in praesenti causa nihil praecox in maturumque censuimus sed innotescere sanctitati vestrae super absoluta Caelesti fide nostrum examen."; *Magnum pondus 8, Collectio Avellana, CSEL 35,1*, p. 101.

⁴³ "Cui etiam prior libellus ab eo intra Africam [datus] testimonio apud vos esse debuisset nec inexploratis famaue iactatis tam facile crederetur."; *Magnum pondus 8, Collectio Avellana, CSEL 35,1*, pp. 101-102.

⁴⁴ "In remissionem autem peccatorum baptizandos infantes, non idcirco dicimus ut peccatum ex traduce firmare videamur, quod longe a catholico sensu alienum est, quia peccatum non cum homine nascitur, quod postmodum exercetur ab homine, quia non naturae delictum est, sed voluntatis esse demonstratur."; Caelestius, *Libellus fidei* 19, *PL* 48, 503. See also Augustine, *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,2, *CSEL* 42, p. 168: "Et in urbe Roma in libello suo, quem beatissimo papae Zosimo dedit, id asseveravit expressius 'quod parvulorum neminem obstringat originale peccatum'; de gestis enim ecclesiasticis Carthaginiensibus haec eius verba descripsimus."; cf. also II,6, *CSEL* 42, p. 170. See further e.g. G. DE PLINVAL, *Pélage. Ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme*, Lausanne, 1943, pp. 313-314.

writing⁴⁵, but at least in the beginning Zosimus did not urge him to such a condemnation. Pelagius' orthodoxy deeply touched the Roman clergy and attendant bishops⁴⁶. Zosimus' judgment concerning the accusers in Carthage and Diospolis was scathing: Paulinus was summoned to come to Rome in order to justify his own position. Heros and Lazarus were accused of lies, rebellion, usurpation etc⁴⁷. The African bishops were told that their decision was of no value, based upon misleading testimonies and illegal⁴⁸. A sharper critique of the anti-Pelagian movement is inconceivable!⁴⁹ Therefore one may believe that Caelestius did not try to mislead Zosimus in order to be set free but that he was set free while stating that the doctrine of original sin as understood by Augustine, was against the catholic doctrine. Still in 417, such a denial did not have a suspicious ring to a Roman bishop. For in fact, contrary to Augustine's report, Zosimus wrote to Africa in order to announce Caelestius' orthodoxy and to criticize severely the African bishops. Neither in the letter dealing with the case of Caelestius nor in the letter about Pelagius did Zosimus ever mention his predecessor. In other words, Zosimus appeared to act autonomously.

Africa, however, did not obey. Indeed we know that not only was the subdeacon Basiliscus, the messenger of Zosimus⁵⁰, given a reply but that the deacon Marcellinus from Carthage also came to Rome with a reply from Paulinus. Zosimus is, however, quite sure of himself. Even after the reply from Africa he is not immediately inclined to change his tactics. In the comprehensive introduction to his reply, *Quamvis patrum*, he does not hesitate to emphasize, in a rather too obvious way, the authority of the Roman episcopal see. This is in fact so large "ut de eius iudicio disceptare

⁴⁵ *Magnum pondus* 2, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, p. 99; Augustine, *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,8, CSEL 42, p. 171.

⁴⁶ *Posteaquam* 3, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, p. 103.

⁴⁷ *Magnum pondus* 3-6, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, pp. 100-101; *Posteaquam* 4-7, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, pp. 103-105. In his works against the Pelagians, written after Zosimus' letters, Augustine was so wise as not to mention both Heros and Lazarus anymore. Concerning Heros and Lazarus, see Ch. PIETRI, *o.c.* pp. 1224-1225. Pietri rightly underlines that the troubles caused in Gaul by Heros and Lazarus influenced Zosimus' attitude towards the Africans. See also DE PLINVAL, *o.c.*, pp. 316-317; cf. also the interesting study of D. FRYE, *Bishops as Pawns in Early Fifth Century Gaul*, in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 42 (1991) 349-361, with further bibliography.

⁴⁸ *Magnum pondus* 8, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 42, p. 102; *Posteaquam* 4, 6, 14, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, pp. 103-104; 107.

⁴⁹ That Zosimus made the same procedural mistakes as the African bishops is well pointed out by J. PATOUT BURNS, *Augustine's Role in the Imperial Action Against Pelagius*, in *JThS* 30 (1979) 67-82, p. 72.

⁵⁰ Cf. *Libellus Paulini*, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, p. 110.

nullus auderet"⁵¹ and "ut nullus de nostra possit retractare sententia"⁵². Zosimus actually intends to say that his previous letters concerning this question have been answer enough⁵³. Indeed he protests against the fact that in replying the impression had been given that the matter had not been taken seriously in Rome even though it had been dealt with down to the last detail⁵⁴. At the same time he points out, with a note of admonition, that it is not right to proceed with such an important matter too hastily and without sufficient deliberation⁵⁵. Finally he repeats that everything has remained in the same situation as at the time of his first letters⁵⁶. Not a word is spoken about Pelagius even though the deacon Paulinus, with reference to Innocent, had spoken about Pelagius and, of course, Caelestius in his *Libellus* with words that could hardly be misunderstood⁵⁷. Zosimus has clearly run into a refusal from Africa and even lets the deacon Paulinus know in quite clear language that he should not be thinking of coming to Rome⁵⁸. Moreover he has also seen that the detailed answer from Aurelius of Carthage and his colleagues was not delivered to his own messenger, Basiliscus, but was entrusted to the Carthaginian subdeacon, Marcellinus, around the 8th of November⁵⁹. Nevertheless

⁵¹ *Quamvis patrum* 1, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, p. 115.

⁵² *Quamvis patrum* 4, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, p. 116.

⁵³ "Omnem eius petitionem prioribus litteris quas vobis misimus, putamus ac novimus explicatam satisque illis scriptis, quae ad illa rescripseratis, credidimus esse responsum"; *Quamvis patrum* 5, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, p. 116.

⁵⁴ "Quo aliquando perfecto ita totum litterarum comprehendistis textum, quasi nos Caelestio commodaverimus in omnibus fidem verbisque eius non discussis ad omnem, ut ita dicam syllabam praeberimus ad sensum."; *Quamvis patrum* 5, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, p. 116.

⁵⁵ "Numquam temere, quae sunt diu tractanda, finiuntur nec sine magna deliberatione statuendum est, quod summo debet disceptari iudicio."; *Quamvis patrum* 6, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, p. 116.

⁵⁶ *Quamvis patrum* 6, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, pp. 116-117.

⁵⁷ *Libellus Paulini*, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, pp. 108-111. According to WERMELINGER, *o.c.*, p. 164 Zosimus is silent about Pelagius because he "unsicher geworden ist". In my opinion this is not apparent from the letter *Quamvis patrum*, but is, of course, a possibility. When PIETRI, *o.c.*, p. 1229 suggests that Zosimus in *Quamvis patrum* is no longer talking about Caelestius' orthodoxy this is, in a certain sense, true. Zosimus, however, expressly says that the investigation of Caelestius was taken seriously when it took place."; *Collectio Avellana* 6, CSEL 35,1, p. 116. In that sense the orthodoxy does not require further information. On the other hand it has to be said that the complete silence concerning Pelagius is surprising. Strictly speaking, however, Pelagius did not have to be discussed. It was Caelestius alone who had experienced problems in Africa.

⁵⁸ *Libellus Paulini* 10-12, *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL 35,1, pp. 110-111.

⁵⁹ For Marcellinus, see A. MANDOUZE, *Prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne* (*Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire* 1), s.v. *Marcellinus* 5, Paris, 1982, p. 689.

he still has no intention of changing his mind⁶⁰. Augustine, in suggesting that some of the faithful in Rome had collected new damaging documents against Pelagius, teaches us that there were people in Rome who were not in agreement with Zosimus' policy⁶¹. Moreover, it would not have escaped Zosimus' notice that Marcellinus, for example, who, owing to sailing restrictions was unable to return to Africa before the 21st of March, had perhaps brought instructions with him from Carthage to do some lobbying in Italy. It is certain that Augustine, before he wrote his *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I, had already tried repeatedly to contact Valerius, an important and influential person at the imperial court of Ravenna, - an attempt which would have to stretch over several months and may have already started at the end of 417⁶² - in connection with the Pelagian controversy⁶³. Also in this connection it is a pity that we know so little about the activities of the African bishop Vindemialis⁶⁴ and the priest Firmus⁶⁵ at the court of Ravenna. Indeed, they brought one and two letters respectively from Valerius to the bishop of Hippo⁶⁶ as a consequence of which Augustine would write his first book *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*. Although we know little about the reasons for their visit it is a fact that both had stayed in Ravenna in the spring or summer of 418⁶⁷. Zosimus does not give in yet but things are about to change.

Events follow one another in quick succession. Zosimus' reply arrives in Carthage on the 29th of April 418. On the 30th of April Honorius promulgates his rescript in Ravenna in which Caelestius and Pelagius are condemned and exiled⁶⁸. As Wermelinger has convincingly shown, this

⁶⁰ MUNIER, *a.c.*, p. 21 seems to be too optimistic when stating: "Le pape se ralliait, en fait, sur toute la ligne, à la procédure proposée par les Africains." The same position is found in DE PLINVAL, *o.c.*, p. 322.

⁶¹ *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,24, CSEL 42, p. 183.

⁶² "Cum diu moleste haberem, quod aliquotiens scripserim et nulla tuae sublimitatis rescripta meruerim"; *Epistula* 200, CSEL 57, p. 293. See also LENAIN DE TILLEMONT, *Vie de saint Augustin* (Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles, t. XIII), Paris, 1702, p. 792, who places the first attempt to make contact at the end of 417; comp. also PIETRI, *o.c.*, pp. 1230-1232.

⁶³ Cf. *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I,1, CSEL 42, p. 211; see also A. DE VEER, *Note complémentaire 1. Le comes Valerius*, in *Premières polémiques contre Julien. De nuptiis et concupiscentia. Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum*. Introduction, traduction et notes par F.-J. THONNARD, E. BLEUZEN et A.C. DE VEER (Oeuvres de saint Augustin 23) s.l., 1974, pp. 661-668, esp. 664-665.

⁶⁴ Concerning this bishop, see MANDOUZE, *o.c.*, s.v. *Vindemialis* 1, p. 1215.

⁶⁵ For Firmus, see MANDOUZE, *o.c.*, s.v. *Firmus* 2, pp. 458-459.

⁶⁶ Cf. AUGUSTINE, *Epistula* 200,1, CSEL 57, p. 293.

⁶⁷ Cf. PIETRI, *o.c.*, pp. 1230-1232 (esp. p. 1231, n. 4).

⁶⁸ Cf. *Collectio Quesnelliana* XIV, PL 48, 490-492.

rescript was based on the exchange of letters between Africa and Innocent, the bishop of Rome⁶⁹. From the African point of view this is quite normal since Innocent was held as the authority par excellence standing, as he was, on the side of the Africans⁷⁰. The following day, during a plenary council⁷¹ in the Basilica of Faustus in Carthage, the errors of which Pelagius and Caelestius were accused were condemned by more than 200 bishops in the form of 9 canons⁷².

Only at this point is Zosimus obliged to give in. The cooperation between imperial authority and the African episcopacy has placed him in a position of isolation⁷³. Moreover Caelestius, either by his own free will or by force, left Rome at that time⁷⁴.

Zosimus, clearly not always even handed in his actions⁷⁵, agrees under pressure from outside. He sends an *Epistula tractoria* to all the

⁶⁹ WERMELINGER, *o.c.*, pp. 199-202.

⁷⁰ Augustine will often refer to Innocent during his dispute with Julian.

⁷¹ See AUGUSTINE, *Epistula* 215,2, CSEL 57, p. 389 (*concilium plenarium*); so also Aurelius in his letter to the bishops of Byzacena and Arzugitana, *Collectio Quesnelliana* XVII, PL 56, 496; *Concilium Carthaginense*, CCSL 149, p. 69. *Concilium plenarium* is found in the title above the *Registri ecclesiae Carthaginensis excerpta* XVII, CCSL 149, p. 220.

⁷² *Concilium Carthaginense*, CCSL 149, p. 69ff.

⁷³ Knowing whether Zosimus had already condemned Caelestius before he came to know of the African decision of the 1st of May is unimportant. *De facto* he was defeated by the cooperation between Africa and Ravenna.

⁷⁴ MARIUS MERCATOR, *Commonitorium super nomen Caelestii* 36, *Collectio Palatina*, ACO V,1, p. 66 as well as AUGUSTINE, *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, p. 465 present matters as if by fleeing Caelestius had escaped an inquiry. We read however, in the rescript of Honorius: "Ob quam rem illustris auctoritas tua, victura in omne aevum lege nos statuisset cognoscat, ut pulsus ex Urbe primitus capitibus dogmatis execrandi Caelestio atque Pelagio ..."; PL 56, 491-492. It appears to me that Caelestius was left with little choice. It was a matter of imposed exile rather than freely chosen flight; see MUNIER, *a.c.*, p. 23. From a juridical point of view Zosimus could rightly condemn Caelestius on the basis of his departure; cf. PIETRI, *o.c.*, pp. 1236-1237. If it all happened in such a neat and tidy way is still a matter of doubt.

⁷⁵ See E. CASPAR, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft. I. Römische Kirche und Imperium Romanum*, Tübingen, 1930, p. 344ff.; FRYE, *a.c.*, esp. p. 345ff. The proposal of E. DEMOUGEOT, *A propos des interventions du pape Innocent Ier dans la politique séculière*, in *Revue Historique*, 213 (1954) 23-38, pp. 37-38 that Zosimus, chosen with the help of Constantius, ought to have rehabilitated Pelagius in 417 under pressure from important members of the aristocracy, Constantius among them, seems to me difficult to reconcile with the fact that the emperor condemned Pelagius and Caelestius on the 30th of April, using "African" phraseology.

bishops⁷⁶. Taken as a whole this letter does not seem to have caused too many problems even though both Julian and eighteen colleagues from southern Italy as well as Aquileia rose in protest. Moreover, it appears that elsewhere the signatures were sometimes slow in coming.

III. JULIAN OF AECLANUM

Julian's protest brings us face to face with Augustine's opponent. In the middle of 418 Julian got involved in a debate as a consequence of his refusal to sign the *Epistula tractoria*. From the beginning of his controversy with Augustine Julian will be harsh in his language. For Julian it is clear that the Roman clergy, as we learned earlier from Augustine's reaction, had changed sides because of fear of the imperial edict. In this way they were going against their previous attitude, which had been set down in acts, and had declared human nature bad⁷⁷. Augustine does present it in such a way as to suggest that the accusation of changing views was based on a change of judgment during the time of Zosimus, a change which went against the previous judgments of Innocent⁷⁸. Augustine, with Innocent's letters in hand, might permit such a suggestion in order to show that Julian had presented matters wrongly but I think, nevertheless, that Julian had his eye on Zosimus' own position. Indeed the accusation of changing views refers to Zosimus himself as we read elsewhere⁷⁹. Furthermore, Julian himself never seems to have spoken of Innocent⁸⁰. Moreover, Augustine makes the connection between Innocent and Zosimus in the context of the refutation of Julian's accusation in similar expressions elsewhere⁸¹. It appears clear to me that Julian's criticism is concentrated on Zosimus and the Roman clergy. The harshness of his criticism has also to do with the fact that he himself had tried fruitlessly to change Zosimus'

⁷⁶ See e.g. AUGUSTINE, *Epistula* 190,22, CSEL 57, p. 157; MARIUS MERCATOR, *Communitorium super nomine Caelestii*, ACO I,V, p. 68; PROSPER, *Chronicum integrum*, a. 418, PL 51, 592. On the content of the *Tractoria*, see WERMELINGER, o.c., pp. 209-218; 307-308, and ID., *Das Pelagiusdossier in der Tractoria des Zosimus*, in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie*, 26 (1979) 336-368; see also PIETRI, o.c., pp. 1237-1244.

⁷⁷ *Epistula ad Rufum*, frg. 2a, CCSL 88, p. 337.

⁷⁸ See *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,8, CSEL 60, p. 468.

⁷⁹ "(... Beatae memoriae) Zosimum (apostolicae sedis episcopum ...) praevaricationis accusas."; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 275, CCSL 88, p. 387.

⁸⁰ See Augustine's pertinent remark in *Contra Iulianum* VI,37, PL 44, 842: "Innocentio, quem tu nominare timuisti".

⁸¹ *Contra Iulianum* I,13, PL 44, 648; VI,37, PL 44, 842.

final decision⁸². On top of all this, it sticks in Julian's throat that the signing of the *Tractoria* was enforced by Rome without the slightest prior consultation⁸³. Furthermore he thought that the intervention of the African church ought to be treated as a sort of highway robbery, a Manicheistic attack on the catholic church⁸⁴ based on anything but fairness⁸⁵, an attack which should not cause people of real intelligence to yield⁸⁶. For Julian it is clear, nevertheless, that the whole question was never discussed at the appropriate level, namely in a consultation between bishops⁸⁷.

What is interesting for the events which concern us here is also the fact that Julian displays a good knowledge of contacts between Africa and Ravenna. Probably he is mistaken while stating that Alypius had brought

⁸² "Facit quoque epistolae mentionem, quae a me ait Romam fuisse directam; sed per verba quae posuit nequivimus, quo de scripto loqueretur, agnoscere. Nam ad Zosimum quondam illius civitatis episcopum super his quaestionibus duas epistulas destinavi, verum eo tempore quo adhuc libros exorsus non eram."; *Ad Florum* I,18, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 15; II,1, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 164; see already *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 9, *CCSL* 88, p. 342; frg. 11, *CCSL* 88, p. 342; frg. 158, *CCSL* 88, p. 373. For one of the two mentioned letters, see *CCSL* 88, pp. 335-336.

⁸³ "Simplicibus episcopis sine congregatione synodi in locis suis sedentibus extorta subscriptio est."; *Epistula ad Rufum*, frg. 28, *CCSL* 88, p. 340; see also *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 9; 11-12, *CCSL* 88, p. 342. Augustine does not really deny this accusation but thinks, with reference to Cyprian and Ambrose, that the teaching he defends is the right one. At the same time he considers the calling of a synod for this "aperta perniciēs" unnecessary, concluding that heresies had already been condemned in earlier times without calling a synod. He does, however, call for vigilance concerning this danger; cf. *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,34, *CSEL* 60, pp. 569-570. I find that Augustine all too easily writes off Julian's complaint concerning coercion as if it were a characteristic of all heretics; see e.g. *Contra Iulianum* III,5, *PL* 44, 703-704. It should be added here that Augustine attempted to construct a sort of law court based on the fathers of the East and the West in order to show Julian clearly that he had absolutely no chance where these great bishops were concerned. At the same time Augustine points to other errors such as Donatism, for example, and notes that this sort of complaint is typical for heretics; *ibidem*.

⁸⁴ "Orandus est hic Deus, frater beatissime Turbanti, consacerdos dilectissime, ut paribus etiam hac tempestate virtutibus Ecclesiam catholicam, Filii sui sponsam, maturam, fecundam, castam, decoram, a Manichaeorum constupratione in Africa vel ex Africa latrocinantium eruere non moretur."; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 51, *CCSL* 88, p. 352. In his reply Augustine notes that from the African standpoint the Pelagians had brought the "plague" into the African continent; cf. *Contra Iulianum* III,31, *PL* 44, 718.

⁸⁵ See e.g. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 3a-b, *CCSL* 88, p. 341.

⁸⁶ So e.g. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 313, *CCSL* 88, p. 394.

⁸⁷ "(... Quasi tu, qui maxime quereris) examen vobis et episcopale iudicium denegari"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 9, *CCSL* 88, p. 342; cf. e.g. also frg. 271b, *CCSL* 88, p. 387. It appeared to Julian that the present state of affairs was not pleasing to God from the fact that serious difficulties had arisen during the election of Zosimus' successor; cf. frg. 276, *CCSL* 88, p. 387.

the second book *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*⁸⁸ to Count Valerius in Ravenna. Julian is actually outraged by the fact that Valerius, praised by Augustine, had refused to allow a serious investigation into the matter in question and that to this end, misled by Augustine, had made use of the power which went with his function⁸⁹. Julian does not hesitate to say, however, that he too had made an attempt to find an audience in Ravenna for his own purposes via the same channel⁹⁰ but those who were to condemn him and his supporters were already against them even before they knew what it was all about⁹¹. Whether Valerius, in view of his important if not clear function⁹², was the primary beneficiary of a gift of more than eighty horses which, according to Julian, were brought to Italy by Alypius⁹³ to the disadvantage of the poor⁹⁴, is not clear⁹⁵. One can ask oneself if Julian's accusations had any basis or whether it was not rather a

⁸⁸ See *Ad Florum* I,7, CSEL 85,1, p. 9. In *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II,1, CSEL 42, p. 253 Augustine does not mention the name of the messenger. On Alypius' travels to Rome, see M.-F. BERROUARD, *Un tournant dans la vie de l'Eglise d'Afrique: les deux missions d'Alypius en Italie à la lumière des Lettres 10*, 15*, 16*, 22* et 23*A de saint Augustin*, in *REA*, 31 (1985) 46-70. The author argues that Alypius was not the one who brought *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II to Rome and thus did not visit Rome for a second time in 421. Julian's information on this specific point is probably based upon hearsays.

⁸⁹ "Laudat etiam potentem hominem, quod nostris petitionibus, qui nihil aliud quam dari tanto negotio iudices vociferabamur, ut ea, quae subreptionibus acta constabat, emendarentur potius quam punirentur examine, mole suae dignitatis obstiterit nec disceptionem tempus aut locum permiserit impetrare."; *Ad Florum* I,10, CSEL 85,1, p. 10; cf. also *Epistula Iuliani ad Valerium comitem*, frg. 1, CCL 88, p. 335. According to WERMELINGER, *o.c.*, p. 232, Valerius rejected the Pelagians' request for a new inquiry under external pressure. I see no proof for this in the text. Indeed Julian's presentation of Valerius points in the other direction.

⁹⁰ "Nos tamen in quantum de eo melius aestimaverimus, nominis illius commemoratio opusculo meo honorifice inserta patefecit."; *ibid.*, CSEL 85,1, pp. 10-11; see also DE VEER, *a.c.*, p. 666.

⁹¹ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 2a-b, CCL 88, p. 341.

⁹² For the problems concerning this, see DE VEER, *a.c.*, pp. 664-666.

⁹³ "Vociferans cum feminis cunctisque calonibus et tribunis, quibus octoginta aut amplius equos tota Africa saginatos collega tuus nuper adduxit Alypius"; *Ad Florum* I,42, CSEL 85,1, p. 30.

⁹⁴ "Cur de sumptibus pauperum saginastis per totam paene Africam equorum greges, quos prosequente Alypio tribunis et centurionibus destinastis?"; *Ad Florum* III,35, CSEL 98,1, p. 375.

⁹⁵ The texts teach us quite clearly that the horses were given to officers and their subordinates, that it had to do with the property of the poor and that the event was an abuse of the poor. According to Julian, Augustine had accepted the guilt for this; see *Ad Florum* III,35, CSEL 85,1, pp. 374-375.

question of an exile kicking a man while he is down⁹⁶. On the other hand, in view of the rather favourable outcome Ravenna had given to the African interventions, we should not exclude the possibility that, as part of a "do ut des"-relationship bribes were given. Indeed it must be recognized that not all of the accusations were confined to Augustine but, as is apparent from the repeatedly used second person plural, that they were directed to the African opponents in general. Furthermore the accusations are the same in *Ad Florum* I,74 and III, 35. They are very comprehensive and actually quite precisely set forth: bribery, use of legacies, importation of horses, drumming up popular uprisings and corruption to the advantage of those in power. The fact that Julian returns to this question several times leads us to believe that it has to do with more than mere gossip⁹⁷. Of course it is also quite possible that the delivery of the African horses happened by coincidence at the same time as arrival of African messengers in Italy. We should not forget that after the loss of Spain the Roman cavalry was more directed towards Africa for her supplies, a country which had been a source of horses from of old⁹⁸.

Whatever happened Julian is correct on one point, whether the African episcopate used underhanded tricks or not, they managed to get the political authorities onto their side and Julian did not⁹⁹. It is not, therefore, without reason that Julian says that Rome yielded under pressure

⁹⁶ Augustine clearly denies the accusation formally and vehemently; zie *Opus imperfectum* I,42, CSEL 85,1, pp. 30-31; I,74, CSEL 85,1, p. 90; III,35, CSEL 85,1, p. 375. P. BROWN, *Augustine of Hippo: a Biography*, London, 1967, p. 362 does not take into account Augustine's reply when stating: "In any case, such diplomacy was known to be costly. On one mission, Alypius had carried with him the promise of eighty Numidian stallions, fattened on the estates of the church, as *douceurs* for the cavalry-officers, whose views on grace had proved decisive."

⁹⁷ In *Ad Florum* I,74, CSEL 85,1, p. 90, one will read: "Amplissimam esse nostri negotii dignitatem, ut ipsa rerum consideratio et appensio indicat quas tuemur, ita etiam vester pavor, qui contra nostrorum sanguinem pecuniarum effusione, hereditatum largitate, equorum transmissione, populorum seditione, potestatum corruptione pugnantes et fidem vestram, quae a nobis impugnatur, erubescitis profiteri et ad nostrae sententiae, a qua devistis, verba confugitis." In III,35, CSEL 85,1, p. 374-375, Julian's accusations go as following: "Cur ergo, si creditis et hoc bonum esse quod dicimus, et illud bonum esse quod dicitis, tantis totam Italiam factionibus commovistis? Cur seditiones Romae conductis populis excitastis? Cur de sumptibus pauperum saginastis per totam paene Africam equorum greges, quos prosequente Alypio tribunis et centurionibus destinastis? Cur matronarum oblati hereditatibus potestates saeculi corrupistis, ut in nos stipula publici furoris arderet? Cur dissipastis ecclesiarum quietem? Cur religiosi principis tempora persecutionum impietate maculastis, si a nobis nihil aliud dicitur, quam quod etiam tu bonum cogeris confiteri?"

⁹⁸ Zie STEIER, art. *Pferd*, in *RE* 19, Stuttgart, 1937, pp. 1440-1441.

⁹⁹ See *Epistula ad Valerium comitem*, CCSL 88, p. 335.

from the court of Ravenna.

Furthermore, it is remarkable that in Honorius' rescript, addressed to Palladius¹⁰⁰, the prefect of Rome, who was not unknown in Africa, the Pelagians were blamed for causing riots in Rome¹⁰¹. At the same time Julian was untiring in laying the blame at the door of Augustine and his supporters for stirring up unrest in Rome. Julian begins his *Ad Turbantium* with such a reproach¹⁰² and returns to it repeatedly in *Ad Florum*¹⁰³ with clear reference to the riots brought about in Rome by the opponents¹⁰⁴. Time and again he takes a swipe at Augustine who, he maintains, had been instrumental in causing the mob to take up arms against the Pelagians¹⁰⁵. Julian returns to this point too many times simply to dismiss it as nonsense or gossip. As an aristocrat who felt very strongly about fairness, erudition and freedom of inquiry¹⁰⁶ he expressed his abhorrence of the fact that the street had won out over common sense. Is it not possible to deduce from this that the riots in Rome which the emperor blamed on the Pelagians were in fact the consequence of argu-

¹⁰⁰ See W. ENBLIN, art. *Palladius* (nr. 39), in *RE* 18,3, Stuttgart, 1949, 220-221.

¹⁰¹ "Siquidem aures mansuetudinis nostrae recens fama perstrinxerat intra sacratissimam urbem nostram aliaque loca, ita pestiferum virus quorundam inolevisse pectoribus, ut interrupto directae credulitatis tramite, scissis in partes studiis asserendi, materia impacatae dissensionis inducta sit; novoque scandali fomite concitato beatissimae Ecclesiae actu nutet attentata tranquillitas: alius aliud ancipiti interpretatione sectantibus et cum sit absoluta sanctorum apicum claritas, ac dilucide quid sequi universitas debeat explanans, pro captu versipellis ingenii novorum ausum profanam moventibus quaestionem, Palladi pares charissime atque amantissime."; Honorius, *Rescriptum*, *PL* 56, 491B. That there are Pelagians in Rome, is confirmed by AUGUSTINE, *Epistula* 177,2, *CSEL* 44, p. 670; Innocent does not deny this; see INNOCENT, *Inter Augustini epistulae*, *Epistula* 183,2, *CSEL* 44, p. 726. See also WERMELINGER, *o.c.*, p. 200.

¹⁰² See frg. 1, *CCSL* 88, p. 340.

¹⁰³ Cf. I,73-74, *CSEL* 85,1, pp. 87-90; I,134, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 149; II,3, *CSEL* 85,1, pp. 165-166; II,128, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 256.

¹⁰⁴ "Cur seditiones Romae conductis populis excitastis?"; *Ad Florum* III,35, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 375. On the other hand, also the Pelagians seemed to have caused disturbances, if we may believe PROSPER, *Chronicum integrum*, a. 418, *PL* 51, 592: "Hoc tempore Constantius servus Christi, ex vicario Romae habitans, ut pro gratia Dei devotissime Pelagianis resistens, factione eorumdem multa pertulit, quae illum sanctis confessionibus sociaverunt." On Constantius and his activities, see Th. DE BRUYN, *Constantius the Tractor*, in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 43 (1992) 38-54.

¹⁰⁵ "(Dicis quod) certaminis singularis oblitus in vulgus refugerim."; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 253, *CCSL* 88, p. 385; see also e.g. frg. 251, *CCSL* 88, p. 385; frg. 254-255, *CCSL* 88, p. 385; frg. 271b, *CCSL* 88, p. 387; *Ad Florum* I,19, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 16; I,41, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 30; II,2-3, *CSEL* 85,1, pp. 164-166; V,4, *PL* 45, 1434.

¹⁰⁶ See e.g. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 6, *CCSL* 88, p. 342; *Ad Florum* II,1-3, *CSEL* 85,1, pp. 164-166; II,36, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 188.

ments between supporters and opponents of Pelagius ? There are always two sides to every row. It seems to me that Honorius preferred nothing other than to see the blame laid at the door of the least important group, the Pelagians, one of whose leaders, Pelagius, was far away while Caelestius was at a disadvantage because of the fact that he had already caused trouble in Carthage and Constantinople on previous occasions¹⁰⁷. For an emperor the choice between a faithful and economically important overseas province and not-so-large and rather motley group of "Pelagians" was hardly a difficult one. Whether this was the right choice I will leave to one side but I have my doubts concerning the question whether the Pelagians had really been the cause of so much trouble that such a rescript was found necessary. In my assessment officials in Rome were in little or no hurry to start hunting out the Pelagians¹⁰⁸. If the unrest was really so bad, if the Pelagians were really such outspoken trouble makers, upsetting orderly affairs, then the authorities would have opted for a different policy.

IV. CONCLUSION

It has become obvious from our survey that there is a clear difference to be noted between Augustine's depiction of Zosimus and Zosimus' real attitude. Julian argues rightly that Zosimus changed his position in the course of the controversy. His criticism that the change was a consequence of pressure from more worldly powers is, as far as we can see from available sources, correct. At the same time we need to repeat that he too had tried to be proved right via the same channels. What Julian accuses Augustine of on this point is equally valid for himself. The question is why did Augustine remain so inexplicably vague concerning Zosimus' attitude ? I do not think that this happened because he did not know any better. There were too many contacts at this time between Africa, Rome and Ravenna for this to be the case. Moreover, Augustine himself spent this time in Carthage and he will have been kept well up to date with the attitude of

¹⁰⁷ I cannot understand why at a certain moment, Julian claims that the emperor had chosen for his group in his pronouncements: "(Sane, ut dicis, si) pro vobis potius ab Imperatore responsam est (cur non in medium prosiliitis et hoc ultro publicis potestatibus allegatis)"; *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 7, *CCSL* 88, p. 342. Augustine has to laugh at this remark and he advises Julian to give some examples to the public if it is indeed the case; see *Contra Iulianum* III,4, *PL* 44, 703.

¹⁰⁸ How can we otherwise explain that in June of 419 prefect Palladius found it necessary to issue a new edict against Pelagius, Caelestius and their supporters; cf. *PL* 56, 492-493. Furthermore, Honorius found it necessary to inform Aurelius of Carthage on the 9th of June 419 that he had issued new measures against Pelagius, Caelestius and their supporters; cf. *Epistula imperialis ad Aurelium Carthaginensem episcopum*, *PL* 56, 493-494; see also WERMELINGER, *o.c.*, p. 205.

Zosimus which was so "strange" for Africa¹⁰⁹. Furthermore it is striking that Augustine only refers to Zosimus' initial tolerance in writings addressed to acquaintances of Pelagius (*De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*) or in the controversial writings against Julian (*Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum*, *Contra Iulianum*), but elsewhere he maintains a respectful silence. Remarkable is also that Augustine, within the controversy, always relates Zosimus to Innocent¹¹⁰. Innocent is more often referred to in the dispute with Julian¹¹¹. On top of this Augustine praises Innocent much more than Zosimus. His information about Zosimus is rather meagre¹¹². Innocent, the successor of Peter, is praised for the fact that he remained faithful to what was taught from of old in the church of Rome along with the other churches. In this matter Julian should have followed his example. Augustine quoted from his works¹¹³. It is noteworthy that Augustine never allowed Zosimus to sit in the objective law court requested by Julian while Innocent appears there repeatedly and shares in the praise sung for this jury¹¹⁴. This is all the more surprising since the most important opponents of the Pelagians present matters as if it was Zosimus himself with his *Epistula tractoria* who had been instrumental in seeing to it that

¹⁰⁹ Relative to Augustine's stay in Carthage in 417-418, see O. PERLER-J.L. MAIER, *Les voyages de saint Augustin*, Paris, 1969, pp. 335-345.

¹¹⁰ In *Epistula* 190,1, CSEL 57, p. 137 and *Opus imperfectum* II,18, CSEL 85,1, p. 15 this is unnecessary, as the context clearly indicates. In the first instance it concerns a mission in the service of Zosimus while in the second instance it concerns the authenticity of letters from Julian to Zosimus.

¹¹¹ See e.g. *Contra Iulianum* I,13, PL 44, 648; I,22, PL 44, 655; I,32, PL 44, 663; II,33, PL 44, 697; II,36-37, PL 44, 699-701; III,32, PL 44, 719; *Opus imperfectum* VI,11, PL 45, 1520.

¹¹² "Puto tibi eam partem orbis sufficere debere, in qua primum Apostolorum suorum voluit Dominus gloriosissimo martyrio coronare. Cui Ecclesiae praesidentem beatum Innocentium si audire voluisses, jam tunc periculosam juventutem tuam Pelagianis laqueis exuisses. Quid enim potuit ille vir sanctus Africanis respondere conciliis, nisi quod antiquitus Apostolica Sedes et Romana cum caeteris tenet perseveranter Ecclesia?"; *Contra Iulianum* I,13, PL 44, 648. Augustine adds here that he does not want to talk about Zosimus so as not to irritate Julian. This is possible but even then it is still true that also elsewhere Augustine very rarely refers to the *Epistula tractoria* of Zosimus.

¹¹³ Cf. *Contra Iulianum* I,13, PL 44, 648; I,32, PL 44, 663; *Opus imperfectum* VI,11, PL 45, 1520.

¹¹⁴ See e.g. *Contra Iulianum* II,37, PL 44, 701-702: "Non tu iudices quaesiturus es, ubi causam tuam purges; sed ubi tot sanctos doctores egregios atque memorabiles catholicae veritatis accusas, Irenaeum, Cyprianum, Reticium, Olympium, Hilarium, Gregorium, Basilium, Ambrosium, Joannem, Innocentium, Hieronymum, caeterosque socios ac participes eorum, insuper et universam Christi Ecclesiam, cui divinae familiae dominica cibaria fideliter ministrantes, ingenti in Domino gloria claruerunt."; cf. also I,22, PL 44, 655; I,32, PL 44, 663; II, 33, PL 44, 697; III,32, PL 44, 719.

the lot of the Pelagians worldwide was, in a certain sense, definitively settled. It is strange then that precisely this letter went missing, worldwide.

The reason that Augustine was happy to appeal to Innocent can also be found in the fact that Caelestius had always shown himself ready to submit himself to Innocent's authority¹¹⁵. The same Innocent, who had been praised by Pelagius¹¹⁶, had shown serious doubts concerning Pelagius' acquittal at Diospolis¹¹⁷ and had not neglected to condemn him¹¹⁸. By stretching the truth a little Augustine managed to salvage the continuity of the Roman positions. In this way the vision that Innocent had approved of the African positions remains¹¹⁹, Zosimus' *piae memoriae* is more or less saved and a line can be drawn beginning with Innocent's decision of the 27th of January 417 to Zosimus' *Tractoria*. The fact that Zosimus up to this point was only to be "got at" via interventions from Africa and the resulting pressure from the court of Ravenna on Rome is, in Augustine's view, not that important.

Leuven

M. LAMBERIGTS

¹¹⁵ So *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* I,32, CSEL 42, p. 150; *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, pp. 464-465; II,6, CSEL 60, p. 466; II,8, CSEL 60, p. 468.

¹¹⁶ See *Contra Iulianum* II,36, PL 44, 699.

¹¹⁷ This argument is skilfully used by Augustine in e.g. *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,9-10, CSEL 42, pp. 171-172.

¹¹⁸ "Ex quibus papam Innocentium et presbyterum Hieronymum retrahere fortasse tentabis: istum quia Pelagium Caelestiumque damnavit"; *Contra Iulianum* II, 36, PL 44, 699.

¹¹⁹ It can be doubted whether this is the case on every point. Looking to Innocent for talk of original sin and its transmission via procreation would be to no avail. His attitude to the baptism of infants, as it is phrased in *Inter epistulas Augustini*, *Epistula* 182,5, CSEL 44, p. 720 the Pelagians would also not reject. It is impossible to avoid the impression that in Augustine's commentary on another letter, *Inter epistulas Augustini*, *Epistula* 181,7, CSEL 44, p. 710, in *Contra Iulianum* I,13, PL 44, 668, he reads more than Innocent actually says. Innocent speaks neither of unfortunate children nor of an *originale malum* that stems from Adam. The addition *primi scilicet hominis* also comes from Augustine and is not to be found in Innocent. In spite of PROSPER, *Auctoritates* 10,11, PL 51, 208 and *Contra collatorem* 5, PL 51, 228, some people have made a certain reservation concerning the conformity of Zosimus' final decision with Augustine's point of view; cf. F. FLOËRI, *Le pape Zosime et la doctrine augustinienne du péché originel*, in *Augustinus Magister* II, Paris, 1954, pp. 755-761. PIETRI, *o.c.*, p. 1223, n. 1 disagrees with Floëri because of "faute de documents suffisants", but has to admit that "(Zosimus) ne formule pas, l'année suivante, une doctrine très explicite du péché originel."; see further WERMELINGER, *o.c.*, p. 283; REES, *o.c.*, p. 65.