

RECENT RESEARCH INTO PELAGIANISM¹ WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON THE ROLE OF JULIAN OF AECLANUM

1. Introduction

The Pelagian controversy, which raged primarily in the western part of the Roman Empire², is generally considered to have been the first theological controversy to have confronted the Latin Christian church and there can be little doubt that its reception left a profound mark on the history of western theology. The African Church Father Augustine of Hippo earned the honorary title *doctor gratiae* for his part therein on account of his many interventions as the eminent defender of grace against the Pelagians whom he accused of being the *inimici gratiae*³. Augustine's works contain an often pointed summary

¹ Reliable surveys, particularly with respect to Pelagius, can be found in the following (in chronological order): C. GARCIA-SANCHEZ, *Pelagius and Christian Initiation: A Study in Historical Theology*, Washington, 1978, 9-103 (concentrates on recent interpretations of Pelagius' vision of the sanctity of the Church); F.G. NUVOLONE, *Pélage et Pélagianisme. I. Les écrivains*, in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* 12,2 (1986) 2889-2923; O. WERMELINGER, *Neuere Forschungskontroversen um Augustinus und Pelagius*, in C. MAYER & K.H. CHELIUS (Hrsg.), *Internationales Symposium über den Stand der Augustinus-Forschung vom 12. bis 16. April 1987 im Schloss Rauischholzhausen der Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen* (Cassiciacum, 39/1), Würzburg, 1989, 189-217; G. BONNER, *Pelagius/Pelagianischer Streit*, in *TRE* 26 (1996) 176-185. In light of the fact that reference can be made with respect to Pelagius to the excellent study of O. Wermelinger, a supplement to which is offered in a recent study penned by the present author, the Pelagius segment can be kept to a minimum; cf. M. LAMBERIGTS, *Pélage: la réhabilitation d'un hérétique*, in J. PIROTTE & E. LOUCHEZ (eds.), *Deux mille ans d'histoire de l'Eglise. Bilan et perspectives historiographiques* (RHE 95/3 [2000]), pp. 97-111. At the same time, in light of the aims of the symposium, in the context of which the present contribution is being offered, attention has been explicitly drawn once again to a number of elements in order to satisfy the target audience. Our own attention will focus for the most part on Julian of Aeclanum, whose works, certainly within the context of the Pelagian controversy, extend widely beyond those of all the other Pelagians.

² The reader is reminded, perhaps unnecessarily, that the role of Rufinus the Syrian in the debates surrounding the *tradux peccati* dogma should not be underestimated; cf. NUVOLONE, *Pélage et Pélagianisme*, 2890-2891; vgl. also W. DUNPHY, *Rufinus the Syrian's Books*, in *Augustinianum* 23 (1983) 523-529; ID., *Marius Mercator on Rufinus the Syrian. Was Schwartz mistaken?*, in *Augustinianum* 32 (1992) 279-288.

³ See, for example, G. BONNER, *Augustine and Pelagianism*, in *Augustinian Studies* 24 (1993) 27-47 (Reprint in ID., *Church and Faith in the Patristic Tradition. Augustine, Pelagianism, and Early Christian Northumbria* (Collected Studies Series), Aldershot, 1996 [7th study]). While a good survey of the studies devoted to Augustine's part in the controversy would be far from an unnecessary luxury, such a survey remains beyond the boundaries of the present literature review.

of what he considered to be objectionable in Pelagian thought⁴. It would appear, however, that the tradition was not always so ill at ease with Pelagian perspectives as was the case with Augustine of Hippo, certainly if one takes into account the fact that several so-called Pelagian documents have survived to the present day because the said tradition had ascribed them to other, "orthodox", Christian authors. Perhaps the most striking example thereof is Pelagius' *Epistula ad Demetriadem*, authorship of which was ascribed for a significant period of time either to Jerome or to Augustine himself⁵ on account of the quality of the ascetic content of the work. When scholars came to be convinced that the work could be ascribed with certainty to Pelagius, it suddenly acquired the epithets 'un-evangelical' and 'non-Pauline'⁶, a somewhat surprising change of perspective given the fact that Pelagius' writings tended to afford a significant amount of space to commentary on the letters of Paul⁷.

2. Dogmatic heresy versus historical reality

The manner with which Augustine struggled with the Pelagians led in part to the fact that dogmatic theology, rooted in doctrinal pre-suppositions, transformed Pelagianism into a system that was quickly qualified as heretical⁸. Constant elements in the presentation of this system as set of coherent dogmatic propositions included the suggestion that the human person was capable of maintaining the commandments of God under his/her own steam, as it were, and that he/she was

⁴ See in this regard O. WERMELINGER, *Rom und Pelagius* (Päpste und Papsttum, 7), Stuttgart, 1975, esp. pp. 278-282.

⁵ Cf. PL 30, 15-45; PL 33, 1099-1120.

⁶ Cf. G. DE PLINVAL, *Pélage, ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme*, Lausanne, 1943, pp. 245-251; J. B. VALERO, *Las bases antropológicas de Pelagio en su tratado de las Expositiones*, Madrid, 1980, pp. 326-330. De Plinval is also worthy of praise for being among the first who provided a more positive picture of Pelagius from the historical-critical perspective. For the English speaking world, reference can be made in this regard to J. FERGUSON, *Pelagius*, Cambridge, 1956 (reprint, New York, 1978). B.R. REES, *Pelagius: A Reluctant Heretic*, Woodbridge, 1988 offers a well written outline of the Pelagian controversy but does not as such introduce anything new.

⁷ See in this regard *Expositiones XIII epistularum Pauli: Pelagius' Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul*, ed. A. SOUTER (Texts and Studies, 9/2), Cambridge, 1926; H.J. FREDE, *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar* (Vetus Latina. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel, 7-8), Freiburg, 1973-1974, 2 vol. Th. DE BRUYN, *Pelagius' Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, Oxford, 1993.

⁸ For a good survey see C. GARCIA-SANCHEZ, *Pelagius and Christian Initiation*.

able to realise his/her own salvation. According to this presentation of Pelagian teaching, emphasis was firmly placed on the potentialities of the will in the human struggle for perfection. As a consequence, Pelagians were accused of affirming only a *gratia adiuvans*. In addition, such grace was considered to be an "external" form of assistance whereby the Law, the Gospels and the example of Christ were 'offered' to the human person who was free to accept their assistance or reject it without restraint or hindrance⁹. At the same time it was argued that Pelagianism denied the dogma of original sin and its consequences for human nature¹⁰, although it should be noted that prior to the time of Augustine and his colleagues¹¹ the ancient literature makes no reference to such a dogma, certainly not as it was proposed by the African bishops. Following Augustine's lead, furthermore, the Pelagians were accused of maintaining a theologically indefensible distinction between the Kingdom of God and eternal life¹². Objections raged that the Pelagians were upholding a naturalistic image of the world and humanity in which the revelatory component was insufficiently represented¹³. Without questioning the value of a systematising condemnation of (non-existent but) potentially dangerous dogmatic propositions, it remains difficult nonetheless to avoid the conclusion that more than a few of the so-called heretical positions ascribed to Pelagianism came to be presented by other authors and at different times as completely legitimate and indeed as orthodox.

⁹ One would be justified in asking the question at this juncture as to whether sufficient account has been taken of the fact that Pelagius and his followers located themselves explicitly in a context of faith from which they reflected on the potential of the human person.

¹⁰ Cf. R. HEDDE & É. AMANN, *Pélagianisme*, in DThC 12,1: "Grande hérésie qui vit le jour en Occident au début du Ve siècle et qui, partant d'une exagération des forces du libre arbitre, aboutissait à nier la nécessité de la grâce divine, la transmission du péché originel, la distinction entre l'ordre naturel et l'ordre surnaturel", a perfect rendering of what can be found among dogmatic theologians.

¹¹ Let it be clear once and for all that Augustine was not present when Caelestius was condemned in 411 and that apparent unanimity existed within the African church, at least among the bishops, with regard to the dogma of the fall.

¹² For a survey see F. REFOULE, *La distinction "Royaume de Dieu-vie éternelle" est-elle pélagienne*, in *Recherches de Science religieuse* 51 (1963) 247-254, esp. 247-249.

¹³ See the survey in WERMELINGER, *Neuere Forschungskontroversen um Augustinus und Pelagius*, 189-190.

3. The Truth of the Historians and other Problems

Within the arena of patristic research in the last decennia, the traditional image of Pelagianism outlined above has been the subject of significant refinement at a variety of levels. At the same time, scholars have not hesitated to offer serious criticism of Augustine's vision of the fall, free will and grace¹⁴. In the space allotted to us we will endeavour to sketch a number of striking developments in scholarly research into the figure of Pelagius himself, particularly in light of the fact that much work has been done in this regard over the last 50 years that has led, at least where church historians are concerned, to a thorough modification of our perspective on a figure who had once been elevated to the status of western arch-heretic par excellence.

A. Pelagius

Born in Brittany¹⁵, Pelagius was known from 380-410 primarily as a Christian ascetic and teacher. Active in Rome up to 410, he enjoyed great respect among Rome's aristocratic classes on account of his highly principled life style and his ethical demands with respect to life of a Christian¹⁶. He tended to place the emphasis on those ethical values that continued to enjoy significant respect in the aforementioned milieus and formulated critical observations concerning the fact that since 380 many had embraced Christianity for opportunistic reasons but were unwilling to take its demands seriously. It might be reasonable to argue that such criticism was not typical of Pelagius. Indeed, it remains possible that the same objections were likewise formulated by other authors of the period. The fact remains, however, that in light of similar emphases or on account of ideological presuppositions in the (recent) past Pelagius' work tended either to be generously extended or (hyper-)critically restricted¹⁷. As a conse-

¹⁴ Restrained by the limits of the present contribution, we are unable to address this sometimes radical criticism of Augustine in greater detail. An interesting endeavour to offer a critical evaluation of Augustine's critics from the perspective of Augustine himself can be found in R. DODARO & G. LAWLESS (eds.), *Augustine and his Critics. Essays in honour of Gerald Bonner*, London & New York, 2000.

¹⁵ Cf. AUGUSTINUS, *Epistula* 186,1, CSEL 57, p. 45.

¹⁶ See in this regard esp. P. BROWN, *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine*, London, 1972, pp. 183-226.

¹⁷ A significant gulf exists between G. DE PLINVAL, *Recherches sur l'œuvre littéraire de Pélage*, in RPh 60 (1934) 9-42 and R.F. EVANS, *Four Letters of Pelagius*, London, 1968. The fact that a maximalist such as De Plinval was inclined to express

quence, and in spite of intensive research into the question of authenticity concerning Pelagius' writings, scholars still lack certainty in this regard¹⁸. It is interesting to note, nevertheless, that a not unimportant group of authors shared a similar intuition with respect to the earnestness with which the ethical demands of Christianity were being treated at the time. It should likewise be noted, albeit as an aside, that a reliable edition of Pelagius' commentary on the letters of Paul has only recently been placed at our disposal¹⁹. All this has led to the requirement that a significant number of ideas that have been ascribed to Pelagius on the basis of a broader understanding of the *corpus Pelagianum* deserve to be treated with the utmost prudence and that

severe critique of those tending more towards a restricted view such as T. BOHLIN, *Die Theologie des Pelagius und ihre Genesis*, Uppsala & Wiesbaden, 1957, remains evident; cf. G. DE PLINVAL, *Points de vue récent sur la littérature pélagienne*, in *RechSR* 29 (1951) 282-294; cf. also the survey to be found in WERMELINGER, *Neuere Forschungskontroversen um Augustinus und Pelagius*, 192-193. Evans's well documented restrictions were even considered by Wermelinger to be too broad still. He thus suggests that questions ought to be asked with respect to the attribution of the letters *Ad Celantiam*, *De divina lege*, and *Ad Claudiam* to Pelagius. The suggestion made by NUVOLONE, *Pélage et pélagianisme*, 2915-2917 and WERMELINGER, *Neuere Forschungskontroversen um Augustin und Pelagius*, 215 that the works *De divitiis*, *De malis doctoribus* and *De castitate* might be ascribed to the later bishop of Rome, Sixtus III, is rejected in the complex argumentation of A. KESSLER, *Reichtumskritik und Pelagianismus. Die pelagianische Diatribe de divitiis: Situierung, Lesetext, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Paradosis. Beiträge zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur und Theologie, 43), Freiburg, 1999, 136-144. All three authors accept the fact that the authorship question cannot be settled once and for all on the basis of the material we have at our disposal. The present author is more interested in the observation that Sixtus was himself a supporter of Pelagius; cf. AUGUSTINUS, *Epistula* 191,1, CSEL 57, 164: "magni momenti patronus (= Sixtus)". The question of the actual author of the abovementioned corpus to one side, it remains true that the corpus in question reveals that we are dealing with a highly ascetic individual who, within Christianity, desired to inspire his audience to take his message seriously.

¹⁸ Certitude exists only with respect to the commentary on Paul, the letter to Demetrias and the *Libellus fidei* (although the present author is inclined to have doubts in this regard, partly on account of the clear parallels with the *Libellus* of Caelestius) and a number of fragments including *De natura* and *Pro libero arbitrio*. See in this regard R.F. EVANS, *Pelagius. Inquiries and Reappraisals*, London, 1968; ID., *Four Letters of Pelagius*. Cf. also WERMELINGER, *Neuere Forschungskontroversen um Augustinus und Pelagius*, passim and KESSLER, *Reichtumskritik und Pelagianismus*, p. 8.

¹⁹ Cf. FREDE, *Ein neuer Paulustext und Kommentar*. Manuscripts regularly appear with respect to other Pelagian documents which claim to provide a better and/or more complete text. See, for example, H.J. FREDE, U. FRÖHLICH & H. STANJEK, *Vetus Latina-Fragmente zum Alten Testament. Die pelagianische Epistula ad quandam matronam christianam*, Freiburg, 1996.

those documents adjudged to be authentically Pelagian should be employed with the necessary critical distance.²⁰ At the same time, one should account for the possibility that propositions designated as Pelagian on account of their parallel concerns, e.g. for the poor, may not indeed be deserving of such title²¹. It remains somewhat bizarre to have to observe that the idea that concern for the poor, as formulated in the *Corpus Caspari*²², has been ascribed the label Pelagian, while the situation in Sicily at the time, in which the gulf between the rich and the poor was enormous, clearly justified a special concern for the fate of the poor and a bitter critique of the vast wealth of a few rich families²³.

It has become clear in the meantime that in both his commentaries on the letters of Paul, written prior to the eruption of the Pelagian controversy²⁴, and in his other writings Pelagius desired to distance himself as an orthodox Christian from significant heterodox movements of his time, including Arianism, Manicheism and the positions adopted by Jovianus²⁵. It was his resistance to the second of

²⁰ It is clear that Pelagius' text was later reworked to appear more "Pelagian" or indeed more "anti-Augustinian" than the author originally intended!

²¹ See the study of KESSLER, *Reichtumskritik und Pelagianismus*, 6ff. Even the distinction between Pelagic (works ascribed to Pelagius) and Pelagian (works of Pelagius' disciples and sympathisers) that has become the custom since G. GRESHAKE, *Gnade als konkrete Freiheit. Eine Untersuchung zur Gnadenlehre des Pelagius*, Mainz, 1972, has been a source of difficulty in this regard: how can one speak with certainty of sympathy for Pelagius if one is obliged to agree that such depends on ideological presuppositions and not on attested facts?

²² Julian's concern for the poor is explicitly mentioned in relation to his Pelagian sympathies; cf. GENNADIUS *De viris illustribus* 46. The idea that concern for the poor might be an expression of genuine Christian engagement would appear to have been ignored.

²³ Cf. J.N.L. MYRES, *Pelagius and the End of Roman Rule in Britain*, in JRS 50 (1960) 21-36; J. MORRIS, *Pelagian Literature*, in JTS NS XVI (1965) 26-60. Critical observations, especially with regard to the British roots of Pelagianism, have been formulated by W. LIEBESCHUETZ, *Did the Pelagian Movement have Social Aims?*, in *Historia* 12 (1963) 227-241; ID., *Pelagian Evidence on the Last Period of Roman Britain?*, in *Latomus* 26 (1967) 436-447.

²⁴ In regard to the rediscovery of Paul and the complex problems associated therewith (among others the dialogue with classical culture), see the documented study of J. TAUER, *Neue Orientierungen zur Paulusexegeese des Pelagius*, in *Augustinianum* 34 (1994) 313-358.

²⁵ Cf. T. BOHLIN, *Die Theologie des Pelagius und ihre Genesis*, Uppsala & Wiesbaden, 1957; cf. also G. BONNER, *How Pelagian was Pelagius? An Examination of the Contentions of Torgny Bohlin*, in *Studia Patristica IX. Papers presented to the Fourth International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford 1963* (Texte und Untersuchungen, 94), Berlin, 1966, p. 350-358 (Reprint in ID., *Church and Faith in the Patristic Tradition. Augustine, Pelagianism, and Early Christian Northumbria*, Aldershot, 1996 [3rd study]); GRESHAKE, *Gnade als konkrete Freiheit*, 27ff.

the aforementioned movements that ultimately explains his emphasis on the existence of free will: he considered Manichean determinism as a danger to authentic Christian ethics, which he maintained could only exist in so far as components such as freedom and responsibility were safeguarded.

Precisely because of the fact that he took such freedom and responsibility seriously, Pelagius thus insisted that the human person, who had received the *posse* from God, had a *duty* to live a life without sin. This need not imply that such *de facto* actually took place²⁶ – as noted above, the idea behind the *impeccantia*, so frequently ascribed to Pelagius and oft considered part of the evidence proving the arrogance of his teaching in this regard, was in fact based on the unjustified criticism of Jerome²⁷. Based on his emphasis on human freedom and responsibility, Pelagius was forced to defend himself at a relatively early stage against the accusation that he had neglected God's grace²⁸, a charge that he continuously (and rightly) denied²⁹. Indeed, it is possible to speak in this regard of a Pelagian theology of grace at the level of creation, revelation and forgiveness³⁰. Although the highly

²⁶ Cf. in this regard Pelagius' commentary on Rom 6 in T. DE BRUYN, *Pelagius' Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Translated with Introduction and Notes*, Oxford, 1993, pp. 96-100 together with the author's instructive remarks, esp. pp. 42-43.

²⁷ For the location of the terminology and the dogma see HIERONYMUS, *Dialogi contra Pelagianos* I,26, CCSL 80, p. 33; II,16, CCSL 80, p. 74; III,3, CCSL 80, p. 101; III,12, CCSL 80, p. 113. Cf. on this point Pelagius' position: *De natura et gratia* 44,52, CSEL 60, p. 271 and the commentary of Augustine: "Hoc et nos dicimus, iungamus dexterās". Pelagius explicitly stated in Diospolis, moreover, that he did believe in the theoretical possibility that human beings could act without sin, although he added that he had never met such a person; cf. AUGUSTINUS, *De gestis Pelagii*, 6,16, CSEL 42, 68-69. With respect to the importance of Jerome in the conceptualisation of Pelagius see, in particular, R.F. EVANS, *Pelagius, Fastidius, and the Pseudoaugustinian De Vita Christiana*, in JThS N.S. 13 (1962) 72-98; ID., *Pelagius' Veracity at the Synod of Diospolis*, in J. SOMMERFELDT (ed.), *Studies in Medieval Culture*, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1964, 21-30; ID., *Pelagius. Inquiries and Reappraisals*, London, 1968. A survey of points upon which the different parties were in fact in agreement within the Pelagian controversy as a whole would be of enormous value.

²⁸ Y.-M. DUVAL, *La date du "De natura" de Pélage. Les premières étapes de la controverse sur la nature de la grâce*, in REA 36 (1990) 257-283. Duval has convincingly argued that we should date this work around 407.

²⁹ Cf. in this regard G. GRESHAKE, *Gnade als konkrete Freiheit*, chapter II: Die Gnadenlehre des Pelagius (pp. 47-157).

³⁰ In addition to the already mentioned study of Bohlin see especially GRESHAKE, *Gnade als konkrete Freiheit*; GARCIA-SANCHEZ, *Pelagius and Christian Initiation*, 187-289; cf. also J. DEMPSEY, *Pelagius's Commentary on St. Paul*, Rome, 1937.

actualising study of Greshake has been the subject of a number of critical reviews – particularly on account of his intense critique of Augustine –, he still deserves credit for the fact that he endeavoured to, albeit in his own headstrong fashion, to read Pelagius through his own eyes³¹, an exercise that established a definitive break with the vision of the latter's theology as lacking in grace³².

J. Rivière pointed to the orthodox character of Pelagius' Christology³³, while Greshake³⁴ made it clear that the *Christus exemplum* hypothesis involved more than a mere "external" following of Christ's example³⁵. Where Augustine was to place the emphasis in the discussion with the Pelagians on the importance of infant baptism as argument for the fact that salvation is only possible via Christ and as proof that every person is born with original sin, Pelagius wanted to speak about and address himself to adults in his theological and liturgical propositions. As a matter of fact, prior to the outbreak of the controversy, it was still relatively unproblematic and in line with the tradition to refer to the importance of baptism for adults. Baptism was considered a break with the old, the beginning of new life, enlightenment, unification with Christ etc.³⁶

With respect to peripheral accusations such as the distinction between the Kingdom of God and eternal life mentioned above, it has been satisfactorily proven that this distinction stems in its formulation from Augustine and is nowhere to be found in Pelagius³⁷.

Pelagius desired to live his Christian ideals as an ascetic within the Church. The familiar adage *Extra ecclesiam salus non est*: salvation in Christ is only offered within the Church as mediating instance. It is only if one neglects or ignores this fundamental fact that

³¹ Cf. G. DE PLINVAL, *L'heure est-elle venue de redécouvrir Pélagé?*, in *REA* 19 (1973) 158-162; A. ZUMKELLER, *Neuinterpretation oder Verzeichnung der Gnadenlehre des Pelagius und seines Gegners Augustinus*, in *Augustinian Studies* 5 (1974) 209-226.

³² See in this regard also E.D. LAVENDER, *The Development of Pelagius' Thought within a Late Fourth Century Ascetic Movement in Rome*, Saint Louis, 1991.

³³ Cf. J. RIVIÈRE, *Hétérodoxie des pélagiens en fait de rédemption?*, in *RHE* 41 (1946) 5-43; cf. also J.MCW. DEWART, *The Christology of the Pelagian Controversy*, in *Studia Patristica* 17,3, Oxford, 1982, 1221-1244.

³⁴ *Gnade als konkrete Freiheit*, 124-125.

³⁵ Cf. also W. GEERLINGS, *Christus Exemplum. Studien zur Christologie und Christusverkündigung Augustins* (Tübinger theologische Studien, 13), Mainz, 1978, 216.

³⁶ Cf. GARCIA-SANCHEZ, *Pelagius and Christian Initiation*, esp. chapter IV.

³⁷ See REFOULE, *La distinction "Royaume de Dieu-vie éternelle" est-elle pélagienne*, 253-254.

one is able, albeit without justification, to accuse him of having placed too much emphasis on the personal potential of the human person. While it is evident that for Pelagius the sanctity of the Church as *corpus Christi* was related in essence to the sanctity of its members, a sanctity that was conceived of as dynamic, it must be stated nevertheless that the virtue of humility had an important role to play in the struggle to attain such sanctity on account of one's recognition of one's personal limitations³⁸. Commentators have rightly emphasised the fact that Pelagius also distanced himself in his writings from the Novatian idea of Christians as *perfecti*³⁹, which need not imply that the grace of baptism does not involve ethical obligations on the part of the human person: the sanctity of the Church is also a task of the faithful⁴⁰.

The final (theological) curtain fell for Pelagius in 418 with the condemnation issued by the emperor (30th April 418), by the African bishops (1st May 418) and, under pressure, confirmed by Zosimus in his *Epistula Tractoria*. Genuinely desiring to be a true believer, Pelagius had explicitly stated to Augustine, nevertheless, that he himself condemned all those who maintained that God's grace was not necessary for every human act⁴¹, but the *Doctor gratiae* was not very gracious. Pelagius was forced to leave Palestine. It is probable that he moved to Egypt at this juncture⁴².

³⁸ See S. THIER, *Kirche bei Pelagius* (Patristische Texte und Studien, 50), Berlin & New York, 1999. In the present author's opinion, this study, as with that of Garcia-Sanchez, offers convincing arguments against the old idea that Pelagius considered the Church to be redundant as salvific gift; see in this regard the survey of WERMELINGER, *Neuere Forschungskontroversen um Augustin und Pelagius*, 193-194.

³⁹ GARCIA-SANCHEZ, *Pelagius and Christian Initiation*, 104-116.

⁴⁰ GARCIA-SANCHEZ, *Pelagius and Christian Initiation*, 161-170, esp. p. 169: "If a Christian thinks that he can be a member of Christ's Church without bearing the fruits of holiness, he is not worthy of such membership. To be a member of Christ means to imitate Christ; Christians must bear fruits of mutual love, as Christ loved his Church."

⁴¹ Cf. AUGUSTINUS, *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* II,2, CSEL 42, p. 125: "Anathemo qui vel sentit vel dicit gratiam Dei, qua Christus venit in hunc mundum peccatores salvos facere, non solum per singulas horas aut per singula momenta, sed etiam per singulos actus nostros non esse necessariam; et qui hanc conantur auferre poenas sortiantur aeternas."

⁴² *Collectio Avellana, Epistula* 49, CSEL 35, 113-115.

B. *Caelestius*⁴³

Several studies tend to refer to Pelagius and Caelestius in one and the same breath. Scholars are even inclined to suggest that Caelestius, who would appear to have been much more combative than Pelagius⁴⁴, certainly in the Pelagian controversy, was in part responsible for the negative image associated with the latter. It remains a pity, therefore, that so little is known with respect to Caelestius⁴⁵. Although he appears in many respects to have been more belligerent during the Pelagian controversy, very little of his writings as a whole have survived to the present day⁴⁶. This might perhaps serve to explain why we had to wait until 1994 before an exhaustive systematic study of Caelestius saw the light of day⁴⁷. This study carefully brings together all the "confirmed" data relating to Caelestius' life and offers, in addition, a detailed analysis of his trial in Carthage in 411. The potential relationship between Pelagius and Caelestius is likewise carefully considered. The frequently employed image of master and pupil is presented in a nuanced fashion and the differences between the two figures are charted with precision. Honnay argues, by way of conclusion, that each figure should be ascribed his own responsibility in the context of the Pelagian controversy and that the contribution of Pelagius should not be glossed over at the expense of Caelestius.

Based on the small amount of material that has been preserved⁴⁸, one can determine that Caelestius had probably expressed his

⁴³ For an introduction see G. BONNER, *Caelestius*, in *Augustinus Lexikon* I/5-6, Basel, 1992, 693-698. The best evaluation in terms of content based on a thorough study of the sources and of recent literature can be found in G. HONNAY, *Caelestius, Discipulus Pelagii*, in *Augustiniana* 44 (1994) 271-302. Honnay also subjects a number of "certainties" with respect to Caelestius to critical analysis!

⁴⁴ Caelestius, not Pelagius, desired to be ordained priest in Carthage (he was ultimately ordained in the East); Pelagius distanced himself (briefly) from Caelestius during the proceedings at Diospolis; Caelestius, not Pelagius, presented himself in person in Rome in 418 to defend his cause. As a matter of fact Caelestius continued to defend his case up to the Council of Ephesus.

⁴⁵ With respect to this figure and the potential attribution of works thereto see G. HONNAY, *Caelestius, Discipulus Pelagii*, in *Augustiniana* 44 (1994) 271-302.

⁴⁶ See NUVOLONE, *Pélage et pélagianisme*, 2893-2895; WERMELINGER, *Neuere Forschungskontroversen*, p. 205.

⁴⁷ HONNAY, *Caelestius, Discipulus Pelagii*. Honnay engages in the discussion in an intelligent manner based on all the relevant literature. The most relevant literature relating to Caelestius has been assembled once again in M. LAMBERIGTS *Caelestius*, in A.D. FITZGERALD, *Augustine through the Ages. An Encyclopedia*, Grand Rapids-Cambridge, 1999, pp. 114-115.

⁴⁸ See NUVOLONE, *Pélage et pélagianisme*, 2893-2895.

critique of the idea of a *tradux peccati* at a relatively early stage in a no longer extant opus⁴⁹, although Pelagius, long before the controversy, had likewise been critical of Augustine's positions, his *De natura* having already been written in 405/7. Differences between the two, however, can also be established with certainty. Based on what has survived of his *Definitiones* one is left with the impression that Caelestius, far more than Pelagius, placed the emphasis on the freedom of the will and that hamartiology and soteriology had thus acquired a more evidently background position in his regard. This might partly explain why Pelagius distanced himself from⁵⁰ at Diospolis (415), where he was acquitted⁵¹. In light of the *Libellus fidei* of both Pelagius and Caelestius, this distancing apparently did not last very long.

C. Julian of Aeclanum

Renewed interest has also been evident in recent years for Julian of Aeclanum⁵². As was the case with respect to Pelagius, a number of commentaries on the Scriptures have been ascribed to Julian in the 20th century. Before exploring this fact in more detail, it seems appropriate to note at this juncture that Julian was in several respects more important than some of his predecessors in the context of the Pelagian controversy. Indeed he engaged in discussion with Augustine in a much more direct and thorough manner. The extent to which fragments and larger segments of his work have survived to the present day remains exceptionally good. Indeed, chapters I-VI of *Ad*

⁴⁹ Cf. *Praedestinatus* 88, PL 53, 618.

⁵⁰ Cf. THIER, *o.c.*, p. 323. The extent to which such distancing can be considered authentic is open to discussion; cf. EVANS, *Veracity*, esp. pp. 28-29. WERMELINGER, *Neuere Forschungskontroversen um Augustin und Pelagius*, 212 is of the opinion, however, that Evans attaches too much faith on this point to Augustine's vision and concludes: „Die Anklage selbst beweist noch nicht, dass Pelagius der Verfasser dieser Schriften ist. (...) Wir können auch hier sagen, der Beweis für die Unehrlichkeit des Pelagius ist noch nicht erbracht.“ Cf. also his thorough examination of Pelagius' attitude in Diospolis in his work *Rom und Pelagius*, 79-81.

⁵¹ It is striking that the “Pelagians” also argued their case in the East (e.g. with Nestorius) or, as was the case with respect to Julian of Aeclanum, sought refuge with critics of Jerome such as Theodore of Mopsuestia. See in this regard M. LAMBERIGTS, *Les évêques pélagiens déposés, Nestorius et Ephèse*, in *Augustiniana* 35 (1985) 264-280 (with additional literature).

⁵² For a further study of Julian's life and work see the recent survey of M. LAMBERIGTS, *Julianus von Aeclanum*, in RAC; J. LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum. Studien zu seinem Leben, seinem Werk, seiner Lehre und ihrer Überlieferung* (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*, 60), Leiden, Boston & Köln, 2001.

Florum have survived in their entirety thanks to Augustine's *Opus imperfectum*, in which the latter exhaustively quotes the position of his adversary before formulating his counter arguments⁵³. The punctuation of the text-critical edition of M. Zelzer makes this crystal clear. One can easily follow where Augustine interrupts his own line of thought and hands the floor to his adversaries etc.⁵⁴ For the Pelagian controversy, A. Bruckner's study served for decades as the point of departure for virtually every survey relating to research into Julian of Aelclanum⁵⁵. Bruckner's work remains interesting on account of the fact that it offers a good survey of the source material employed by the author, although it has been surpassed at a variety of levels by the above mentioned work of J. Lössl. This has to do with new discoveries.

Indeed, after the publication of Bruckner's research, the number of works that scholars were inclined to ascribe to Julian grew dramatically. In 1913, for example, G. Morin proposed Julian as the author of a *Tractatus prophetarum Osee, Iohel et Amos*⁵⁶. According to Morin, the three commentaries had once belonged to a larger, more complete commentary dealing with all twelve of the minor prophets. In 1915 A. Vaccari published a work in which he claimed to be able to prove that a certain *Expositio libri Job* had been written by Julian of Aelclanum. Vaccari based himself for the most part on philological arguments (together with content based arguments in which he

⁵³ Such a way of acting was unique in the ancient world and reveals the seriousness with which Augustine took the criticism of his opponents to heart. Further evidence of Augustine's behaviour can be derived from Julian's critique that the former had misrepresented texts from *Ad Turbantium* in his *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II. Augustine was reacting in fact to a summary of Julian's work that had been sent to him from Italy. When he was finally able to read *Ad Turbantium* in its entirety he recognised that he had not always represented Julian's positions in an adequate manner. While *Contra Iulianum* was thus intended to serve as an exhaustive response to Julian, it remains impossible to determine whether Julian ever had the chance to read it.

⁵⁴ M. ZELZER (ed.), *Aurelius Augustinus, Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum* (CSEL 85,1), Vienna, 1974. For a critical review of this edition see A. PRIMMER, *Textvorschläge zu Augustinus Opus imperfectum*, in *Latinität und alte Kirche. Festschrift für R. Hanslik zum 70. Geburtstag* (Wiener Studien, Beiheft 8), Vienna-Cologne-Graz, 1977, pp. 235-250. For the remainder of the work we continue to be indebted to the edition in *Patrologia Latina*. It is interesting to note that Augustine apparently reacted with less haste in books V and VI, only to give the floor to Julian more extensively (especially in book VI), without interrupting him immediately, as had been the case in e.g. book I.

⁵⁵ *Julian von Eclanum. Sein Leben und seine Lehre*, Leipzig, 1897.

⁵⁶ For a critical text edition see L. DE CONINCK & J. D'HONT, *CCSL* 88.

claimed to be able to determine the presence of Pelagian ideas)⁵⁷. Both attributions were positively received⁵⁸. Vaccari was less successful in 1916 when he claimed to have discovered a commentary on the Psalms written by Julian⁵⁹. R. Devreesse made it quite clear that the segment of this work that had been preserved *in extenso* (Pss. I-XVI) was in fact a translation of the work of Theodore, a translation that could be ascribed nevertheless to Julian (one should not forget that Julian spent a period of time with Theodore of Mopsuestia and that he may well have occupied himself with such a translation during his "idle" moments)⁶⁰. The so-called *Epitomè*, ascribed by Bouwman⁶¹ to Julian himself, was more problematic since several recent authors were inclined to prefer to ascribe it to a later summariser of the translation of Julian⁶². While degrees of dependence on Julian at the literary level and at the level of content can be established, the final result ultimately belongs to the history of reception.

Although there would appear to be a level of consensus on Julian authorship with respect to the attribution of exegetical works, recent research has led, nevertheless, to an ever growing unanimity that another work, ascribed by some to the bishop of Aeclanum, should be removed from his list of publications. Indeed, consensus would appear to have been reached, in my opinion prematurely, that

⁵⁷ A. VACCARI, *Un commento a Giobbe di Giuliano di Eclana*, Rome, 1915.

⁵⁸ With one exception, namely J. STIGLMAYR, *Der Jobkommentar von Monte Cassino*, in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 43 (1919) 269-288. On both formal and content based grounds Stiglmayr maintained that Julian could not be the author of the work in question. In his study *Il Commento Cassinese di Giobbe*, in *Miscellanea Amelli*, Badia di Montecassino, 1920, pp. 43-51 Vaccari offers a detailed counter-attack to Stiglmayr's criticisms. For a reaction see J. STIGLMAYR, *Zum Jobkommentar von Monte Cassino*, in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 45 (1921) 495-496. The present author is of the opinion that a systematic response to Stiglmayr's objections has still to be written.

⁵⁹ A. VACCARI, *Nuova opera di Giuliano Eclanense*, in *Civiltà Cattolica* 67 (1916) 578-593.

⁶⁰ Cf. R. DEVREESE, *Le commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psalmes*, in *Rbibl* 37 (1928) 340-366; 38 (1929) 35-62.

⁶¹ G. BOUWMAN, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar zu den Propheten Osee, Joël und Amos. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Exegese*, Rome, 1958, pp. 10-11. Bouwman's study is of particular importance with respect to the exegetical part of Julian's work; see also his *Zum Wortschatz des Julian von Aeclanum*, in *ALMA* 27 (1957) 141-164.

⁶² DE CONINCK, p. XXV-XXXVI; I.-M. DUVAL, *Iulianus Aeclanensis restitutus. La première édition "incomplète" de l'œuvre de Julien d'Eclane*, in *Revue des Études augustinienes* 25 (1979) 162-170.

the *Libellus fidei* is not by Julian of Aeclanum⁶³. If I use the word premature it is because of the fact that to the present day no single systematic comparison of the authentic works of Julian with the aforementioned *Libellus fidei* has been made⁶⁴. It remains interesting to note, nevertheless, that if the authorship of the said work is to be located in Northern Italy then the level of opposition with respect to African perspectives must likely have been much greater than scholars are sometimes inclined to think.

In spite of the fact that the source material for prospective Julian authorship increased spectacularly in the first quarter of the 20th century, the scholarly world had to wait until the 1950's before this part of his work was given due attention, namely in the studies of Baxter⁶⁵ and Bouwman⁶⁶. Both authors focused their attention of use of terminology as a means whereby a degree of certainty could be acquired with respect to the Julian authorship of certain works. Their research (together with that of Vaccari and Morin) made it clear that Julian's Latin was somewhat technical and that he had a preference for the use of substantives (with particular preference for fourth declension words)⁶⁷. Scholars also observed a preference for abstract terms as well as the frequent use of the supina on ire etc. Without going into detail, however⁶⁸, it ought to be noted that this approach to the question of disputed authorship did not account for a great deal of progress and that the wholesale attribution of all sorts of works to Julian, an approach in which Bouwman in particular would appear to have excelled, did not gain much in the way of scholarly acceptance⁶⁹.

⁶³ Cf. BRUCKNER, *Julian von Aeclanum*, pp. 31-33, NUVOLONE; *Pélage et pélagianisme*, 2907; LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum*, pp. 12-13.

⁶⁴ This need not imply that the present author is convinced by Bouwman's arguments (*Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar*, pp. 2-5) with respect to the potential authorship of Julian, only that he is of the opinion that serious research in this regard remains an urgent desideratum. While WERMELINGER, *Rom und Pelagius*, pp. 220-226 offers an initial step in this direction, he does not solve all of the problems; cf. J. LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum*, p. 13. Lössl is likewise unsuccessful in introducing new elements on this point. It thus remains unclear why one should ascribe less weight to philological arguments than to historical ones. A whole series of text-critical problems are raised but this does not constitute a thorough "evaluation" of the manuscripts.

⁶⁵ J.H. BAXTER, *Notes on the Latin of Julian of Eclanum*, in *ALMA* 21 (1951) 5-54.

⁶⁶ G. BOUWMAN, *Zum Wortschatz des Julian von Aeclanum*, in *ALMA* 27 (1957) 141-164.

⁶⁷ BOUWMAN, *Des Julian von Aeclanum Kommentar*, pp. 31ff.

⁶⁸ See in this regard LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum*, pp. 94-101.

⁶⁹ See also in this regard the highly critical review of D. DE PLINVAL, *Julien*

A different sort of interest in Julian's use of terminology can be found in the text-critical editions. Both Zelzer⁷⁰ (although more in the context of her edition of Augustine) and De Coninck have shown a great deal interest in Julian's use of words. While Zelzer's edition in particular was subject to serious critical review⁷¹, observations concerning the edition of De Coninck tended rather to be marginal. Detailed and thorough studies of Julian's commentaries on the Scriptures had to wait until the 1990's and the beginning of the new millennium. I. Strobl devoted a fairly comprehensive study to Julian's commentary on the prophet Joel⁷². A broader study of Julian's exegesis can be found, however, in the fifth chapter of the abovementioned work of J. Lössl (pp. 147-249)⁷³. Lössl's volume together with a number of articles in journals⁷⁴, correctly focuses attention on the exegesis of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Lössl likewise endeavours to locate Julian's exegesis more clearly in the context of the history of western exegesis as a whole, particularly by comparing it with that of major figures such as Augustine and Jerome. Lössl's research makes it clear that a great deal of unexplored territory exists with respect to the Julian's exegetical works.

It would be difficult to say the same with respect to the works in so far as they are directly related to the controversy with Augustine. At the beginning of the 1960's several interesting studies were published in short succession in this regard. F. Clodius offered an analysis of the vision of Julian of Aeclanum and of Augustine of Hippo with respect to freedom of the will, grace and their relationship with one another⁷⁵. F. Perago explored the points of discussion that had arisen between

d'Eclane devant la Bible, in *Recherches de science religieuse* 47 (1959) 345-366, which offers particular critique on the level of attribution.

⁷⁰ M. ZELZER (ed.), *Aurelius Augustinus, Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum*.

⁷¹ A. PRIMMER, *Textvorschläge zu Augustinus Opus imperfectum* and ID., *Rhythmus- und Textprobleme in Aug. Op. Imperf.* 1-3, in *Wiener Studien* NS 9 (1975) 186-212; 11 (1977) 182-218.

⁷² I. STROBL, *Eine Untersuchung zum Verständnis alttestamentlicher Prophetie anhand des Julian von Aeclanum zugeschriebenen Kommentars zum Propheten Joël*, Vienna, 1991.

⁷³ An essential orientating summary is lacking at the end of this otherwise detailed study.

⁷⁴ Cf. his studies *Julian of Aeclanum's Tractatus in Osee, Iohel, Amos*, in *Augustiniana* 51 (2001) 5-31; ID., *A shift in Patristic Exegesis. Hebrew Clarity and Historical Verity in Augustine, Jerome, Julian of Aeclanum and Theodore of Mopsuestia*, in *Augustinian Studies* 32 (2001) 157-175.

⁷⁵ Reference should be made for this survey to F. CLODIUS, *El libre albedrío según Julian de Eclano*, in *Anales de la Facultad de Teología* 14 (1962) 99-134.

Augustine and Julian with respect to the questions of justice, values and the salvation of the pagans. His work emphasised that two understandings of nature (one based on grace the other departing from the Stoic notion of the unblemished nature of the human person) were in fact irreconcilable⁷⁶. Of great interest was the discussion that arose between F. Refoulé⁷⁷ and F.-J. Thonnard. In a two volume study Refoulé had pointed, on the one hand, to the Aristotelian roots of Julian's philosophical thought patterns while suggesting, on the other hand, that Julian should be seen as a forerunner of Thomas Aquinas. Refoulé's contentions concerning the relationship between Julian and Aristotelian thought were based on a suggestion already made by Bruckner⁷⁸. Refoulé was severely criticised by Thonnard, who argued that Julian's philosophical perspectives should be seen against the background of his controversy with Augustine⁷⁹. For Thonnard, Julian was an eclectic who employed his knowledge in a polemical fashion in order to force Augustine into an awkward predicament⁸⁰.

The first attempt at a theological synthesis was made by E.S.P. Jones⁸¹ who studied Julian's theology from the following perspectives: God's justice, humanity, integrity and as saviour of the world⁸². While

⁷⁶ F. PERAGO, *Il valore della tradizione nella polemica tra S. Agostino e Giuliano d'Eclano*, in *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Napoli* 10 (1962/1963) 143-160.

⁷⁷ F. REFOULE, *Julien d'Éclane, théologien et philosophe*, in *Recherches de science religieuse* 54 (1964) 42-84; 233-247.

⁷⁸ BRUCKNER, *Julian von Eclanum*, pp. 90ff. Bruckner's suggestion is interesting in the sense that he thereby deviated from the conventional opinion that Julian's teaching was profoundly Stoic; cf. LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum*, p. 101 for this widely held opinion. As we shall indicate further below, we are inclined to support the idea that Julian should be taken seriously as a theologian and believer.

⁷⁹ F.-J. THONNARD, *L'aristotélisme de Julien d'Éclane et de Saint Augustin*, in *REA* 11 (1965) 296-304.

⁸⁰ Thorough research into Julian's philosophical sources has shown in the meantime that one should first look to Cicero in this regard and that Julian's philosophical knowledge rarely if ever extends beyond that which can be found therein; cf. LAMBERIGTS, *Julianus von Eclanum*; M. STEIN, *Bemerkungen zu Iulianus von Aeclanum*, in *JAC* 43 (2000) 122-125 for confirmation of this hypothesis. The present author is of the opinion, moreover, that the word eclectic is often taken unnecessarily as a negative determination: every period either consciously or unconsciously adopts a number of the insights of the preceding period without the need of a thorough familiarity therewith.

⁸¹ E.S.P. JONES, *Julian, Bishop of Aeclanum. Exegete and Theologian* (unpublished doctoral dissertation), Saint Andrews, 1965.

⁸² With regard to the question of justice see also V. PERAGO, *Una "querelle" del V secolo sulla giustizia, la virtù, la salvezza degli infideli*, in *Asprenas* 9 (1962) 32-40.

this study, which incidentally was never published and thus did not receive the attention it ultimately deserved, was a serious attempt to render Julian's vision in an objective manner, it remains subject nonetheless to a number of prejudices, particularly with respect to its judgement of Augustine.

Based in part on the outline established by Wermelinger, an ever increasing interest has become evident since the 1980's in Julian's own perspectives on a variety of matters. N. Cipriani, for example, has published an elaborate study focusing on Julian as a man of letters, especially in his work *Ad Florum*⁸³. In an exemplary study, P. Brown has highlighted the difference between Julian and Augustine with respect to their knowledge of medicine, especially in relation to human sexuality⁸⁴. An original contribution going into considerable detail on Julian's understanding of human pain was published recently by J. Lössl based on the author's thorough study of the sources.⁸⁵ E. Clark has made it clear how a difference in their appreciation of corporeality can explain the profound gulf between Augustine and Julian with respect to sexuality in marriage⁸⁶. Clark rightly notes that for Julian sexual desire is a necessary prerequisite for bringing the natural goal of marriage to completion, namely in procreation⁸⁷. Although theological concepts were never completely absent from the aforementioned studies, they have nevertheless received a more systematic treatment in the publications of McGrath, Lamberigts and Barclift. In an otherwise rather programmatic contribution McGrath turns the reader's attention to differences in perspective with respect to the question of justice⁸⁸. In a series of

⁸³ N. CIPRIANI, *Aspetti letterari dell'Ad Florum di Giuliano d'Eclano*, in *Augustinianum* 15 (1975) 125-167.

⁸⁴ P. BROWN, *Sexuality and Society in the Fifth Century*, in E. GABBA (ed.), *Tria Corda. Scritti in onore di A. Momigliano*, Como, 1983, pp. 49-70.

⁸⁵ J. LÖSSL, *Julian of Aeclanum on Pain*, in *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 10 (2002) 203-243.

⁸⁶ E.A. CLARK, *Adam's Only Companion. Augustine and the Early Christian Debate on Marriage*, in *Recherches augustiniennes* 21 (1986) 139-162.

⁸⁷ E.A. CLARK, *Vitiated Seeds and Holy Vessels. Augustine's Manichaean Past*, in ID, *Ascetic Piety and Woman's Faith. Essays on Late Ancient Christianity*, Lewiston, 1986, pp. 291-349.

⁸⁸ A.E. MCGRATH, *Divine Justice and Divine Equity in the Controversy between Augustine and Julian of Eclanum*, in *Downside Review* 101 (1983) 312-319. It is the present author's opinion that this study devotes too little systematic attention to the biblical basis upon which Julian founded his vision of justice. By basing his concept of justice on "to each his due" Julian's biblical dossier was clearly more significant than scholars have maintained. LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum*, pp. 130ff. could likewise have been more detailed in this regard.

articles, Lamberigts has given pride of place to the importance of Julian's concept of God as the basis for his theological convictions. Julian's detailed arguments favour the divinity of the creator who stands as guarantor for the goodness of creation⁸⁹. God's goodness comes to the fore in an eminent fashion in the creation of a good soul in the birth of every newborn infant⁹⁰. Given the fact that the ethical behaviour of the human person is to be situated for Julian precisely on the level of the soul, the notion of inherited sin in newborn infants is for him unthinkable and indeed incomprehensible. Such would imply, as a matter of fact, that God himself as creator would have to be considered responsible for the sin and guilt present in the soul. Rooted in his belief in the personal responsibility for his or her ethical of every human being, Julian is unable to accept, in part on account of his vision of justice, that everyone since Adam has been born in guilt and that Adam's sin is the sole and exclusive reason for this fact. For Julian, Adam is nothing more than a "homo olim defunctus"⁹¹. Indeed, for Julian, sin has to do in essence with one's personal moral life: sin is to be located at the level of the human will and cannot affect or harm the nature of the human person as he/she appears as a created being⁹². As a consequence of this perspective, Julian's allusions to grace, a concept that received significant attention in his works, came to be given a different and far from dull interpretation when compared with Augustine⁹³. Clearly indignant about the fact that such a serious matter could not be raised as the subject of a synod, Julian was likewise convinced that, based in part on literature from the east⁹⁴, the Church was under threat from Manicheism. He was severely irritated by the fact that Zosimus had changed his opinion concerning the Pelagians, a criticism that compelled Augustine to prefer to allude to

⁸⁹ M. LAMBERIGTS, *Julian of Aeclanum: A Plea for a Good Creator*, in *Augustiniana* 38 (1988) 5-24.

⁹⁰ M. LAMBERIGTS, *Julian of Eclanum and Augustine on the Origin of the Soul*, in *Augustiniana* 46 (1996) 243-260.

⁹¹ M. LAMBERIGTS, *Julien d'Eclane et Augustin d'Hippone: deux conceptions d'Adam*, in *Augustiniana* 40 (1990) 393-435.

⁹² P.L. BARCLIFT, *In Controversy with Saint Augustine: Julian of Eclanum on the Nature of Sin*, in *RTAM* 58 (1991) 5-20.

⁹³ M. LAMBERIGTS, *Julian of Aeclanum on Grace. Some Considerations*, in *Studia Patristica* 27 (1993) 342-349.

⁹⁴ N. CIPRIANI, *L'Autore dei testi pseudobasiliani riportati nel C. Iulianum (I, 16-17) e la polemica agostiniana di Giuliano d'Eclano*, in *Congresso internazionale su S. Agostino nel XVI centenario della conversione (Roma, 15-20 settembre 1986). Atti I. Cronaca del Congresso. Sessioni generali. Sezione di Studi I. (Studia Ephemeridis "Augustinianum", 24)*, Rome, 1987, pp. 439-449.

Innocent in his reactions rather than to Zosimus⁹⁵.

An endeavour to offer a synthesis with respect to Julian of Aeclanum has recently been published by J. Lössl⁹⁶. After a detailed introductory survey, the study offers an profound contribution with respect to Julian's life, formation, and intellectual profile. As we noted above, a great deal of attention is focused on Julian's exegetical works. The study gives evidence of a significant knowledge of the literature and a thorough mastery thereof. The apparent need for further analysis of Julian's exegetical works has been addressed by the author's more recent publications in this regard. While we highly recommend this work, one, albeit minor reservation cannot be avoided. It would appear that the author has not offered a systematic analysis of Julian of Aeclanum's theology as expressed in the context of his controversy with Augustine⁹⁷.

By way of conclusion it seems appropriate that we should underline the fact that Julian's position in the controversy differed considerably from that of Pelagius on several levels. Julian focused more attention on marriage and *concupiscentia*, dealt in greater detail with the question of justice, reflected more extensively on the human nature of Christ and its relationship with our own nature and devoted a great deal of his energy to the Genesis narrative. The present author is likewise convinced that Julian was less interested in the ascetic aspects of Christian life. This fact is probably related, at least in part, to his theological point of departure, namely his desire (more intense than Pelagius) to contest the theological convictions of Augustine. Nevertheless, the very magnitude of Julian's surviving works makes him, in our opinion, the most interesting participant in the controversy, although this cannot be the reason why he was canonised for a short period...⁹⁸.

D. Other figures

We noted above that Caelestius referred to Rufinus the Syrian when he was asked about possible opponents of the *tradux peccati*

⁹⁵ M. LAMBERIGTS, *Augustine and Julian of Aeclanum on Zosimus*, in *Augustiniana* 42 (1992) 311-330.

⁹⁶ LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum*.

⁹⁷ Lössl is well aware of this fact and is currently preparing a monograph in collaboration with the present author in which this problem will be studied in greater detail.

⁹⁸ H.-I. MARROU, *La canonisation de Julien d'Eclane*, in *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77 (1958) 434-437 (= *Patristique et humanisme* (Patristica Sorbonensia, 9)), Paris, 1975, pp. 373-377.

dogma. Both Pelagius and Caelestius sought refuge via Africa in the East after their departure from Italy. Pelagius spent a period of time with John of Jerusalem and was deemed orthodox by the bishops assembled in Diospolis. Caelestius received in Ephesus what had been refused him in Africa, namely priestly ordination. After being exiled from Italy he sought refuge in the East and was well received, at least for a time, by Nestorius⁹⁹. He continued to hope to the last that the emperor in Constantinople would rehabilitate him and his supporters. Points of contact can also be established with respect to Julian of Aeclanum. His presumed father-in-law, Aemilius of Beneventum¹⁰⁰, was sent together with Gaudentius of Brescia¹⁰¹ to the East in an attempt to rehabilitate John Chrysostom. Julian himself likewise endeavoured to convince Rufus of Thessalonica to support his cause¹⁰². After his departure from Italy he spent a period of time in Sicily with Theodore of Mopsuestia. Together with Caelestius he endeavoured to argue his case with Nestorius in Constantinople but he and his supporters were ultimately refused a hearing in Ephesus and the curtain finally fell on the drama¹⁰³.

⁹⁹ LAMBERIGTS, *Les évêques pélagiens déposés, Nestorius et Ephèse*, offers a survey of the sources.

¹⁰⁰ For family relationships see J.A. BOUMA, *Het Epithalamium van Paulinus van Nola*, Assen, 1968; LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum*, p. 56ff.

¹⁰¹ See Ch. & L. PIETRI, *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire. 2. Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313-604)*, Rome, 1999, s.v. Gaudence de Brescia.

¹⁰² Cf. LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum*, pp. 290-292.

¹⁰³ LAMBERIGTS, *Les évêques pélagiens déposés, Nestorius et Ephèse*, pp. 279-280. The present author continues to be intrigued by the fact that someone like Marius Mercator has endeavoured to connect Julian, Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia with one another. In the aforementioned study I suggest that Julian did not play a significant role in Ephesus (if indeed he was present there) and that he was thus reduced to a figure *in margine* thereafter. LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum*, p. 318, n. 387 questions this suggestion without offering serious arguments in support of his doubts: „Darauf dass Julian zumindest im Umfeld des Konzils von Ephesus eine aktive Rolle spielte, lässt sich also aus einer Reihe von Indizien (for one of the indications Lössl appeals to Coelestinus of Rome; the only certainty in this matter is that Coelestinus was not present at Ephesus; the attribution of a greater knowledge of events to him than to those present at the council seems untenable) schließen. Gleichzeitig fehlt es jedoch ... an Quellen“. The source material (which is not the same as learned suspicion) does not offer sufficient basis for ascribing an active role to Julian at Ephesus. If Julian and his followers had been so well received in the East how must we explain why he asked Sixtus (a former Pelagian sympathiser) to be reinstated in the Western Church. We likewise find it impossible to understand why Lössl proposes that Julian was indeed (potentially) present at Ephesus on the basis of *absence*. The fact remains that the group surrounding John as well as that surrounding Cyrillus accused the opposing party of the fact that they included Caelestiani among their ranks. If we were

All by all, it is somewhat surprising that a systematic study of reciprocal points of contact with the Eastern part of the empire remains lacking to the present day, at least with respect to the Pelagian controversy. It would be of considerable value in this regard if a systematic study were to be devoted, for example, to Anianus of Celada¹⁰⁴. Indeed, based on documents written by Pelagius himself, Anianus appears to have already reacted around 414/417 to Jerome's attack on Pelagius in *Epistula ad Ctesiphontem*. Anianus appears likewise to have supported Pelagius at Diospolis. While he was to distance himself, in line with Pelagius, from the propositions condemned at Diospolis, this did not prevent him from attacking Jerome who was later to ask Augustine to respond to the attack. The same Anianus was to translate the works of John Chrysostom apparently on behalf of Julian of Aeclanum¹⁰⁵ and of the group of people who were to address a letter to Augustine of Aquileia. A sermon addressed to the newly baptised appears to have been a source of inspiration for their opposition to the dogma of original sin¹⁰⁶. Anianus also appears to have written a letter to Orontius¹⁰⁷, the latter being referred to in a list of bishops who had supported the Pelagian cause in the presence of Nestorius. As a matter of fact, his translation of John Chrysostom's sermon on the Gospel of Mathew was dedicated to Orontius¹⁰⁸. Anianus ultimately saw himself as a victim in the entire affair, associating his fate with that of Orontius. He was likewise inclined to envisage his dispute as directed against Manichean aberrations and

to follow Lössl, we would thus be obliged to locate followers of Caelestius in both parties. If that were the case, however, then we would at least have a right to expect Lössl to explain (preferably on the basis of sources) why they were to be found in both groups. Is it not unusual in this regard that Augustine of Hippo went in search of the authentic acta of Diospolis via Cyrillus while the latter would appear to have been in no great hurry to place his signature under the *Tractoria of Zosimus*?

¹⁰⁴ NUVOLONE, *Pélage et pélagianisme*, 2908-2912 continues to be the guide in this regard. The fact that we do not know where Anianus came from explains the spelling variations in his name (Anianus or Annianus) and the place with which he is associated (Celada, Celeda, Celenda).

¹⁰⁵ NUVOLONE, *Pélage et pélagianisme*, 2908.

¹⁰⁶ See in this regard esp. J.-P. BOUHOT, *Version inédite du sermon Ad Neophytos de saint Jean Chrysostome utilisée par saint Augustin*, in REA 17 (1971) 27-41.

¹⁰⁷ A. PRIMMER, *Die Originalverfassung von Anianus' Epistula ad Orontium*, in *Antidosis. Festschrift für Walther Kraus*, Vienna, 1972, pp. 278-289.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. H. MUSURILLO, *John Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew and the Version of Annianus*, in *Kyriakon. Festschrift Johannes Quasten I*, Münster, 1970, pp. 452-460; R. SKALITZKY, *Annianus of Celeda: His text of Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew*, in *Aevum* 45 (1971) 208-233.

was of the opinion that he had the support of John Chrysostom in this regard. Anianus' convictions would ultimately appear to be close to some of those of Julian and Pelagius¹⁰⁹.

A detailed and thorough study of Sixtus, pope from 432 to 440, was undertaken by P. Carefoote in 1995¹¹⁰. It is interesting to note in this regard that a Roman, at least in his earlier years, had shown a degree of sympathy for the ideas of Pelagius. He was to abandon Pelagius, however, after the latter's condemnation in Zosimus' *Tractoria*¹¹¹, and offer his services to Coelestinus in his correspondence with the East after Ephesus. When Julian asked Sixtus to reinstate him in the Western Church his request was met with refusal, in part on account of the insistence of Leo I¹¹². While what once attracted Sixtus in Pelagius remains difficult to determine nowadays, it remains interesting to note nevertheless that Pelagius had left an impression on him, at least for a period (even after the outbreak of the controversy).

4. Some concluding observations

The survey we have provided in the present contribution is far from exhaustive. We have drawn little attention, for example, to the large collection of anonymous documents associated with Pelagianism¹¹³, a significant number of which still require to be published in critical editions. Many of these documents have been labelled Pelagian on account of the simple fact that they contain an appeal for an authentic ascetic Christian life. Pelagian attribution is also frequently based on "presumed Pelagian basic principles"¹¹⁴. What we intend thereby is that scholars have established a concept of what they think Pelagianism represents in terms of content and have gone off in search of authors on this basis. The picture changes considerably if one treats the preserved literature as a collection of independent

¹⁰⁹ NUVOLONE, *Pélage et pélagianisme*, 2909.

¹¹⁰ P. CAREFOOTE, *Augustine, the Pelagians and the Papacy. An Examination of the Political and Theological Implications of Papal Involvement in the Pelagian Controversy*, Leuven, 1995.

¹¹¹ Cf. the exemplary study of O. WERMELINGER, *Das Pelagiusdossier in der Tractoria des Zosimus*, in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 26 (1979) 336-368.

¹¹² LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum*, pp. 319-321.

¹¹³ NUVOLONE, *Pélage et pélagianisme*, 2915-2923 offers a highly compact survey.

¹¹⁴ KESSLER, *Reichtumskritik*, makes it clear, for example, that *De divitiis* need no be located per se in the "Pelagian" camp.

products written by a variety of authors who were attracted by the emergence of asceticism (which is much broader than a life of abstinence) and put their ideas into writing on these grounds. One should be wary of ascribing the epithet Pelagian to an author simply because he was critical towards the rich or because he sent a letter of consolation to a widow. One should be especially wary of forgetting that the monks of Hadrumetum and Marseille, who were not particularly overjoyed with Augustine's ideas on grace, free will and predestination, were inclined to defend positions that differed little in many respects from those of Julian, for example¹¹⁵. Building on this observation one would be justified in asking whether resistance, albeit perhaps lacking explicit articulation, to the positions adopted by Augustine was not more extensive and widespread, without thereby attaching the label Pelagian thereto. Indeed one would be justified in asking whether resistance to African ideas was not spread over a wider front, without considering such resistance to have its roots in Pelagianism.

A further observation is related to the claim to coherence within the Pelagian group. Given the well known fact that Julian makes few references to Pelagius in his works, one might be more inclined to suggest that he represents a different sort of thinking to that of Pelagius: sustained attention for ascetic themes (such as poverty or health) is ultimately lacking in Julian. Julian, rather, was a dogmatician who reflected on matters such as the goodness of nature, the goodness of the creator, human freedom, human responsibility, God's justice, Christ's humanity etc.

Serious attention should also be paid to possible lines of association between the Pelagian reaction to Augustine and contacts with the East. It is clear that Pelagius, Caelestius and Julian had connections with the East. Anianus of Celada placed his translation of John Chrysostom in part at the service of those who contested Augustine's position. It is evident that a great deal of research has still to be done in this regard.

It has also become evident that politics (and not only ecclesial politics) had a significant role to play in the Pelagian controversy. Reference should be made in this regard to the manner with which Pelagius and Caelestius were condemned, the fact that Julian was denied the right to debate in a synod and the ambiguous – to say the

¹¹⁵ See in this regard the brilliant study of D. OGLIARI, *Gratia et certamen. The Relationship between Grace and Free Will in the Discussion of Augustine with the so-called Semipelagians*, Leuven, 2002 (unpublished doctoral dissertation).

least – stance of the bishops of Rome (none of whom ever condemned Pelagianism on the basis of the African interpretation thereof; cf. the doctoral dissertation of P. Carefoote). There is thus clear evidence that the controversy did not restrict itself to the realms of theology, it also enjoyed both social and political relevance.

We are inclined to argue on the basis of the present survey that progress in historical research into the Pelagian controversy has led to a degree of “dogmatic” deterioration. What we mean thereby is that traditional representations of Pelagianism are no longer tenable in light of the fact that historical research has demonstrated that such a thing as a Pelagian School never existed. It is the present author’s opinion that differentiation and nuance with respect to the idea of a “school” belong among the most valuable contributions of patristic research. In spite of the scarcity of sources, it has become apparent that consistent “theories” have not done justice to the complex historical reality.

Should our observations somehow find their way into the dogmatic manuals then we think that this survey will have served its purpose.

Mathijs LAMBERIGTS