

JULIAN OF AECLANUM'S *TRACTATUS* IN OSEE, IOHEL, AMOS

Some notes on the current state of research

In 1580 René Laurent de la Barre published a collection of works by Rufinus of Aquileia which contained the fragment of a commentary on the Minor Prophets entitled *Tractatus prophetarum Osee, Iohel et Amos*¹. Barraeus's text of this latter work is based on a MS from the Charterhouse of Mont Dieu², which is now lost. That MS contained mainly authentic Rufiniana³. Barraeus seems to have had no reason to question Rufinus's authorship of the *Tractatus*. He followed a medieval tradition going back to a 10th century MS from Corbie, which names Rufinus as the most probable author⁴. There is, however, no ancient proof for such a claim. Gennadius and Cassiodorus in their catalogues, for instance, do not list the *Tractatus* among Rufinus's works.

¹ Renatus Laurentius Barraeus, ed., *Ruffini Aquileiensis presbyteri opuscula* [some prints have, less humbly, *opera omnia*; cf. G. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar zu den Propheten Osee, Joel und Amos. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Exegese*. *Analecta Biblica* 9 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1958), 24 n. 1] *quaedam partim antehac nunquam in lucem edita partim nuper ope doctissimorum virorum emendata et castigata* (Paris: apud Michaellem Somnium, 1580). The commentary mentioned can be found on pp. 25-168; *tractatus* is its title in the 9th, 10th century Corbie MS (Paris. BN Lat. 12148) which also ascribes the work to Rufinus (cf. below n. 4). The author himself categorizes his work as an explanatio (CCL 88, 115.16); cf. also Y.-M. Duval, "Iulianus Aeclanensis restitutus. La première édition – incomplète – de l'œuvre de Julien d'Éclane", in: *RÉAug* 25 (1979): 162-72, 167-68.

² Cf. Barraeus, Ruffini (n. 1), iiii (PL 21, 71-72); BOUWMAN, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 24; L. De Coninck & M. J. D'Hont, ed., *Iuliani Aeclanensis expositio libri Iob, tractatus prophetarum Osee, Iohel et Amos, accedunt operum deperditorum fragmenta post Albertum Bruckner denuo collecta aucta ordinata*. CCL 88 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1977), 18-19. Barraeus is now also traded as the name for the text of La Barre's print, which has replaced the lost MS.

³ M. Simonetti, "Sulla tradizione manoscritta delle opere originali di Rufino", in: *SE* 9 (1957): 25; 10 (1958): 31.

⁴ Parisinus Bibl. Nat. Lat. 12 148 (saec. IX sive X): *tractatus prophetarum ... quem esse putamus Rufini...*; cf. G. Morin, "Un ouvrage restitué à Julien d'Eclanum: Le commentaire du Pseudo-Rufin sur les prophètes Osée, Joel et Amos", in: *RB* 30 (1913): 1-24, 1-2, drawing on Fontanini's and Vallarsi's lives of Rufinus (PL 21, 268; cf. below n. 5). Other representatives of the said medieval tradition are John Colonna (13th century), Andrea Dandolo (14th century) and John of Tritenheim (15th century).

In 1590 Rufinus's authorship of the *Tractatus* was seriously called in question by the Jesuit exegete Francisco Ribera⁵. Ribera's doubts were subsequently confirmed, e. g. by Tillemont, Fontanini and Vallarsi, whose arguments were based on three main points: 1. The author of the *Tractatus* holds a bias against Origen. 2. He is also critical of Jerome, though he refers to, and relies on, the Hebrew text and Jerome's translation. 3. His Latin strikes as artificial and constructed⁶. All of which speaks against Rufinus' authorship.

But who, if not Rufinus, was the author? Only Vallarsi came up with a suggestion. He included the *Tractatus* in an appendix to his edition of Rufinus' works⁷. In the preface to that edition he argued that Jerome's pupil Orosius might be a likely candidate for the authorship of the *Tractatus*⁸. The latter had to be a presbyter or a bishop⁹, to come originally from the west and to have lived, at least for some time, in

⁵ Cf. Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 2. Ribera's commentary on the Minor Prophets was in fact first published in Salamanca in 1587. Its second edition was published in Rome in 1590 by Jacob Torner; see C. Sommervogel et al., *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus* 6 (Paris: A. Picard & Brussels: O. Schepens, 1895), 1761; cf. now also K. Reinhardt, *Bibelkommentare spanischer Autoren (1500-1700)*, vol. 2 (M-Z) (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1999), 238-45, 240-41. In that latter edition of Ribera's commentary the reference can be found on p. 91. Ad Os 2:14 (ecce ego lactabo eam) Ribera makes an interesting discovery. The author of the tractatus translates "lactabo eam" as "I will feed her" (lactare from lac-lactis), yet it means "I will seduce her" (from lacio). Rufinus, Ribera writes, would not have made such a simple mistake. He would have known better from the Greek text. Ribera thus began "to persuade himself that the author of this commentary was not the Rufinus who wrote against Jerome" (ibid.). There were also differences in their style, he adds. Ribera is extensively cited by Fontanini and Vallarsi in their *Vita Rufini* (PL 21, 75-295, 271). Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 6 n. 4, makes the same point as Ribera (concerning Os 2:14), but does not cite him.

⁶ On Fontanini and Vallarsi cf. above n. 5; on Tillemont cf. Sebastien Le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclesiastique* XII (Paris: Charles Robustel, 1710), 315 and 659; on point 3. The language of the tractatus: The harsh verdict of Fontanini, Vallarsi and Tillemont on the supposedly corrupt language and style of the tractatus has of course long been revised; cf. below n. 13.

⁷ Dominicus Vallarsi, ed., *Tyrannii Rufini Aquilejensis Presbyteri opera quae exstant omnia nunc primum collecta, ordinate disposita, ab alienis sejuncta, aucta et ad Mss. codd. quamplurimos, necnon vetustiores editiones castigata, notis atque observationibus continentur illustrata studio ac labore Dominici Vallarsii...* (Verona, apud Petrum Antonium Bernum & Jacobum Vallarsium, 1745), 389-560 (PL 21, 959-1104).

⁸ Vallarsi, *Tyrannii Rufini* (n. 7) (PL 21, 67-70).

⁹ Vallarsi argued that the tractatus was structured like a teaching homily, as if the author was in reality a speaker (preacher) addressing an audience. But, as Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 1-2, replies, Vallarsi's observations could as well apply to a writer addressing a readership.

the east. Orosius, a presbyter, maybe even a bishop, most probably from Braga in modern day Portugal, who spent part of his life in Palestine, qualifies on all of these accounts. Vallarsi even thought to have found an entry in a 12th century catalogue of ecclesiastical writers which ascribes to him a commentary on the Minor Prophets¹⁰. But that entry is unreliable¹¹; and since Vallarsi did not even remotely address the burning issues of language and style in the *Tractatus*, his assumptions about the author's *persona* remained arbitrary and, ultimately, of no consequence.

The situation had not changed, when in 1903 Germain Morin came up with the idea to ascribe the work to Vigilantius¹², a presbyter from Aquitaine, who had visited Jerome in Palestine and whom Jerome later accused of polemicizing against the cult of martyrs and saints, the practice of vigils and ascetic life in general. The *Tractatus* may indeed show a certain affinity to Vigilantius's character and thought, as presented by Jerome, but like Vallarsi before him, Morin failed to address the question of language and style. He soon had to drop his case. Vigilantius was not the author of the *Tractatus*.

Then, in July 1912, Morin stumbled across some passages in Augustine's *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum*, citations from Julian's of Aeclanum work *Ad Florum*, an invective against Augustine's doctrine of original sin. Originally a bishop from Aeclanum in southern Italy, Julian, so goes the tradition, had written it while in exile in Mopsuestia in Cilicia around the mid-420s and sent it to his friend Florus in Constantinople. From there it also found its way

¹⁰ Anonymus Mellicensis, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*; see E. Ettlinger, *Der sogenannte Anonymus Mellicensis De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis. Text- und quellenkritische Ausgabe mit Einleitung* (Karlsruhe: Braun, 1896), 78; and also the more recent work of F. R. Swietek, *Wolfger of Prüfening's De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (Diss. Univ. of Illinois, 1978); but note the critique of the work of Swietek by F. Fuchs, "Zum Anonymus Mellicensis," in: DA 42 (1986): 213-26, 216. Melk is not where the author wrote, but where the MS was found on which the editio princeps is based. Today the author has been identified as Wolfger of Prüfening (*1100); on him cf. G. Glauche, "Wolfger von Prüfening", in: LMA 9 (1998): 308-309.

¹¹ Cf. the references listed under n. 10, especially Ettlinger, *Der sogenannte Anonymus Mellicensis* (n. 10), 78; cf. also Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 6.

¹² Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 7. However, on p. 17 Morin admits that the recent publications by Bruckner had opened new opportunities for his own research. See in particular A. Bruckner, *Julian von Eclanum. Sein Leben und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pelagianismus*. TU 15/3a (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1897); Id., *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 (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1910; repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1973).

to Rome, where the then bishop of Thagaste and Augustine's friend, Alypius, spotted it at a visit in 426. It was from him that Augustine received his copy, which he began to refute almost immediately in what was to become his *Opus imperfectum*, citing in full almost six out of the eight *libri ad Florum*, which Julian had written. These *Libri VIII ad Florum*, Morin found, bear striking similarities to the *Tractatus* in language and style. To demonstrate this he drew up lists of words and phrases, which became the basic frame of reference for a number of further lexicographical studies on the Latin of Julian of Aeclanum¹³: *profanitas*, *magister gentium* (for St. Paul)¹⁴, *obscentitas*, *censura*, *angor*, *stemma*, *neutiquam*, *consulentia*, *concinenter*, *gnarus-ignarus*, *supin* plus *ire*, 4th declination on *-us*, like *apparatus*, *atritus*, *natatus* etc., nouns on *-as*, like *profanitas*, *generalitas*, *inanitas*, *nimietas* etc., nouns on *-tio*, like *ablactatio*, *frustratio*, *praelatio*, *taxatio* etc., nouns on *-tor* and *-trix*, like *castigator*, *circulator*, *superatrix*, *ultrix*, adjectives on *-lis*, like *causalis*, *trabalis*, *aequabilis*, verbs on *-escere*, like *cinescere*, *adolescere*, *aegrescere* etc. He also pointed to similarities in the areas of prose rhythm and other syntactic elements¹⁵.

Shortly before he published his findings Morin made another interesting discovery. As early as 1884 the German scholar Carl

¹³ Most notably those of Alberto Vaccari, who used the method to attribute himself a number of works to Julian. See A. Vaccari, *Un Commento a Giobbe di Giuliano di Eclana*. Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1915); Id., "Nuova Opera di Giuliano Eclanese: Commento ai Salmi", in: *Civiltà Cattolica* 67 (1916, 1): 578-93; then also V. Bulhart, "Lexikalisches zum Spätlatein", in: *WS* 67 (1954): 145-61; J. H. Baxter, "Notes on the Latin of Julian of Eclanum", in: *ALMA* 21 (1951): 5-54; G. Bouwman, "Zum Wortschatz des Julian von Aeclanum", in: *ALMA* 27 (1957): 141-64; and Id. *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1). The method is continued in a certain sense by A. Primmer, "Rhythmus- und Textprobleme in Aug. op. imperf. 1-3", in: *WS NS* 9 (1975): 186-212; 11 (1977): 192-218, who also touches upon questions concerning the language of *Ad Florum*. See also id., "Textvorschläge zu Augustins *Opus imperfectum*", in: H. Bannert, J. Divjak, R. Hanslik, eds., *Latinität und Alte Kirche. FS Rudolf Hanslik*. *WS.B* (Böhlau: Wien 1977), 235-50.

¹⁴ Following J. Witte, *Der Kommentar des Aponius zum Hohenliede* (Diss. Erlangen, 1903), 26, Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 10 n. 1, and 22 n. 1, sees the use of this term by Apponius in his commentary on the Canticum, Appon. exp. Cant. 1.3 (CCL 19, 4.34), dating probably from the second half of the 6th century, as possible evidence for Apponius's knowledge of Julian's commentary on the Canticum mentioned by the Venerable Bede (see below n. 25). More recently this suggestion has been ignored. It is neither mentioned in the critical edition of Apponius's commentary (CCL 19) nor by H. König, *Apponius. Die Auslegung zum Lied der Lieder. Die einführenden Bücher I-III und das christologisch bedeutsame Buch IX*. *Vetus Latina. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel* 21 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1992), 7.

¹⁵ Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 8-17.

Paucker had preliminarily suggested Julian of Aeclanum as author of the *Tractatus*¹⁶. In an appendix to his study on the Latin of Orosius Paucker reiterated the common opinion first expressed by Ribera that the author of the *Tractatus* must be counted among the "more eminent theologians of the early fifth century. He cannot have been Jerome, however. For although he uses Jerome's translation from the Hebrew, he even more frequently criticises Jerome. Nor does he seem to have been a follower of Augustine, like Orosius. Julian the Pelagian comes to mind, an ingenious and not entirely uneducated chap", Paucker mused. Paucker never had the chance to verify his proposition, but he did a lot of groundwork on the text, as Morin and after him Bouwman gratefully acknowledged¹⁷.

Having established the author on linguistic and stylistic grounds Morin went on to put the work in its historical context. As Vallarsi rightly assumed, it would have been written within a few years after Jerome's death¹⁸. This is precisely the period when Julian left Italy to stay with Theodore of Mopsuestia in Cilicia¹⁹ and to write the *Libri*

¹⁶ C. Paucker (ed. H. Rönisch), *Vorarbeiten zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte. Dritte Abteilung, II. De latinitate scriptorum quorundam seculi quarti et ineuntis quinti p. C. minorum Observationes, II. Orosius* (Berlin: Calvary, 1884), 53: Epimetrum I. ad II. De latinitate Orosii: Identidem locis Orosii testimonia adiecimus e commentariis in prophetas minores tres Oseam, Joel, Amos, Rufino Aquileiensi adscriptis, ut pridem constat, immerito, quod quare fecerimus iam clarescet. Commentarios istos (sane luculentos, sobrietate praesertim interpretationis commendabiles, uerborum sensus exponere contentae ipsos, neque, ut Hieronymus solet Origenem secutus, ad allegoriam singula quaeque referendo tanquam aenigmata conantis dissoluere) conscripsisse mihi quidem uidetur unus aliquis ex eminentioribus quinti seculi ineuntis doctoribus, incertum tamen an catholicis. Hieronymum quidem, tametsi translatione Scripturae noua illius utens, saepius reprehendit, neque Augustini uidetur fuisse sectator, ut erat Orosius. Venit in mentem Iuliani Pelagiani, hominis ingeniosi neque inerti, sed de eo uidero si forte alias.

¹⁷ The latter more expressly than the former; cf. Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 18; Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 29-37.

¹⁸ Which Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 18, following the tradition initiated by Prosper chron. 1274 (MGH AA IX, 469), dates into the year 420. More recent studies prefer 419. There seems to be no doubt about the day, 30 September. See J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome. His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London: Duckworth, 1974), 331-32; for the present state of research and more recent literature cf. A. Fürst, "Hieronymus", in: S. Döpp & W. Geerlings, eds., *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 21999), 286-90, 286-87.

¹⁹ According to Marius Mercator, commonitorium super nomine Caelestii = coll. Palat. 36 (ACO I/V/1, 68.23-26): ... Iulianus et reliqui complices eius ... ex omni Italia deturbati sunt; Id., epistula in refutationem symboli Theodori Mopsuesteni = coll. Palat. 15 (ACO I/V/1, 23.24-25): ... secutum esse Theodorum; and Id., commonitorium aduersum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii uel etiam scripta Iuliani = coll. Palat. 14

VIII ad Florum. Probably during the same period Theodore of Mopsuestia wrote a polemic against Jerome's and Augustine's teachings on original sin²⁰. It might be influenced by one of Julian's

(ACO I/V/1, 19.26-27): ... in Cilicia ingeris. However, it is not clear when exactly Julian left Italy for Cilicia. In 421 Augustine is still perplexed: Aug. c. Iul. 2.34 (PL 44, 697): ... ubicumque sis, ubicumque legere ista potueris... Is he assuming that Julian has already left Italy, or that he is still there, on the move, or in hiding? Julian could indeed still have been in Italy. He even could have written *Ad Florum* there. In Flor. = Aug. c. Iul. imp. 1.7 (CSEL 85/1, 9) Julian writes that Augustine's friend Alypius "recently" (nuper) handed over Augustine's work On concupiscence (nupt et conc. 2) to Count Valerius. He is referring to an event that happened in 421. Traditionally, Julian is thought to have been already in Cilicia, when he wrote these lines. Yet even if we suppose that he was, the question remains, when he arrived there. Nuper does not give a clue here. It could mean anything, from a few weeks to a few years. Julian could have travelled to Cilicia at any time between the second half of 419 and the second half of 421, or even later, if we assume that he wrote *Ad Florum* while still in Italy, and travelled east after completing it.

²⁰ Photios, *Bibliotheca* 177 (II 178 Henry), in his summary of Theodore's work, thinks that it was directed against Jerome, whom Theodore called Aram, a westerner who had come to the east and composed books about the new heresy. He had also claimed to have found a fifth gospel in the library of Eusebius of Palestine and rejected the existing Biblical translations to produce a new one of his own, although his Hebrew was not natural, but acquired from a low-born native speaker. On Henry's edition of this passage cf. the review by M. Aubineau, "Photius, Bibliothèque Cod. 53 sur les Pélagiens", in: RPh 93 (1967): 232-41. The "books" which Theodore may have had in mind here is Jerome's *Dialogue against the Pelagians*, in particular Hier. dial. adu. Pel. 3.2 (CCL 80, 99-100), where Jerome cites from an apocryphal Gospel *According to the Hebrews*, where it is supposedly written that even Jesus may have unwittingly committed sins. Cf. O. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius*. Päpste und Papsttum 7 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1975), 54. The sixth century (cf. ACO I/V/1, vii-viii) compiler of the *Collectio Palatina*, where fragments of Theodore's original seem to be preserved, apparently thought that Theodore's invective was directed against Augustine. Cf. coll. Palat. 51 (ACO I/V/1, 173-76). Following Tillemont, *Mémoires* XII (n. 6), 449, and J. M. Vosté, "La chronologie de l'activité littéraire de Théodore de Mopsueste", in: RBibl 34 (1925): 54-81, 79, L. Wickham, "Pelagianism in the East", in: R. Williams, ed., *The Making of Orthodoxy. Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 200-13, 206-207, thinks that both possibilities are not mutually exclusive. In contrast, J. Gross, "Theodor von Mopsuestia, ein Gegner der Erbsündenlehre", in: ZKG 65 (1953/1954): 1-15, 11-15, and Id., *Geschichte des Erbsündendogmas 1: Entstehungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas. Von der Bibel bis Augustinus* (München: Reinhardt, 1960), 200-202, argues that Theodore had only Jerome in mind. On Jerome's and Augustine's teachings on original sin in comparison see A. Fürst, "Zur Vielfalt altkirchlicher Soteriologie. Augustins Berufung auf Hieronymus im pelagianischen Streit", in: J. B. Bauer, ed., *Philophronesis für Norbert Brox*. Grazer theologische Studien 19 (Graz: Institut für Ökumenische Theologie und Patrologie an der Universität Graz, 1995), 119-85. Fürst's findings support the view that Theodore's arguments are not only directed against the teachings of Jerome, but also against those of Augustine. On the development of Jerome-

earlier works²¹. After Theodore's death in 428 Marius Mercator claimed that around 423 Theodore had declared Julian a heretic at a synod in Cilicia²². But his "report" lacks credibility²³. If Julian wrote the *Tractatus* in Mopsuestia, in addition to the *libri ad Florum* and, as

's own position against Pelagius see now B. Jeanjean, *Saint Jérôme et l'hérésie*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 161 (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1999), passim.

²¹ The doctrines condemned by Theodore, as reported by coll. Palat. 51 (ACO I/V/1, 173-76) and Photius, *Bibliotheca* 177 (II 178 Henry), bear striking similarities to those listed in a Letter to the Romans quoted by Augustine in Aug. c. duas epp. Pel. 1 (CSEL 60, 423-59). This letter, Iul. ep. Rom. (CCL 88, 396-98), is almost certainly composed by Julian of Aeclanum, most probably during the months after Pope Zosimus's death on 26 December 418. It was signed by Julian and a group of fellow bishops opposed to the condemnation of Pelagius and Caelestius and addressed to the clergy of Rome. The modern editor, De Coninck (CCL 88), is not entirely certain about its authorship and date and places it somewhat awkwardly towards the end of the volume. But see the critical note by Duval, "Iulianus Aeclanensis restitutus" (n. 1), 164. Julian's authorship of ep. Rom. was first called into question by Jean Garnier, who argued that Julian himself denied it: Iul. Flor. = Aug. c. Iul. imp. 1.18 (CSEL 85/1, 15). Garnier ascribed the letter to Caelestius: Joannes Garnerius, "Dissertationes septem, quibus integra continetur historia Pelagiana = Appendix secunda ad primam partem operum Marii Mercatoris", in: Id., *Marii Mercatoris s. Augustino aequalis opera quaecumque extant* (Paris: Sebastien Mabre-Cramoisy, 1673) (PL 48, 255-698); ibid. "Dissertatio" V, 317-19 (PL 48, 505-507). In the passage in question, however, Julian only denies that ep. Rom. is identical to one of two letters which he had written a few months earlier to Pope Zosimus. One of these two letters is extant in fragments Merc. comm. Iul. = coll. Palat. 11 (ACO I/V/1, 12.7-39) now edited as Iul. ep. Zos. (CCL 88, 335f.). The other one is lost. Garnier, however, perhaps to compensate for the loss of ep. Rom. to Julian's œuvre, saw it extant in a *libellus fidei*, traditionally seen as a document composed by a group of either Sicilian or Aquileian bishops: Garnerius, "Dissertatio" V, 319-23, with further notes on pp. 324-35 (PL 48, 508-36). On arguments against such an identification see Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius* (n. 20), 220-26, esp. 220-21 nn. 3 and 4. Interestingly, at one point *Libellus fidei* 3.16 (PL 48, 522) also attacks Hier. dial. adu. Pel. 3.2 (CCL 80, 99f.) of Manicheism, just as Theodore does in his work against Augustine's and Jerome's teachings on original sin (cf. the previous note). Taken together, however, the arguments against Julian's authorship of the *libellus fidei* and in favour of his authorship of ep. Rom., and the striking similarities, and downright parallels, between Theodore's invective and ep. Rom. suggest a dependence of the latter on ep. Rom.

²² Merc. epistula in refutationem symboli Theodori Mopsuesteni = coll. Palat. 15 (ACO I/V/1, 23.33-34).

²³ F. Loofs, "Pelagius und der pelagianische Streit", in: RE 15 (1904): 747-74, 772, dismisses it as an invention. Mercator is the only source for the event and in a sense even he does not say that it actually occurred. He rather seems to conclude from Theodore's Creed (ed. A. Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der Alten Kirche* (Breslau: Morgenstern, 1887; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1962), 302-308) that it must have occurred. On a balanced discussion of the evidence see Bruckner, *Julian von Eclanum* (n. 12), 5-6, who calls in question Mercator's claim, but stops short of dis-

he announces in the prologue of the *Tractatus*²⁴, after finishing a commentary on the books of Solomon²⁵, he stayed there for more than just two or three years. In that case he wrote the *Tractatus* well after 423, though yet prior to his translation of Theodore's commentary on the book of Psalms²⁶. Thus Morin's suggestions imply, though Morin

missing it entirely. If the synod took place, Bruckner argues, it would have done so not earlier than in 424. Anazarbus 423 was first suggested by Garnerius, "Dissertatio" II, 219-20 (PL 48, 359-61); further literature in Bruckner, *Julian von Aeclanum* (n. 12), 6 n. 2; Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius* (n. 20), 252. C. Pietri and others, eds., *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, vol. 2: *Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne* (313-604), vol. 1 (A-K) (Rome: École française de Rome, 1999), 1175-86, 1179 n. 132, accepts Garnier's version; M. Lamberigts, "Julianus IV (Julianus von Aeclanum)", in: RAC 19 (2000): 483-505, 487, is – rightly – inclined to dismiss it altogether on the basis of Bruckner's and Loof's arguments in conjunction with the new concern of dating and locating Julian's exegetical works (cf. n. 26).

²⁴ Iul. tr. proph. prol. (CCL 88, 115.13f.): Salomonis quippe uoluminibus disse- rendis, dispositionum eius gloriam sumus, in quantum posse contulit, exsecuti.

²⁵ Only fragments of a commentary on the Canticum remain extant in the writings of the Venerable Bede: Iul. Cant. (CCL 88, 398-401); cf. Beda Cant. praef. (CCL 119B, 167-73). The same work of Bede also contains fragments of a work of Julian's entitled *de bono constantiae*; Iul. bono const. (CCL 88, 401f.); Beda Cant. praef. (CCL 119B, 173-75). These fragments could be part of the commentary on the uolumina Salomonis, of which Julian speaks in the preface to the tractatus. See above, the previous note, and F. Nuvolone & A. Solignac, "Pélage et Pélagianisme", in: DSP 12/2 (1986): 2889-2942, 2906.

²⁶ Cf. in contrast Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), p. 19: "...de 421 à 423, ou peu après...." Morin ignores the sore issue of Theodore's alleged condemnation of Julian in 423 or 424 (see above n. 23). As a consequence he also fails to discuss the implications of his own suggestion that Julian did not only write the *libri ad Florum* and the *tractatus in Osee, Iohel, Amos* in Mopsuestia while staying with Theodore, but also the commentary on the uolumina Salomonis, *de bono constantiae*, the *expositio in Iob* and the translation of Theodore's commentary on the Psalms. For the translation of Theodore's commentary on Psalms it seems reasonable to assume a later date than for the *tractatus*, since, by its very nature as a translation, it shows a much closer acquaintance with Greek and with Theodore's thought than the *tractatus*, which depends more on Jerome's commentary on the Minor Prophets. This opinion is shared by Lamberigts, "Julianus" (n. 23), 490 and 499, but not De Coninck, *Iuliani* (n. 2), vii, who reckons that the translation of Theodore's commentary on Psalms is one of Julian's earliest works. His view has recently been endorsed by N. Adkin, "Julian of Eclanum on Psalm 103:2", in: JTS 51 (2000): 161-63, 161 n. 4. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 60, argues that the *tractatus* is Julian's last and most mature work. He dates it into the late 430s (439), after Julian's return to the west. Cf. Prosper epit. chron. an. 439 (MGH AA IX, 477.1336). G. De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible", in: RSR 47 (1959): 345-66, 354 n. 31, dates it tentatively into the early thirties (432-436), shortly after the Council of Ephesus (431). He is endorsed by De Coninck, *Iuliani* (n. 2), xi and xviii, and Duval, "Julianus Aeclanensis restitutus" (n. 1), 168. The general lack of evidence for the period after 430, however, makes it difficult to argue convincingly for any date later than 430. One could also ask why the

himself never accounted for these implications, that Julian did not leave Mopsuestia prior to 423 or 424, and that Theodore did not condemn Julian, neither in 423 nor in 424, nor in any other year. Rather, Julian and Theodore were throughout in agreement in matters of doctrine and exegetical method²⁷.

tractatus should have remained fragmentary, if Julian composed it during the comparatively 'quiet and peaceful' (Bouwman, *ibid.* pp. 60 and 79) periods of either the 430s, or after 439 (against I. Strobl, *Eine Untersuchung zum Verständnis alttestamentlicher Prophetie anhand des Julian von Aeclanum zugeschriebenen Kommentars zum Propheten Joel*, Diss. Mag., Universität Wien, 1991, 7 n. 29, who argues that under the circumstances the fragmentary character of the *tractatus* is of no consequence. Note also that the later parts of the work are less well composed and their style is less polished than in the earlier parts). It seems therefore reasonable, taking into account textual as well as historical considerations, to date the *tractatus* into the comparatively dense and turbulent mid- to late 20s.

On further details concerning Julian's translation of Theodore's commentary on Psalms see L. De Coninck & M. J. D'Hondt, ed., *Theodori Mopsuesteni Expositiones in Psalmos Iuliano Aeclanensi interprete in Latinum versae quae supersunt*. CCL 88A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1977), vii-xlv, and the more recent work by M.-J. Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques du Psautier (iiie-ve siècles), vol. 1: Les travaux des Pères Grecs et Latins sur le Psautier. Recherches et Bilan*. Orientalia Christiana Analecta 219 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1982), 175-88.

²⁷ A possible exception to the rule, as a note by J. Stiglmayr, "Der Jobkommentar von Monte Cassino", in: ZkTh 43 (1919): 269-88, 275-76, implies, is the *expositio in Iob*, once attributed to Philip the presbyter, which follows Theodore's brother's, Polychronius' of Apamea, commentary on Job rather than Theodore's. Theodore presents Job as a contemptuous pagan and even goes as far as to deny the canonicity of the book. Polychronius asserts its canonicity and presents Job as a Biblical saint struggling with his God. Stiglmayr took the departure of exp. Iob from Theodore as evidence against Julian's authorship, which had been argued for by Vaccari, *Un commento a Giobbe* (n. 13). Vaccari responded to Stiglmayr's objections in A. Vaccari, "Il Comento Cassinese di Giobbe", in: A. M. Amelli, *Scritti di Letteratura Ecclesiastica dedicati al A. Amelli*. Miscellanea Amelli (Badia di Montecassino, 1920), 43-51, esp. 48-51. Stiglmayr reaffirmed his position, but failed to present new evidence in Id., "Zum Jobkommentar von Monte Cassino", in: ZkTh 45 (1921): 495-96. In the meantime Vaccari's position had been endorsed by A. Jülicher in: TLZ 41 (1916): 78-79, C. Weyman in: TR 15 (1916): 241-42; 18 (1919): 325, A. D'Alès in: Études 147 (1916): 132; RSR 6 (1916): 311-24, 314-22, D. De Bruyne in: RB 12 (1915): 595, and A. Souter in: JTS 16 (1916): 336-38. With Vaccari's position firmly established and Stiglmayr's refuted, the apparent departure of exp. Iob from Theodore's exegesis of Job can no longer be seen as evidence against Julian's authorship of exp. Iob. There is no reason why Julian, as the author of exp. Iob, should not have had recourse to, besides John Chrysostom's exhortations, Polychronius's (rather than Theodore's) commentary, and depicted Job as a (pagan!) Biblical saint struggling with his fate before God rather than a man doomed to a meaningless existence in pain, suffering and ultimate death. Theologically, this would have been fully in tune with Julian's fundamental tenet, the irreversible goodness of creation due to God's unequivocal and absolutely reliable willing and acting as creator and saviour. Cf. on this latter point

Morin's examination of the *Tractatus* is guided mainly by interests arising from its historical context. Later authors studying the work like D'Alès, Bouwman and De Plinval followed Morin in that respect²⁸. They looked for "Pelagian doctrine" in the *Tractatus* and asked to what extent Julian was influenced by Theodore's exegesis, or, more generally, by the Antiochene tradition. Julian himself situates the

M. Lamberigts, "Julian of Aeclanum: a Plea for a Good Creator", in: *Augustiniana* 38 (1988): 5-24, although Lamberigts does not consider exp. Job, despite passages like Iul. exp. Job praef. (CCL 88, 3): sancti itaque Iob uita laudatur, ut in eo bonum humanae naturae possit agnosci, quae tam ad repulsam peccatorum quam ad sectationem uirtutum omnium, quippe ita a deo condita, etiam sine legis scripta magisterio ostendit se sibi posse sufficere. It may, of course, be that, as Ch. Kannengiesser, "Job (livre de): 2. Job chez les Pères", in: *DSP* 8 (1974): 1218-25, 1222, suggests, exp. Job is here influenced by Imperial Stoic ideas. But, as E. Dassmann, "Hiob", in: *RAC* 15 (1991): 366-442, 379-91, shows, what Kannengiesser identifies as Stoic, may as well pass as Early Christian, beginning from Iac 5:11. Thus it is not surprising that theologically Julian's view of Job is not in the least at odds with Theodore's, who, in his commentary on Job, points out that by virtue of its content the story of Job deserves its place in the Bible (PG 66, 697AB): quae autem ad significationem uitae eius [sc. iusti] necessaria erant exponere, haec omnia sufficiebant quemlibet ad meliora conuertere et aemulatorem facere boni. Of course, the seriousness of Theodore's denying the book its canonicity must not be underestimated, as may have been done by R. Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*. Studi e Testi 141 (Rome: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1948), 33-35, considering the historical impact of that denial. Cf. on this J. M. Vosté, "L'œuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste au 2e Concile de Constantinople", in: *RB* 38 (1929): 390-93. Yet what must be taken into account is that Theodore rejected the canonicity of Job mainly for formal reasons, like: 1. The story is shared by cultures outside Israel (PG 66, 698B). 2. Its message is in a sense 'un-Biblical'. Especially Job's show of self-contempt is untypical for the way in which wise and just men are usually depicted in the Bible (PG 66, 697B). 3. The style of the book is artificial and construed, as if the author vaingloriously tried to display his poetic abilities, rather than preach a humble sermon (PG 66, 698A). On the last four references from Theodore's commentary cf. Ch. Schaublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*. Theophaneia. Beiträge zur Religions- und Kirchengeschichte des Altertums 23 (Köln and Bonn: Hanstein, 1974), 77-83. See also Dassmann, "Hiob", 403-405 and 419-20. Julian's recourse to, besides other sources, Polychronius may thus indicate his departure from Theodore in this one instance and to some degree, while on the whole he remains firmly within the Antiochene tradition. Furthermore, this departure, if it can be called that, extends more to the application of exegetical method than to theological substance. As far as the latter is concerned Theodore would certainly have applauded Julian's work.

²⁸ A. D'Alès, "Julien d'Éclane, exégète", in: *RSR* 6 (1916): 311-34 (cf. also above n. 27); Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1); De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26).

Tractatus in the latter, in the prologue²⁹ as well as in the main text³⁰. Following the great Angelo Mai, Morin also identified traces of Theodore's commentary on the Minor Prophets in Julian's *Tractatus*³¹,

²⁹ In Iul. tr. proph. prol. (CCL 88, 115f.) Julian mentions John Chrysostom as a previous Antiochene interpreter of the Minor Prophets, but Chrysostom, Julian argues, only did exhortations, not proper exegetical commentaries (exhortatione, non explanatione). Origen, he goes on, indulged in allegories, and Jerome merely reiterates Origen's allegories, or diverts to the quisquilliae of Hebrew exegesis, thus losing the thread of the narrative, the consequentia of the Biblical text.

³⁰ The prime, though in a certain way misleading, example cited by Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 19 n. 1, is Hosea's marriage to a prostitute following an order from God, which, as Iul. tr. Osee 1.1.2-5 (CCL 88, 119-121) reports, the Egyptians and others who follow Origen interpret as a non-corporeal affair, while the Syrians, with whom he sides, take it literally, as an act of prophecy and devotion on the prophet's part to emphasize and illustrate his message to the people. If necessary, however, Julian concludes the passage, one could defend God's order and Hosea's action even in plain rational terms, as a means of transferring the woman from a commercial life as a prostitute to the honourable existence of a modest housewife. – The example chosen by Morin – it happens to stand at the beginning of the commentary – can be misleading in the context of a modern exegesis of Hosea, which has increasingly become preoccupied with metaphors, and tends to dismiss interpretations built on a literal understanding of the text, like Julian's, as naïve. This would not cause any problems, if only any better solutions were on offer. If, however, metaphors are not properly understood, if they are contradictory, if clusters of metaphors confuse, and a point of reference is not in sight, as I. Willi-Plein, „Das Zwölfprophetenbuch“, in: Theologische Rundschau 64 (1999): 351-95, 361-67, writes of some recent studies on Hosea, the situation is similar to the one which Julian decries in his prologue in reference to the allegorizing of an Origen and a Jerome (cf. above n. 29). It is useful to keep in mind that Julian, and Antiochene exegetes in general, did not advocate literalism for its own sake, but to communicate better the consequentia ἀκολουθία, or coherence, of the Biblical text. If that intention pointed beyond the literal meaning, it could well be taken into account. But first a basic understanding of the text had to be secured. Morin, for his part, was well aware of this; cf. Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 19 n. 2.

³¹ Mai had first edited Theodore's commentary on the Minor Prophets in 1832, and then again in 1854 with a Latin translation. Cf. A. Mai, ed., *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio e Vaticanis Codicibus edita* VI (Rome: Typis Vaticanis, 1832), 1-300; Id., *Novae Patrum bibliothecae* VII (Rome: Spithoever, 1854), 1-300. This second edition was included by Migne (PG 66, 123-632), behind Mai's prefaces to his first (PG 66, 104-119) and his second edition (PG 66, 119-23). On further details see H. N. Sprenger, ed., *Theodori Mopsuesteni commentarius in xii prophetas. Einleitung und Ausgabe*. Göttinger Orientforschungen V/1 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977), 3-4. In the preface to his first edition (PG 66, 118) Mai notes that Theodore and the author of the tractatus are in remarkable agreement (astipulans Rufinus) on Os 11:1 (see Theodore's text: ... διότι νήπιος Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἐγὼ ἡγάπησα αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ...; Julian's text: ...quia puer Israel, et dilexi eum, et ex Aegypto uocaui filium meum...). Theodore writes that the text calls Israel a child, from the time when he was in Egypt, when he began to grow into a people and God began to take care of him. Julian writes that the text speaks here of the people,

and, despite the, generally, non-polemical character of the work³², instances of "Pelagian" exegesis³³. Finally, he notes a few vague hints at Julian's "Lebenswelt", the gloomy world of the Late Empire. When reading in the prophets of disasters, famine and war, Julian can say that he knows these things not only from history books. His own time has seen people deserting magnificent cities, leaving them to be covered by forest, burying their valuables in the soil committing them to permanent rot and oblivion³⁴. No year passes without another

but adds that "apostolic authority indicates that this is applicable to the person of Christ". Morin rightly remarks that there should be more obvious parallels than this. Theodore here says nothing at all about the possibility of a typological application of the motif to Christ, which is hardly surprising, since the Greek text of Hosea speaks of "Israel's children" whom God has called out of Egypt, not "my son". Maybe Mai thought that Julian's identification of child, Israel and people depended on Theodore and encouraged him to associate it with the story of the infant Jesus in Egypt according to Mt 2:15. However, the source on which Julian really depends for this passage is Jerome's commentary, where all possibilities, including the textual problems, are discussed at length. See Hier. in proph. min. Osee 3.11.1-2 (CCL 76, 119-21). In contrast, Morin is intrigued by Julian's preference for interpreting the prophecies in their historical context, i. e. as linking them to contemporary events and figures like Hezekiah, Sennacherib, or to the Macchabees, before applying them to Christ and eschatological events. Although even here Jerome provides ample material for discussion, the method by which Julian treats the individual cases reminds of Theodore rather than Jerome. Cf. Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 19 n. 3. Following the general verdict of Bruckner, *Julian von Eclanum* (n. 12), 124, Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 129, casts doubt upon the possibility of any obvious, direct, dependence of Julian's exegesis on that of Theodore.

³² But cf. Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 21 n. 3, and Stiglmayr, "Der Jobkommentar von Monte Cassino" (n. 27), 277 n. 3, on the anti-clerical and social-critical remarks in Iul. tr. Iohel 2.4-11 (CCL 88, 241); tr. Amos 2.7.11 (CCL 88, 309.158-165). Such remarks discredited the author of the *tractatus* already before he was known as Julian of Aeclanum. See, for example, the verdict of Tillemont, *Mémoires* XII (n. 6), 316.

³³ Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 20 on Iul. tr. Osee 2.6.7 (CCL 88, 167-68), where Julian insists at length that Os 6:7 "they broke the covenant like Adam" (sicut Adam transgressi pactum) means exactly what it says, i. e. sicut here means in similitudine, in imitation of Adam committing his act of transgression, and not that the perpetrators acquired a state of dereliction in paradise and carried it forward to the present day. See also below n. 59.

³⁴ Iul. tr. Osee 2.9.5-6 (CCL 88, 186f.): quod autem subicit, "desiderabile argenti eorum urticae hereditabunt" [cf. Os 9:6d Vulg.: desiderabile argenti eorum urtica hereditabit], ex usu captiuitatem euenire, utinam nos lectio tantum et non etiam experientia docuissent. constat quippe uel aedes magnis sumptibus fabricatas, cum defecissent incolae, siluis fuisse contextas, uel plerumque etiam auri et argenti defossos thesauros, his qui occuluerant interemptis, in continuam obliuionem perisse; cf. Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 20 n. 2.

victory for Rome's enemies³⁵, and when Julian reads Amos describing the plight of captivity, he wishes that he knew of that condition only from his reading. In fact, however, "this plight has become so common nowadays that one is struck by the audacity of those who still hope for a better future"³⁶.

Yet despite his rather dim view concerning the general prospects of his day and age Julian seems far from succumbing in principle to the gloom surrounding him. This impression of a Julian who remains optimistic and confident, always ready to act and respond to oncoming challenges is confirmed by Gennadius, who reports that "in a time of famine and anxiety Julian managed to procure alms for those in need". This passage famously led to the curious "canonisation" of Julian by Pietro de Natali in his "Catalogue of Saints"³⁷, who studiously ignores Gennadius's added remark that Julian abused his "apparent charity in order to attract many nobles and especially religious men and women to associate themselves to his heresy"³⁸.

³⁵ Iul. tr. Amos 1.2.13-16 (CCL 88, 272.175-76): quae omnia mala hostili euenire uictoria, annuis magis cladibus quam annalibus litteris comprobamus.

³⁶ Iul. tr. Amos 2.8.10 (CCL 88, 315.145-149): quod totum tempore captiuitatis obtingere, utinam lectione tantum indicante nossemus. sed tam frequens nostris temporibus eiusmodi est facta condicio, ut quidquam melius sperantium miremur audaciam; but cf. already Hier. comm. in Osee 1.4.3 (CCL 76, 39), and Kelly, *Jerome* (n. 18), 294 n. 44.

³⁷ Petrus de Natalibus, *Catalogus sanctorum et gestorum eorum ex diuersis et multis uoluminibus collectus* (ed. A. Verli: Vicenza, 1493; editio princeps). Pietro de Natali, who died some time after 1400, wrote the work between 1369 and 1372 (see his own account ed. by A. Poncelet, in: *AnBoll* 29 (1910): 35). He calls Julian a confessor [qui] scripsit aduersus Augustinum ... et ... alios heresiarchas and fuit in elemosynis liberalissimus. Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 21 n. 2, following diocesan propria of his time argues that the passage could refer to the cult of St. Julian, bishop of Cuenca in Spain, which predates the lifetime of that bishop in the 13th century and may therefore be traceable to an ancient popular image of Julian of Aeclanum as a liberal giver of alms. H. I. Marrou, "La Canonisation de Julien d'Éclane", in: *Theologie aus dem Geist der Geschichte*. FS Berthold Altaner = *HJ* 77 (1958): 434-37, in contrast thinks that the entry in Pietro de Natali's "Catalogue" represents not so much a "popular" as a "literary canonisation". According to his own account (ed. Poncelet p. 36) Pietro de Natali had drawn his information from a book of legends composed by Pietro Calo de Chioggia († 1348), which renders exactly Gennadius's account cited below in the following note (n. 38). The legend of Julian the confessor is therefore most probably a literary creation by none other than Pietro de Natali himself.

³⁸ Cf. Gennad. uir. ill. (45) 46 (Ed. E. C. Richardson, *TU* 14.1a (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1896), 78): Hic Iulianus elemosynis tempore famis et angustiae indigentibus prorogatis multos miserationis specie nobilium praecipueque religiosorum iniciens haeresi suae sociauit; for an analysis of the links between historical background and literary representation in Gennadius's account cf. B. Czapla, *Gennadius als Literarhistoriker*.

Morin closes with a note on Julian's lemma, an early variant of Jerome's translation, the Latin Vulgate³⁹. Julian repeatedly praises this text as "that latest edition called 'according to the Hebrew'"⁴⁰. He values it particularly for its integrity and, therefore, reliability concerning language and style (*elocutionum integritate*). It is interesting that he follows it even when it differs from the text which Jerome uses for his commentary on the Minor Prophets⁴¹, a work on

Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung der Schrift des Gennadius von Marseille De uiris illustribus. Kirchengeschichtliche Studien 4/1 (Münster: Schöningh, 1898), 101-103. More recently Andreas Kessler has indicated that it could have been precisely Julian's euergetism at the outset of his episcopal career that raised suspicions about his orthodoxy and dragged him into the Pelagian controversy; cf. A. Kessler, *Reichtumskritik und Pelagianismus. Die pelagianische Diatribe de diuitiis*. Paradosis. Beiträge zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur und Theologie 43 (Freiburg/Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1999), 56.

³⁹ Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 22-24; cf. also Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 61-79; De Coninck, *Iuliani* (n. 2), xxviii-xxx; R. Weber, ed., *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983); *Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem iussu Ioannis Pauli PP. II cura et studio monachorum abbatiae pontificiae sancti Hieronymi in urbe O. S. B. edita*, vol. xvii: *Liber duodecim prophetarum* (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1987).

⁴⁰ Iul. tr. proph. prol. (CCL 88, 116): istam postremam editionem, quae secundum Hebraeum appellatur, eligerem; cf. also Id. tr. Iohel prol. (CCL 88, 227).

⁴¹ See Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 71: „Die Textkritik ist ihm [as far as the Biblical text is concerned] vollkommen fremd; er betrachtet seinen Schrifttext als ein fest Gegebenes, an dem er nicht rüttelt.“ According to Bouwman some cases of textual corruption may have been introduced at a later stage in the transmission of the *tractatus*. In general, however, Julian's text hardly varies from the oldest strands of Vulgate MSS. Indeed it shares with the latter the most blatant mistakes (ibid. p. 75), while Jerome obviously revised his text later on (see below n. 51). Julian may have adapted such revised variants from Jerome's commentary, but only in the body of his own commentary, not for his lemma (see below in this note the example given by De Coninck, who does not differ that much from Bouwman); cf. Bouwman, ibid., 66-69. Thus the fact that Julian does not seem to tamper with his lemma, does not mean that he ignores variant readings. He considers them, especially if he finds that they can help him to explain his text. E. g. on Iohel 2:23-24 his lemma reads *faciam ad uos imbrem matutinum et serotinum in principio*. To unravel the apparent contradiction Julian cites the LXX reading, which he got most probably from Jerome's commentary, Hier. comm. in Iohel 2.21-27 (CCL 76, 189.486f.); cf. Iul. tr. Iohel 2.24f. (CCL 88, 245.319f.): *quod septuaginta non "in principio", sed "sicut a principio" transtulerunt*. It seems obvious, Julian concludes, that (like the LXX) the Vulgate does not imply here that everything happens simultaneously. Rather, there is a sequence of events: First God sends the rains, then the barns are filling up and then the people are joyful. Thus *in principio* here simply marks the beginning of a sequence of events. Julian here may have developed further a notion which he found expressed in rudimentary form by Jerome in his commentary: Hier. comm. in Iohel 2.21-27 (CCL

which Julian relies heavily in exegetical terms⁴². Morin picks three examples: 1. *Os* 11:12, where Julian's text says *circumdedit me in negotiatione Efraim et in dolo domus Israhel*. Instead of *negotiatione* Jerome reads *negatione*, which he qualifies as *mendacio*, while Julian

76, 189.510-12): [deus] qui dedit eis alimenta iustitiae, et, ut septuaginta transtulerunt, et imbrem temporaneum et serotinum, ut comedant atque laetentur. This belies Bouwman, *ibid.*, 127-32, who argues that Julian ever only copied Jerome. On Julian's exegesis of *Joel* 2:23f. see also *ibid.* p. 73. Some further notes on this passage: Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 23, wrongly suggests that Julian reads a *principio*. He reads in *principio*. Interestingly, as far as the Hebrew original is concerned, the LXX were on the right track: in *principio* renders Hebrew: *bāri'shōn*, while the more probable variant is *kāri'shōn*, meaning "like in the old days", when the covenant was still intact. Cf. H. W. Wolff, *Dodekapropheton 2: Joel und Amos*. BKA 14/2 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 66 and 76. Theodore of Mopsuestia finally, in his commentary, ignores the *sicut* (Gr. *καθώς*) in his text and writes: Theod. Mops. in *Ioelem* 2.23 (93-94 Sprenger): ὁ γὰρ τοῖς ἀνωτέροις εἶπεν ἀφηρῆσθαι ταῦτα νῦν ἀποδίδοθαι λέγει; on Theodore's handling of the lemma cf. R. Bultmann, *Die Exegese des Theodor von Mopsuestia* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984), 44-46.

The case of tr. *Iohel* 2.24f. leads De Coninck (CCL 88, xxx n. 163) to question Bouwman's view (*ibid.* 71-72) that the LXX (resp. Old Latin) emendations in Julian's commentary are largely not by Julian himself, but by later copists, for if Julian had carried them out himself, he would have indicated this, since he likes "to show off". The reference to the LXX variant in tr. *Iohel* 2.24-25, Bouwman argues (p. 71 n. 1), must therefore be treated as an exception. Against this view De Coninck lists several cases, which differ from tr. *Iohel* 2.24f. only in that in them Julian does not "show off", i. e. explicitly state that he has the respective variant from the LXX. For example, in *Iul. tr. Osee* 1.3.1-5 (CCL 88, 145.4, 146.27) the lemma has for *Os* 3:2a the Vulgate version *fodi eam...* (from *fodere*: to dig, dig up, excavate, prick, prod, jog) rendering Hebrew *vā'ēkrēhā*, "I rented her" (Hebrew *krh* can mean "to dig" or "to rent"). In his commentary Julian explains *fodi eam ...* by *posset ... conduci*, "she can be rented". He most probably has this from Hier. comm. in *Osee* 1.3.2-3 (CCL 76, 34.45), where Jerome, who also cites the LXX lemma, renders LXX *ἐμισθωσάμην* as *conduxi*. Both, Bouwman and De Coninck, are partly right, Bouwman in saying that Julian treats his lemma with the utmost care and is not inclined to make emendations, even when he has a seemingly better variant at his disposal. De Coninck is right in saying that Julian however does work with different text variants in his commentary, not just rarely and in order to show off, as Bouwman alleges, but rather frequently, as part of his exegetical method and because he works with Jerome's commentary. What is interesting here is that even Jerome in his commentary seems to leave the lemma alone, despite *fodi* being obviously not the right translation, for unlike Hebrew *krh* it is not synonymous with *conduci*. There are other cases where Jerome does interfere with his lemma. It is after all his own translation; cf. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 66 n. 3; cf. also below n. 51.

⁴² As the following examples show, Julian keeps to his text, but adapts his exegesis, if necessary, with the help of Jerome's commentary, as for *Os* 11:12. For *Os* 14:4 on the other hand, Julian's text favours his own, literal, approach. Julian's attitude to the text, therefore, works both ways.

tries to make sense of *negotatio* by qualifying the *negotiator* as *malus*, operating fraudulently (*fraude*). On the whole the variant reading remains only of little consequence for the exegesis⁴³. Similarly Morin's second example: 2. On *Os* 14:4 Julian has *misereberis populi* instead of, as Jerome, *pupilli*. This, of course, allows Julian to deliver a beautifully literal exegesis, while Jerome has to explain a metaphor: "Israel here is called an orphan, because he has deserted God, his father"⁴⁴. 3. Morin's third example has practically no bearing on the exegesis at all, though the variant reading might affect the syntax. *Os* 14:6 Julian's text declines the proper name (*ero quasi ros Israheli. germinabit...*), Jerome's does not. Whether this warrants a different punctuation of Jerome's text, as Adriaen suggests (*ero quasi ros. Israel germinabit...*)⁴⁵, depends also on whether one may assume that Jerome usually declines proper names, or here, specifically, *Israel*. For if he does not – and indeed he does not in most of his works (the ratio is approximately 10:1 in the case of *Israel*, even though in the commentary on the Minor Prophets it is almost reversed)⁴⁶, the non-declension of a proper name does not necessarily suggest that it is set in the nominative.

Besides the latest rendition from the Hebrew, Morin finally notes, Julian knows "a few more editions" (*sunt enim plusculae [editiones]*), which he calls *uulgator*⁴⁷ and on which he relies for the (sic) other Biblical books⁴⁸. According to Bouwman the latter statement is not quite correct⁴⁹. What can be said according to

⁴³ Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 22; Iul. tr. Osee 3.12.1 (CCL 88, 208); Hier. comm. in Osee 3.11.12 (CCL 76, 130). Note also that *negotatio* and *negotiator* are more common in Late Latin. Cf. A. Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949), 264, and in this article above Morin's list of vocabulary typically used by Julian.

⁴⁴ Iul. tr. Osee 3.14.4 (CCL 88, 223f.); Hier. comm. in Osee 3.14.4 (CCL 76, 154.87).

⁴⁵ Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 68 n. 1, argues that the move is wrong, even though he agrees with Morin that Jerome did not decline *Israel* in this verse. The modern editors of the Vulgate (cf. n. 39) agree with Bouwman, against Adriaen (CCL 76, 155.112).

⁴⁶ Cf. Iul. tr. Osee 3.14.6 (CCL 88, 224.66), Hier. comm. in Osee 3.14.6 (CCL 76, 155.112), and above the previous note (n. 45).

⁴⁷ Cf. Iul. tr. Iohel prol. (CCL 88, 227.6-7).

⁴⁸ Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 23.

⁴⁹ Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), p. 78-79, refutes Morin in detail. Gn 21:12 in Iul. tr. Osee 1.1.2-5 (CCL 88, 120.118f.), Morin's first example, as Bouwman points out, could have been quoted from the New Testament (Rm 9:7 or Hebr 11:8) and in any case represents a rare variant of the Old Latin translation. According to B. Fischer, *Genesis. Vetus latina. Reste der altlateinischen Bibel. Nach*

Bouwman is that in the *Tractatus* Julian cites most Biblical passages from the Vulgate, except those from New Testament writings and the *Canticum*.

Bouwman's monograph of 1958 marks the next big step in research on Julian's *Tractatus*. Despite some minor criticisms Bouwman generally builds upon Morin's findings in his study of Julian's Biblical text⁵⁰. He compares several MS traditions and finds that Julian's lemma is equivalent to an early version of Jerome's translation; for it contains errors which Jerome is thought to have corrected in later drafts to attain a purer rendering of the text *iuxta Hebraeos*⁵¹. The MSS containing these variants may stem from an

Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron 2 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1951), 225, Julian's tractatus is the only source for this variant. For the long quotation III Rg 12:26-33 in Iul. tr. Osee 2.7.2 (CCL 88, 171f.) Julian uses his own Vulgate text. (Jerome in his commentary does not cite the passage.) Ier 2:13 in Iul. tr. Osee 3.10.9-10 (CCL 88, 198.154-55) is from the Old Latin. However, in this case Julian does not resort to his own text, but takes the passage from Hier. comm. in Osee 3.10.9-10 (CCL 76, 113.300-303). Mt 10:16 in Iul. tr. Osee 2.7.11 (CCL 88, 175.185f.), Bouwman suggests, could well be cited from memory, as again, no other source is known for this particular "Old Latin" rendering of the verse. What Bouwman does not mention is that once again Julian finds a very similar version in Jerome's commentary: Hier. comm. in Osee 2.7.11f. (CCL 76, 77.267): *astuti quasi* (Iul: *sicut*) *serpentes*.

⁵⁰ Cf. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 61-79, 76.

⁵¹ Copies of the earliest translation of Os, Ioel and Am may have circulated from as early as 392, while the text in the commentary dates from as late as 406; cf. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 76 n. 1, the reference to J. O. Smit, *De Vulgaat. Geschiedenis en herziening van de latijnse bijbelvertaling*. Bijbelse monographieën (Maaseik: Romen Roermond, 1948), 33-38, esp. 37 (table and discussion concerning Jerome's complaint about the quality of pirate copies of his autographs). See now also Kelly, *Jerome* (n. 18), 159-63 and 283-85 and S. Rebenich, *Jerome: The 'Vir Trilinguis' and the 'Hebraica Veritas'*, in *VigChr* 47 (1993) 50-77, (on chronological questions in connection with the Bible translation); cf. further Bouwman, *ibid*, 71 and, on Os 11:8 as an example of a text improvement over time, 66 n. 3, with a reference to J. Ziegler, *Die jüngeren griechischen Übersetzungen als Vorlagen der Vulgata in den prophetischen Schriften*. Personal- und Vorlesungsverzeichnis der staatlichen Akademie zu Braunsberg, Ostpreussen, 1943-1944. Beilage (Braunsberg: Ostpreussen, 1943) (on the influence of the more recent translators, the *recentiores*, Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus, upon Jerome's continuous work on the text). On the development of Jerome's attitude towards the LXX and the Bible *iuxta Hebraeos* respectively see now A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford Classical Monographs (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 41-72. It is important to recognize that Jerome's aim was not to produce an ideal Bible beyond LXX and Hebraica, but a version as close to the Hebraica as possible, besides the LXX and other translations. For that reason Jerome has no problem resorting to texts other than his translation from the Hebrew in order to get the most out for his exegesis of particular passages, for example Os 7:1-3, as we shall see below; cf. Kamesar, *ibid.*,

archetype older than the latter⁵². A group of Old Latin variants may largely result from later interventions⁵³. Bouwman's general impression is, however, that many contaminations in Julian's lemma were introduced at a very early stage in the transmission process and not eliminated or aggravated at a later stage, which suggests that it could originate from an archetype "practically identical" with an early draft of Jerome's first translation⁵⁴. After all, between the latter (ca. 392) and Julian's lemma lies an interval of less than fifty, possibly even less than thirty years.

Bouwman's textual studies⁵⁵ and his studies on Julian's language, style, hermeneutics and exegetical practice⁵⁶ have been acclaimed, his additions to the *Corpus Iulianum* mostly dismissed. Already in 1959 George De Plinval criticizes his attribution to Julian not only of the so called *Praedestinatus*, *Ad Demetriadem*, *Ad Celantiam* and the Viennese fragments (MS 954), but also of the commentary on the *Canticum*, *De bono constantiae* and others. Why

82-88, esp. 87-88, against G. Bardy, "La littérature patristique des Quaestiones et responsiones sur l'Écriture sainte", in: RB 41 (1932): 349-69, 358, who argues that Jerome worked on reconciling the differences between the different textual traditions. An analogous issue arises in the correspondence between Jerome and Augustine, where the discussion is not about the canon of Scripture, but about quantitative and qualitative textual variants in Biblical writings regarded as canonical in either (LXX and Hebrew) tradition. Thus A. Fürst, *Augustins Briefwechsel mit Hieronymus*. JAC.E 29 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1999), 140 n. 361, against R. Hennings, *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Augustinus und Hieronymus und ihr Streit um den Kanon des Alten Testaments und die Auslegung von Gal 2,11-14*. VigChr. Suppl. 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 110-21 and 131-217 (cf. also below n. 62).

⁵² Cf. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 71-76.

⁵³ Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 71, points out that the *tractatus* was transmitted via Spain, where the *Vetus Latina* remained dominant longer than elsewhere; with a reference to D. De Bruyne, "Étude sur les origines de la Vulgate en Espagne", in: RBén 31 (1914-1919): 373-401. It remains to be asked, however, whether the various types of variants can be divided into "very early" and "late" ones as "sharply" as Bouwman suggests on p. 68. As indicated under n. 51, some variants close to Old Latin readings may go back to Jerome himself, or to the earliest copists of his early drafts, as Bouwman himself points out on pp. 71 and 75.

⁵⁴ Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 75-76; cf. Jerome's complaint that friend and foe alike spread pirate copies of his works, which were of doubtful quality: Hier. epist. 48 (49) ad Pammachium 2.2 (CSEL 54, 348.2): statim ut aliquid scripsero, aut amatores mei aut invidi diuerso quidem studio, sed pari certamine in vulgus nostra disseminant.

⁵⁵ Carried further by the critical edition of the *tractatus* prepared by C. Van Deyck, completed by L. De Coninck and M. D'Hondt (CCL 88, xvii), and by the critical edition of the Vulgate text of the Minor Prophets (s. above nn. 39 and 41).

⁵⁶ Cf. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 52-60 and 80-135.

not ascribe to Julian the prefaces and translations of Anianus of Celeda as well? he asks⁵⁷. Such attributions cannot be made on purely lexicological grounds, he adds⁵⁸. Historical and psychological aspects must be considered as well. Bouwman's attempts to secure a chronology of Julian's literary activity on the basis of his use of different versions of Biblical texts in the *Tractatus* deserve similar criticism⁵⁹.

⁵⁷ G. De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), 348. But here De Plinval himself is not above criticism. The last two items certainly are Julian's (cf. above n. 25), the first, De Plinval fails to mention, has been successfully attributed to Arnobius the Younger by G. Morin, "Examen des écrits attribués à Arnobe le jeune", in: RBén 26 (1909): 419-32. Cf. Id., "Étude d'ensemble sur Arnobe le jeune", in: RBén 28 (1911): 154-90, M. Abel, "Le Praedestinatus et le Pélagianisme", in: RTAM 35 (1968): 5-25, F. Gori, *Praedestinatus*. CCL 25B (Turnhout: Brepols 2000), and (already) Jacobus Sirmondus, *Praedestinatus. Praedestinatorum haeresis et libri S. Augustino temere ascripti refutatio* (Paris: Sebastien Cramoisy, 1643) (= PL 53, 583-672, 491, 567, 671-72), and J. L. Mosheim, *Vollständige Kirchengeschichte des Neuen Testaments* 1 (Heilbronn: Eckebrecht, 1786), 737-38. The case of the *Epistula ad Demetriadem* is trickier than either Bouwman or De Plinval are able, or willing, to appreciate. Cf. O. Wermelinger, "Neuere Forschungskontroversen um Augustinus und Pelagius", in: C. Mayer & K.-H. Chelius, eds., *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinusforschung 1987* (Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1989), 189-217, 213. Similarly *Ad Celantiam* (cf. *ibid.*), of which one can merely say that R. F. Evans, *Pelagius. Inquiries and Reappraisals* (London: Black, 1968), Id., *Four Letters of Pelagius* (London: Black, 1968), has so far been more successful in attributing it to Pelagius than Bouwman has been in ascribing it to Julian. In the case of the Viennese fragments De Plinval has a personal interest, since he attributes them to Pelagius. Cf. G. De Plinval, *Essai sur le style et la langue de Pélagie*. Collectanea Friburgensia. Nouvelle serie, fasc. 31 (Fribourg en Suisse: Librairie de l'Université, 1947), 9 n. 5. But cf. Nuvolone-Solignac, "Pélagie" (n. 25), 2900. Finally, De Plinval fails to mention the *Libellus fidei*, on which he agrees with Bouwman (but see above under n. 21).

⁵⁸ De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), 349.

⁵⁹ Cf. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 78-79; as mentioned under n. 26, Bouwman aims for a late date of the *Tractatus* (around 439). His main evidence from the Biblical text is that Julian relies almost exclusively on the Vulgate. But the lemma of the *expositio in Iob* is also a version of the Vulgate, and the citations from other Biblical books are also taken in part from the Vulgate and partly from the Vetus Latina. Citations in Turb. and Flor. are also from the Vetus Latina, but again, Job and Kohelet, and, in one passage, Isaiah, are cited from the Vulgate, while elsewhere in these two writings Isaiah is cited from the Vetus Latina. In his translation of Theodore's of Mopsuestia commentary on the Psalms Julian cites from both, the Vetus Latina and Jerome's translation from the Hebrew. This evidence provides no basis whatsoever for putting the writings in any chronological order. Historical and theological aspects must be considered as well. But here Bouwman displays a weakness. For example, criticizing (on p. 79 n. 3) Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 20 (see above n. 33), he is, of course, right in that it is not, or rather, it should not be considered, "Pelagian" (in the sense of "heretical") to hold that sins are committed in imitation (imitatio, similitudo) of Adam's transgression, as Iul. tr. Osee 2.6.7 (CCL 88,

De Plinval wants to evaluate Julian's exegesis in its historical context. He presents Julian as a representative of a widespread late fourth, early fifth century "rationalist-moralist" Biblical movement, the western branch of which later became associated with "Pelagianism"⁶⁰. Deposed and exiled for his sympathy for the latter

167f.). For even Jerome holds that view: Hier. comm. in Osee 2.6.6f. (CCL 76, 66f.). What he does not consider, however, is that Jerome wrote his commentary before 406. At about the same time Pelagius wrote his Pauline commentaries without being accused of heresy for another decade. When Julian wrote his commentary in the 420s Pelagius had been condemned and with him the view that sins are committed merely by imitation rather than the inheritance of, and, thereby, essential participation in, Adam's transgression. A writer anxious to pass as orthodox during that period would have modified his position accordingly in order to avoid any conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities and Augustinian propagandists like Prosper of Aquitaine and Marius Mercator. Cf. Wermelinger, *Rom und Pelagius* (n. 20), 244-53. The author of the *Tractatus*, however, reiterates and even accentuates Jerome's position. In the given historical context this makes him a potential "Pelagian" or "Semi-Pelagian". In conjunction with all the other evidence concerning the author of the *tractatus* it can be read as a characteristic of Julian's authorship. De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), 354 n. 31, argues on historical grounds against a late date of the *Tractatus* (s. above n. 26).

⁶⁰ De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), 352-53, thus duly mentions Pelagius (with his *Testimonia* and commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and the Canticum), Anianus of Celeda (with his translations of Chrysostomica), and the authors of the interlinear commentary on Job (CPL 3rd ed. 757; Dassmann, Hiob (n. 27), col. 405) as representatives of that movement in the west, not however, for example, Jerome. In contrast to this view see now, with a special focus on Pelagius, J. Tauer, "Neue Orientierungen zur Paulusexegese des Pelagius", in: *Augustinianum* 34 (1994): 313-58. On Anianus of Celeda cf. H. Marti, "Anianus von Celeda", in: Döpp-Geerlings, *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur* (n. 18), 30-31. De Plinval, *ibid.*, 352 n. 28, also lists in this context a work which he calls the "Pseudo-Augustinian *Speculum*". By that he does not seem to refer to the (probably) 5th century Italian Pseudo-Augustinian *Speculum audi Israhel* (CSEL 12, 287-700), a systematic collection of Bible passages with headings, but the *Speculum quis ignorat* (CSEL 12, 1-285), an apparently incomplete, annotated collection of Bible passages. Augustine's authorship of the latter has often been doubted, but never convincingly disproved. De Plinval had tried to attribute it to a Pelagian author (cf. *ibid.*, 352 n. 28), because in his opinion its teaching on grace was Pelagian in tendency. For Augustine's authorship cf. most recently A. Mutzenbecher, "Der Nachtrag zu den Retraktionen mit Augustins letzten Werken", in: *REAug* 30 (1984): 60-83, 63-71, who dates the work into 427, after the completion of the *Retractiones*. This also explains Augustine's use of Jerome's Vulgate in this work, a text which he rejected a decade earlier, but to which he seems to have subscribed during the later 420s; see on this question A.-M. Bonnardière, "Augustin a-t-il utilisé la Vulgate de Jérôme?" in *Saint Augustin et la Bible. Bible de tous le temps* 3, ed. A.-M. La Bonnardière (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986), 303-12; ET: *Augustine and the Bible. The Bible through the Ages* 2, ed. P. Bright (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986), 42-51. On Augustine's adaptation and on other aspects of the impact of Jerome's translation from the Hebrew cf. also my forth-

Julian continued his work under the auspices of the most illustrious eastern representative of that Biblical movement, Theodore of Mopsuestia.

De Plinval detects three basic rules, according to which Julian conducts his exegesis: 1. Establish the respective Biblical author's main intention and analyse the structural coherence (*consequentia*) of the text under review⁶¹! 2. Clarify obscure passages and "make them plain"⁶²! 3. Treat the historical meaning of the text as its basic

coming article "A Shift in Patristic Exegesis".

Tauer in particular has shown that it is Pelagius's thought, and that of other representatives of that movement, which is embedded in a larger exegetical tradition, rather than that tradition, which originates from a particular kind of "Pelagian" (in the sense of "inherently heretical") way of thinking as promoted by those exegetes, which were later branded as "Pelagian", like Pelagius or, in the present case, Julian of Aeclanum. De Plinval clearly suggests the latter and his assumption is vital for his evaluation of Julian's exegesis. A case in point is his rejection out of hand on p. 350, n. 18, of Wörter's suggestion that the later Julian may in a certain sense have "converted" to "Semi-Pelagianism", and his unlikely call upon Klasen and Bruckner to support his case. Cf. F. Wörter, *Der Pelagianismus nach seinem Ursprung und seiner Lehre. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Dogmas von der Gnade und Freiheit* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Wagner, (1866) 1874), 396-402; F. Klasen, *Die innere Entwicklung des Pelagianismus. Beiträge zur Dogmengeschichte* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1882), 250-60; Bruckner, *Julian von Aeclanum* (n. 12), 163-65. Klasen fundamentally dismisses the theological relevance of Julian's thought. Bruckner is more balanced, but less optimistic than Wörter. De Plinval is right in that the idea of a "conversion" to "Semi-Pelagianism" is ill-conceived. He does not appreciate, however, that among late 420s and 430s western theologians Julian's looks less extreme than Augustine's. It is more in tune with that of a John Cassian, of a Vincent of Lérins or of an Arnobius the Younger than that of a Prosper of Aquitaine or a Marius Mercator. Wörter had a point in that respect and was largely misunderstood by Klasen, Bruckner and De Plinval. On this whole area see now also R. A. Markus, "The Legacy of Pelagius: Orthodoxy, Heresy and Conciliation", in: R. Williams, ed., *The Making of Orthodoxy. Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 214-34.

⁶¹ Cf. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 80-87.

⁶² De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), 355 n. 33, immediately ridicules this aim as "ramener [sc. ces passages] à quelques formules claires et banales" and, mysteriously, contrasts Julian's exegesis of Am 1:3-5 in tr. Amos 1.1.3-5 (CCL 88, 262-265) with Augustine's of Am 6:1-6 in doct. 4.7.16-20 (CCL 32, 128-131), an entirely different passage, completely ignoring the fact that Augustine merely interprets his passage to explain the use of rhetorical devices (*quae pertinent ad praecepta eloquentiae*), while Julian explores the fundamental purpose and real meaning of the whole work (cf. the first and third rule of Julian's exegesis according to De Plinval!). On Julian's exegesis of Am 6:1-6 cf. Iul. tr. Amos 2.6.1-6 (CCL 88, 299-302), on Augustine's see M. Moreau, "Sur un commentaire d'Amos", in: A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Saint Augustin et la Bible. Bible de tous le temps 3* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986), 313-22, and A.-M. La Bonnardière, "Augustin a-t-il utilisé la Vulgate de Jérôme?" in: *ibid.*, 303-12. These two articles suggest that in doct. 4.7.16-20 Augustine, who elsewhere criticizes Jerome for replacing the seasoned LXX translation with his

meaning (i. e. the meaning with the highest degree of reality). Treat allegory and other non-historical ways of interpretation as secondary to the historical meaning of the text⁶³!

Julian, De Plinval argues, reads Hosea, Joel and Amos as "poetic transpositions of contemporary disasters"⁶⁴. By "disasters" he

new version ex hebraeo, resorts to the latter, as it seems, on purpose to write what in fact becomes "un hommage à Jérôme" (p. 314). Cf. Fürst, *Augustins Briefwechsel mit Hieronymus* (n. 51), 139-45 and 223-24. Doctr. 4.7.16-20, dating from around 425/6, is one among several passages that show that in his later works Augustine adapts the technique used by Jerome and Julian of comparing the two versions for exegetical purposes (La Bonnardière, "Augustin", 311-12).

⁶³ Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 111-13 and 130-32, and De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), 355-56, tend to formulate the principle in a too simplistic fashion, as if one type of interpretation is supposed to entirely suppress the other. That way they see the use of allegory and typology by Julian as an inconsistency. However, Julian and the Antiochenes merely defend the priority of the historical perspective, against the dominance of allegory and typology, not against their very existence. For a balanced survey of the problem cf. now F. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 161-85.

⁶⁴ De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), p. 356. Here De Plinval takes for granted that Julian, like Jerome and Theodore, sees Joel as a contemporary of Hosea and Amos. Cf. Iul. tr. Iohel prol. (CCL 88, 227.17), Hier. comm. in Ioelem 1.1 (CCL 76, 161.34f.), Theod. Mops. in Ioelem prol. (79.29f. Sprenger). On Amos cf. Iul. tr. Amos 1.1.1 (CCL 88, 260.4f.), Hier. comm. in Amos 1.1.1 (CCL 76, 212.13-15), Theod. Mops. in Amosum 1.1 (109.22-24 Sprenger). Hosea and Amos can be dated from Os 1:1 and Am 1:1. Both are said to have lived under king Jeroboam II. of Israel (786-746) and king Oziah of Judah (786-736). Hosea is also reported to have lived on, through the reigns of kings Jotham (756-741) and Ahaz (742-725), to that of king Hezekiah (725-696) of Judah. Corroborating internal evidence suggests that Amos prophesied earlier than Hosea. Cf. Wolff, *Joel und Amos* (n. 41), 105-106. As a book, however, Hosea in its final edition predates Amos and takes precedence over the latter in the canon. Jerome makes no difference between the persons and the literary products, when he writes on Am 1:1 that first comes Hosea, then Joel and then Amos, but all lived in one generation. The book of Joel bears no title which would allow it to be dated on its own grounds. However, in cases like this, Theodore, Jerome and Julian keep to the rule that every book which does not bear its own date is to be dated after the last book preceding it which does bear its own date. In the case of Joel this is, of course, Os. Theodore, Julian and Jerome therefore agree that Joel is a contemporary of Hosea and Amos and that his prophecy falls in between the other two. It would be less easy to sustain this position, if it was not corroborated by internal evidence, i. e. the content of Joel, which seems very similar to that of Os and Am. Julian, for example, can write in the prologue: 'he [Joel] has suffered the cruelties and abuses of the same kings [as Hosea], he has accused the same crimes of the raging people and announced to those who committed crimes the same imminent torments'. This encouraged even more recent exegetes, like J. Schmalohr, *Das Buch Joel, übersetzt und erklärt. Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 7/4* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1922), to treat Joel as a contemporary of Hosea and Amos, or, like M. BIC, *Das Buch Joel* (Berlin:

(De Plinval) here means the "political" disasters recorded in 1 and 2 Kings, i. e. the Assyrian invasion of the northern kingdom in 722, Sennacherib's campaign in 701, and the Babylonian invasion of 587, whereby the latter cannot strictly be called "contemporary"⁶⁵. The prophecies of salvation, he continues, Julian associates with Hezekiah's reign of peace as preliminary to the eschatological

Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1960), even earlier, into the reign of king Joash (837-800). The common opinion now, however, is that Joel dates from the post-exilic period; Willi-Plein, "Das Zwölfprophetenbuch" (n. 30), 372: "Joel belongs into the period of Persian rule." It was first put forward by W. Vatke, *Die biblische Theologie 1: Die Religion des Alten Testaments nach den kanonischen Büchern entwickelt* (Berlin: Bethge, 1835), who thought of the 5th century. Wolff, *Joel und Amos* (n. 41), 2-4, thought the 4th century more likely. J. L. Crenshaw, *Joel*. Anchor Bible 24C (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 21-29, favours once more the 5th century.

Another point which De Plinval fails to address in this context is Julian's struggle with the prophets' commutatio temporum ἐναλλαγή τοῦ χρόνου, their apparent presentation of past events as future ones and vice versa. Cf. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 83-85; Sprenger, *Theodori Mopsuesteni* (n. 31), 90-91. Like Theodore and Jerome, Julian was, of course, not entirely oblivious to the fact that the problem lay in the nature of the Hebrew tempora. Cf. Iul. tr. Osee 1.1.2-5 (CCL 88, 124.277f.) with Hier. comm. in Osee 1.1.2 (CCL 76, 8.80f.) and Iul. tr. Amos 1.4.1-3 (CCL 88, 279.51) on characteristics of the Hebrew language (idiomata hebraei sermonis). But other than Jerome – and more like Theodore – Julian sees the problem as a literary and also an historical one, affecting his intention to clarify the consequences of the text and the contemporary-historical reference of the prophecy under review. Cf. Iul. Theod. Mops. exp. Ps 9.35 (CCL 88A, 52.360-62) on commutatio temporum as a key to understand the passage and Julian's commentary on Joel 2 and 3, e. g. his identification of Hezekiah with the doctor iustitiae, ridiculed by De Plinval (see below n. 66), with Theodore's prologue on Amos, where he develops an extensive argument on why Amos's prophecy should be seen in the historical context of Hezekiah's reign. On Theodore's use of ὑποθέσεις in this context cf. Schäublin, *Untersuchungen* (n. 27), 84-94. Strobl, *Eine Untersuchung* (n. 26), 69-71, quite rightly suggests: „Dass Julian zunächst an keiner Stelle an Christus und das NT denken lässt, rückt ihn allerdings in die Nähe Theodors“; cf. also Bultmann, *Die Exegese* (n. 41), 96-109.

Indeed, one of the most striking features of Theodore's and Julian's exegeses is that they treat the prophecies concerned as if they were historical records of the future, i. e. the (short term, contemporary-historical) future from the point of view of those prophecies, which by now (in Theodore's and Julian's time) has, of course, once more become the past, as historically recorded in 1 and 2 Kings (III and IV Reg). Even motifs from the New Testament are treated in this way. E. g. the motif of the coming of Christ is divided into an (historical) first and an (eschatological) second coming, whereby the first coming, historically recorded in the New Testament, is given priority. Thus it seems, as if the eschatological future is seen as but a small (remaining) section of the whole of history. In De Plinval's opinion this is, of course, mere rationalism and historicism, lacking in theological vision and spiritual depth (cf. below nn. 66, 67 and 71).

⁶⁵ Jerome and Julian are aware of that problem. But cf. Hier. comm. in Amos 3.7.1-3 (CCL 76, 313-15), Iul. tr. Amos 2.7.1 (CCL 88, 305f.), and below n. 66.

salvation in Christ⁶⁶. But "historical" is not necessarily "political" for Julian and his preference for the historical does not exclude the allegorical⁶⁷. The detailed description of a locust plague in Joel 1:4, for

⁶⁶ Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 129 n. 3, argues that Julian himself develops this motif, which, he says, can be found only once in Theodore's commentary on the Minor Prophets: Theod. Mops. comm. in Oseam 1.6-10 (7 Sprenger). But see also *ibid.* prol. (1.21 Sprenger), 1.1 (3 Sprenger), and in Ioelem 2.1 (86 Sprenger). He admits that it occurs several times in Theodore's commentary on Psalms and quotes the same passages as De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), 356-57 n. 38, but unlike De Plinval he does not seem to accept this as evidence for a dependence of Julian's *tractatus* on Theodore's commentary on Psalms. Cf. Iul. Theod. Mops. comm. in Pss 13 (CCL 88A, 65-71; 78-86 Devreesse), 28 (CCL 88A, 128-31; 132-34 Devreesse), and 29 (CCL 88A, 132-35; 135-37 Devreesse), and already Morin, "Un ouvrage" (n. 4), 19 n. 13, and Vaccari, "Nuova opera" (n. 13), 587. Bouwman and De Plinval agree, however, on excluding Jerome's commentary on the Minor Prophets as a possible source of the motif. But cf. Hier. comm. in Amos 3.7.1-3 (CCL 76, 313-14), where Jerome pointedly rejects an eschatological interpretation of Amos's vision of salvation (God has pity with Jacob and saves him from annihilation) as premature. The prophet's vision, he insists, refers first and foremost to Hezekiah, who expressed his hopes for "peace in my days" (IV Reg 20:19). So it does not even include his children, let alone the present age, Jerome points out. It therefore leaves open the possibility of further disasters preceeding the final cataclysm. This insistence on underpinning any eschatological interpretation with a historical one is an important precondition for developing a meaningful salvation-historical interpretation of Hezekiah's reign as a preliminary to Christ's eschatological rule, as Julian does, though admittedly not for this particular passage, Am 7:1-3 (on a reason for that cf. Bouwman, *ibid.*, 36, and De Plinval, *ibid.*, 358 n. 44). But cf. Iul. tr. Osee 3.10.11-12 (CCL 88, 199f.), tr. Iohel 2.26-27 (CCL 88, 246.364-373), 3.20-21 (CCL 88, 258f.) on Hezekiah's reign as a historical preliminary to Christ's eschatological reign, and tr. Osee 1.1.6-7 (CCL 88, 127f.), 3.12.1 (CCL 88, 208.28-38), 3.13.13 (CCL 88, 220f.), 3.14.1-7 (CCL 88, 223f.), tr. Iohel 2.28-32 (CCL 88, 248.250.252), 3.4-8 (CCL 88, 254f.), 3.20f. (CCL 88, 258f.) on the relative importance of Hezekiah's rule in the prophecies of Hosea and Joel. Bouwman's and De Plinval's judgments must therefore be differentiated. Julian did get some idea about the relative importance of the reign of Hezekiah from both, Theodore and Jerome, but he also developed this idea further in his own exegesis, especially on Hosea and Joel. Finally, in tr. Iohel 2.26-27 Julian hints at a further possible source for the idea, when he notes that the emphasis on the special role of Hezekiah in salvation history goes back to the prophet Isaiah (cf. Bultmann, *Die Exegese* (n. 41), 96 n. 1). De Plinval, *ibid.*, 357-58 n. 42, ignores that passage, when he declares Julian's exegesis of Joel 2:23 (*dedit uobis doctorem iustitiae*) as banal, because Julian sets out with a literal understanding of the verse: "He gave you a learned professor of ethics", before concluding (CCL 88, 246.362-373) that according to the prophet Isaiah the verse ultimately refers, beyond Hezekiah, to Christ.

⁶⁷ De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), 358, sees this sophistication as a development for the worse, an impoverishment and a decline of exegesis even compared to Pelagius. Julian, he argues, is cool and detached, superficial and vague. He lacks the fear of God that would breath life into the threats and promises of the prophets. See in contrast Schäublin, *Untersuchungen* (n. 27), 26-27, on the problematic ethos of Antiochene exegesis, especially as represented by Theodore of Mopsuestia (cf. above n. 64).

example, he understands strictly literally as a natural disaster, a natural-historical as opposed to a political-historical event⁶⁸. Then he goes on, however, in the wake of Jerome, to interpret the same event allegorically, with the four types of locusts representing the four basic emotions of the soul (hope, joy, fear and pain)⁶⁹. De Plinval is ultimately unable to appreciate the theological value of this kind of exegesis, although he recognizes that rationality and the goodness of God are Julian's guiding principles⁷⁰. He criticizes that Julian does not allow for every passage in the Bible to be interpreted directly and unequivocally as signifying the eschatological reality of Christ and the Church⁷¹.

⁶⁸ Again an opportunity for De Plinval to decry the banality and inconsistency of Julian's work. Cf. also Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 112. But Jerome, too, reports from his own experience of a real locust plague in Palestine: Hier. comm. in Ioel 2.1-11 (CCL 76, 178.95-96): hoc nuper in hac prouincia uidimus... Nevertheless, he and Theodore both go on to apply the four types of locusts to the four powers which submitted Israel in history, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Greeks and the Romans, whereas Julian insists that prior to such an exegesis one has to take into account the real possibility of devastating locust plagues in Palestine (again he may have got this information from Jerome!) and suggests to discuss the event in terms of natural science. Having considered that aspect, however, he moves on to suggest that there is also a possibility of understanding the four types of locust as signifying the four emotions of the soul (cf. below n. 69). On the whole passage see also Strobl, *Eine Untersuchung* (n. 26), 93-105, and already A. Merx, *Die Prophetie des Joel und ihre Ausleger* (Halle: Waisenhaus, 1879), 179-80.

⁶⁹ The whole passage extends from Iul. tr. Ioel 1.2 to 2.19f. (CCL 88, 228-44). The allegory is drawn from Hier. comm. in Ioel 1.4 (CCL 76, 164). Bouwman and De Plinval both criticize Julian for including it in his commentary, but fail to mention the source. On the classical sources for the psychological model behind the allegory (including Augustine) see now G. J. P. O'Daly, "Affectus I-II," in: *Augustinus-Lexikon* 1/1-2 (1986): 166-71, 167; on Jerome cf. H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics. A study on the Apologists, Jerome and other Christian writers*. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 6 (Göteborg: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1958), 331-46. The classical background may have tempted Julian to include it in his commentary, not, however, without modifying it considerably; cf. Strobl, *Eine Untersuchung* (n. 26), 101-104.

⁷⁰ De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), 359: For Julian there is 1. a rational explanation for every single detail in the text. 2. Prophetic threats are usually not ending in real disasters because of God's patience. 3. If nevertheless evil occurs, it is because people act foolishly. Moreover, every evil is contingent. In the end God restores everything. Of course, combined, these principles make up a perfect recipe for reducing the threat of Old Testament prophecy.

⁷¹ De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), 362, contrasts this with Ambrose's and Augustine's intention of relating every single detail in the Bible to this reality. Julian's attitude is, of course, guided by the principle of Antiochene, and especially Theodore's, exegesis, according to which only a few passages in the Old Testament may be interpreted as τύποι μελλόντων, which leads Antiochene exegetes to restrict themselves almost entirely to an historical exegesis of the Old Testament. Cf. Sprenger, *Theodori Mopsuesteni* (n. 31), 127.

De Plinval concludes by decrying the secondary, epigonal, character of Julian's work, his "re-writing" of Jerome's commentary in a spiritually mediocre and secularist fashion⁷². In his view Julian's achievements lie in using Jerome's new Biblical translation, and his and others', like Theodore's and Polychronius' commentaries, distilling them into a brilliant Late Latin and acquaint a wider public with an exegesis that concentrates on the historical and literary detail rather than mystical-theological speculation. Julian may be granted a tiny share in Jerome's great merit of mediating between east and west, on the whole, however, he remains vastly inferior to a Jerome or Theodore of Mopsuestia; and even compared to a Pelagius or an Anianus of Celeda he lacks spiritual generosity and self-abnegation. He is, and should remain, a personality of the second tier⁷³.

This verdict is unjustified, the result of an analysis lacking in depth and limited to the *Tractatus*, which should be judged by its own merit, and compared to works similar rather than dissimilar to itself. Julian's literary output as a whole should be seen against the background of his turbulent life and the age in which he lived. Its epigonal character is shared, to a greater or lesser degree, by that of other authors, above all Jerome's⁷⁴. Moreover, it cannot alter the fact that the degree of learning, level of philosophical reflection and literary skill displayed by Julian are exceptional, not only by the standards of his own, but by the standards of any age.

⁷² De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), 362-64.

⁷³ De Plinval, "Julien d'Éclane devant la Bible" (n. 26), 365-66.

⁷⁴ Take, for example, the dependency of Jerome's commentary on Zechariah on that of Didymus the Blind. Cf. L. Doutreleau, ed., *Didyme l'Aveugle. Sur Zacharie: texte inédit d'après un papyrus de Tournai 1-3*. SC 83-85 (Paris: Cerf, 1962), vol. 1, 129-37. For all his commentaries Jerome drew extensively on Rabbinic and earlier Christian sources. For Hosea, for example, he names Appolinarius, Origen, Pierius, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Didymus the Blind. Cf. Hier. comm. in Osee prol. (CCL 76, 4f.). For Zechariah he adds Hippolytus. Cf. Hier. comm. in Zachariam prol. (CCL 76A, 748.30). For Joel and Amos he refers to "others". Cf. Hier. comm. in Ioelem 2.28 (CCL 76, 193f.): *alius dicit...*; comm. in Amos 1.3.3 (CCL 76, 245.64ff.): *... legi in cuiusdam commentariis...* He certainly drew on commentaries of Origen's on Joel and Amos. Cf. Y.-M. Duval, "Vers le Commentaire sur Joël d'Origène", in G. Dorival & A. Le Boulluec, eds., *Origeniana Sexta. Origène et la Bible*. Betl 118 (Leuven: Peeters, 1995), 393-410, and the edition of fragments of the latter from P. Oxy. XIII 1601 by R. Reitzenstein, "Origenes und Hieronymus", in: ZNW 20 (1921): 90-93. See now also Y.-M. Duval, "Vers l'In Malachiam d'Origène. Jérôme et Origène en 406", in: W. A. Bienert & U. Kühneweg, Eds., *Origeniana Septima. Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts*. Betl 137 (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 233-59.

Today it is much easier than in the days of Morin, Bouwman and De Plinval to make this case in point, with De Coninck's edition of 1977, though sadly it cannot be called "complete"⁷⁵, H. N. Sprenger's edition of the same year of Theodore's of Mopsuestia commentary on the Minor Prophets⁷⁶, and M. Adriaen's edition (post Vallarsi) of Jerome's commentary on the Minor Prophets of 1970⁷⁷. Furthermore, scholarship nowadays thinks differently than yet De Plinval about the dependency of later authors on earlier ones⁷⁸.

De Plinval was certainly right in calling the *Tractatus* a "re-writing" of Jerome's commentaries on Hosea, Joel and Amos. He could have called it by an equally fashionable expression a «relecture». It was a "re-writing" influenced in spirit, if not letter, by Theodore's commentaries on Hosea, Joel and Amos. But De Plinval was wrong to consider the *Tractatus* an inferior work for that. He might have come to a different conclusion, if he had compared the three authors in detail. Bouwman had compared the texts, but had failed to appreciate Julian's originality as a writer and thinker. His verdict that Julian has merely "copied" Jerome⁷⁹ is contradicted by his own findings concerning Julian's language, style, compositional technique, exegetical method and theological content. For these are not only similar, but also dissimilar to Jerome's and Theodore's. Both, similarities and dissimilarities alike need to be studied in more detail. The new editions have made this much easier. Strobl in her work on *tr. Iohel* has shown how it can be done. A lot however still remains to be done, before we can say that we can now fully evaluate the achievement and limitations of Julian's contribution to Late Ancient Biblical exegesis.

Leuven

Josef LÖSSL

⁷⁵ Cf. the detailed critique of De Coninck's edition (cf. above nn. 2 and 26) by Y.-M. Duval, "Iulianus Aeclanensis restitutus" (n. 21). M. Lamberigts, "Some remarks on the critical edition of the preserved fragments of Julian of Aeclanum", in: RTAM 54 (1987): 238-39, contains a number of useful remarks, though nothing in particular on the tractatus, similarly M. Stein, "Bemerkungen zu Iulianus von Aeclanum", in: JAC 43 (2000) 122-125.

⁷⁶ Cf. above n. 31.

⁷⁷ M. Adriaen, ed., *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera. Pars I. Opera Exegetica 6. Commentarii in Prophetas Minores*. CCL 76 and 76A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1970).

⁷⁸ See, for example, the excellent study by Strobl, *Eine Untersuchung* (n. 26).

⁷⁹ Cf. Bouwman, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar* (n. 1), 125 and 131.