

AUGUSTINE'S USE OF TRADITION IN THE CONTROVERSY WITH JULIAN OF AECLANUM

Abstract

During the Second Pelagian Controversy, Julian of Aeclanum accused Augustine of having invented the doctrine of original sin. Julian considered this doctrine as a Manichaean, North African invention that threatened the orthodoxy of the Church and misled the faithful. Often, Julian complained about the fact that the discussion at stake had never been the subject of a council, consisting of erudite and well informed people.

In his reply, Augustine made ample use of his predecessors, both from the East and the West, in order to show that the doctrine he defended was in line with what had been taught by the Catholic Church always and everywhere throughout its history. Especially in the books I-I of his *Contra Iulianum* he tried to offer an extensive dossier in order to answer the objections made by Julian. Also in his other works against Julian, Augustine would appeal to his predecessors but he never did it in such a detailed way.

Augustine first and foremost emphasized the absolute priority of Scripture, the source of truth par excellence. The predecessors are described as faithful interpreters of Scripture and as people who have taught what they have learned in the Church: they are first children of the Church and then teachers in the same Church.

This article further offers a survey of the way in which Augustine presents his predecessors, showing Augustine's strategic choices, his motives, and his unequal familiarity with his predecessors. Augustine possesses less than basic knowledge about bishops such as Reticus of Autun, but shows to be well informed about people like Cyprian and Ambrose. Much attention is paid to the way in which Augustine tries to refute Julian's accusations by either referring to texts of his predecessors or their authority. Augustine stresses that these predecessors defend the same faith, at least with regard to the essentials of the truth. All are worthy to be members of the board of judges, Julian was asking for. They held their positions long before the outbreak of the controversy and they can in no way be accused of Manicheism. Indeed, some already held these positions before Manicheism came into existence. He regularly makes clear that these authorities were held in high esteem by Pelagius, the "father" of the heresy. Further, he repeats time and again that accusations against Augustine in fact should be read as accusations directed against his predecessors.

Finally, the article pays attention to the way Augustine replied to the critique that he misled the common people: the common people, better than

Julian, are familiar with the truth as taught by the Church. At the same time he warns the reader that these simple faithful can easily become victims of Pelagian tactics.

Augustine's use of tradition in the Pelagian controversy is a well studied subject and the literature on this topic is abundant.¹ Moreover, the Pelagian controversy is not the first situation where Augustine referred to tradition. In the debate with the Donatists, Augustine was confronted with the question whether the Catholic Church was still in line with tradition. It was a challenging question for his adversaries maintained that they were the legitimate heirs of Cyprian.²

However, it was especially in the debate with the Pelagians that Augustine was urged by his opponents to make ample use of his predecessors. In the beginning of the controversy, Augustine limited himself to Cyprian and Jerome.³ When Augustine was confronted with the fact that Pelagius in his *De natura* not only made use of texts of Lactantius, Hilary of Poitiers, Chrysostom, Sixtus and Augustine

¹ See K.-H. LÜTCKE, *Auctoritas bei Augustin*, Stuttgart, 1968; ID., *Auctoritas*, in *AL I*, Basel, 1986-1994, 498-510; J.J. O'DONNELL, *The Authority of Augustine*, in *Augustinian Studies* 22 (1991) 7-35, esp. pp. 7-13. For the Pelagian controversy in general: G. MÁRTIL, *La tradición en San Agustín a través de la controversia pelagiana*, Madrid, 1943; É. REBILLARD, *Augustin et ses autorités: l'élaboration de l'argument patristique au cours de la controverse pélagienne*, in *Studia Patristica* 38, Leuven, 2001, pp. 245-263. For a slightly changed version, see ID., *A New Style of Argument in Christian Polemic: Augustine and the Use of Patristic Citations*, in *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8 (2000) 559-578. For the first period of the Pelagian controversy: H. REUTER, *Augustinische Studien*, Gotha, 1887, pp. 4-46; 163-230; P. BATIFFOL, *Le catholicisme de saint Augustin*, Paris, 1920, esp. pp. 473-508; F. HOFMAN, *Der Kirchenbegriff des Hl. Augustinus in seinen Grundlagen und in seiner Entwicklung*, Münster, 1978 (=1933), pp. 425-485; O. WERMELINGER, *Rom und Pelagius. Die theologische Position der Römischen Bischöfe im pelagianischen Streit in den Jahren 411-432 (Päpste und Papsttum, 7)*, Stuttgart, 1975, esp. pp. 264-278; G. MASCHIO, *L'argomentazione patristica di S. Agostino nella prima fase della controversia pelagiana (412-418)*, in *Augustinianum* 26 (1986) 459-479; É. REBILLARD, *Sociologie de la déviance et orthodoxie. Le cas de la controverse pélagienne sur la grace*, in S. ELM, É. REBILLARD & A. ROMANO (Eds.), *Orthodoxie, Christianisme, Histoire/Orthodoxy, Christianity, History* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 270), Rome, 2000, pp. 221-240.

² S. LANCEL & J.S. ALEXANDER, *Donatistae*, in *AL II*, Basel, 1996-2002, 606-638 (with further literature); J.E. MERDINGER, *Rome and the African Church in the Time of Augustine*, New Haven & London, 1997, esp. part I; M.A. TILLEY, *Cyprian*, in A.D. FITZGERALD, *Augustine through the Ages. An Encyclopedia*, Grand Rapids, Michigan & Cambridge, UK, 1999, 262-264; S. LANCEL, *Saint Augustin*, Paris, 1999, pp. 388-403; REBILLARD, *Augustin et ses autorités*, pp. 247-249.

³ *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* III, 10-13, CSEL 60, pp. 135-140.

himself,⁴ he evidently had to deal with his antagonist's use of tradition.

The controversy with Julian was the beginning of a new phase.⁵ In the debate with Julian, Augustine had already appealed to Ambrose's *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I,40. In *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II,51, a reference to Cyprian appears for the first time in the debate. In *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,20-31, Augustine presented a quite substantial dossier, mostly based on Cyprian and Ambrose, who both had a special place in Augustine's life and thinking.⁶ *Contra Iulianum* I-II can be considered as a continuation and further elaboration of this dossier.⁷ Indeed, one not only sees that the number of quotations from the works of Ambrose is growing, but several other authors will be used, both from the East and the West.

In this contribution I will concentrate on the way in which Augustine presented his *auctoritates* in the debate with Julian and how they functioned in his polemics.⁸ I will not deal with the content of the texts quoted,⁹ nor with the theological issues at stake in the

⁴ See *De natura et gratia* 71-85, CSEL 60, pp. 286-293.

⁵ For the second period of the Pelagian controversy, see F. PERAGO, *Il valore della tradizione nella polemica tra sant'Agostino e Giuliano di Eclano*, in *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia di Napoli* 10 (1962-1963) 143-160; E. DASSMANN, "Tam Ambrosius quam Cyprianus" (c. Iul. Imp. 4,112): Augustins Helfer im pelagianischen Streit, in D. PAPANDREAOU, W.A. BIENERT & K. SCHÄFERDIEK (Eds.), *Oecumenica et patristica. Festschrift für Wilhelm Schneemelcher zum 75. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart, 1989, pp. 259-268. Needless to repeat that Augustine considered himself a man of the African Church, and had to be faithful to this tradition; see the still pertinent remarks of G. BONNER, *Les origines africaines de la doctrine sur la chute et le péché originel*, in *Augustinus* 12 (1967) 97-116 (reprint in id., *God's Decree and Man's Destiny. Studies on the Thought of Augustine of Hippo*, London, 1987, 97-116; cf. also R.J. DE SIMONE, *Modern Research on the Sources of Saint Augustine's Doctrine of Original Sin*, in *Augustinian Studies* 11 (1980) 205-227, a very critical review of P.F. BEATRICE, *Tradux peccati. Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale* (Studia Patristica Mediolanensia, 8), Milan, 1978.

⁶ See the pertinent remarks of DASSMANN, "Tam Ambrosius quam Cyprianus", p. 259. To this, one should add that Cyprian lived before Manicheism came to Africa, Ambrose before Pelagianism appeared; see REBILLARD, *Augustin et ses autorités*, pp. 259-261.

⁷ *Contra Iulianum* I-II do not have an equivalent in *Ad Turbantium*; in this regard, see D. WEBER, *Some Literary Aspects of the Debate between Julian of Eclanum and Augustine*, in *Studia Patristica* 43, Leuven, Paris & Dudley MA, 2006, pp. 289-302, p. 293.

⁸ It will be evident that Augustine's appeal to the authorities of the past must be situated within a long Roman tradition of appealing to the past; see, in this regard, T.G. RING, *Auctoritas bei Tertullian, Cyprian und Ambrosius* (Cassiciacum, 29), Würzburg, 1975, pp. 3-32.

⁹ In this regard, see J. LÖSSL, *Intellectus gratiae. Die erkenntnistheoretische und hermeneutische Dimension der Gnadenlehre Augustins von Hippo* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 38), Leiden, New York & Cologne, 1997, pp. 332-346.

debate between Julian and Augustine. Indeed, such discussion would exceed the length of this article. Moreover, as far as I can see, the presentation of the *auctoritates* and the way in which they functioned in the polemics were never the subject of a systematic survey. First I will present Julian's complaints and critiques. Then I will offer a survey of the way in which Augustine presents the individual doctors. In a next step, I will examine how these Fathers function in Augustine's defense. Finally, I will offer some conclusions.

I. Julian's Complaints

By way of introduction it should be said that, according to Julian, the doctrine under discussion, an impious and stupid one, was accepted in nearly the entire West. This had happened without any consultation with a synod and through simple bishops, who remained in their own territories and had been forced to consent to it.¹⁰ Indeed, Julian, for whom erudition was important,¹¹ quite often complained about the fact that his fraction was never given a fair process. He searched in vain for a council that would be able to treat in a correct and objective manner, without hatred, anger or friendship, the affair under discussion.¹² What was denied to Julian and his companions was the possibility to defend their case for the truth before *learned judges*,¹³ people like John Chrysostom and Basil the

¹⁰ For these complaints, see Julian, *Epistula ad Rufum*, frg. 27-28, CCSL 88, p. 340.

¹¹ With regard to his intellectual profile, see D. WEBER, *Klassische Literatur im Dienst theologischer Polemik: Julian von Eclanum, Ad Florum*, in *Studia Patristica* 38, Leuven, 2001, pp. 503-509; J. LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum. Studien zu seinem Leben, seinem Werk, seiner Lehre und ihrer Überlieferung* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 60), Leiden, Boston & Cologne, 2001, pp. 74-146, esp. pp. 101-126; M. LAMBERIGTS, *The Italian Julian of Aeclanum about the African Augustine of Hippo*, in P.-Y. FUX, J.-M. ROESSLI, O. WERMELINGER (Eds.), *Saint Augustin: africanité et universalité. Actes du colloque international Alger-Annaba, 1-7 avril 2001* (Paradoxis, 45/1), Fribourg, 2003, pp. 83-93, esp. pp. 85-86.

¹² *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 3a, CCSL 88, p. 341: "(De iudicibus) apud quos propterea (dicens) non potuisse uos agere causam uestram, quia nemo de rebus dubiis bene consultat, nisi qui ab odio, ira et amicitia uacuum pectus attulerit; quales non fuisse (dicens), qui de causa uestra iudicauerunt, quia prius eam coeperunt odisse quam nosse (...)" ; cf. also frg. 3b, CCSL 88, p. 341.

¹³ *Ad Florum* II,1, CSEL 85,1, p. 164: "Commode nobis cum ageretur, si (...) apud eruditos iudices negotium ueritatis tueri daretur facultas (...)"; cf. also II,37, CSEL 85,1, p. 189, where Julian, moved by mercy, asks for a trial by men, illustrious for their prudence. In his own argumentation, Julian opts for a legal and learned approach; see *Ad Florum* V,20, CSEL 85,2, p. 201. The learned people needed can

Great.¹⁴ His group had to suffer envy because of truth.¹⁵ In any case, he hoped that he and his friends would be no longer beaten by the shouting of the ignorant¹⁶ and that the agreement of the populace should no longer contribute to his defamation. He complained about the great confusion that existed. He deplored that because of the huge number of stupid people, the guidance of reason is taken away from the Church so that popular belief 'steers the ship under full sail'.¹⁷ In these times, little could be accomplished with the wise, while with the common folk whatever one liked, no matter how banal, was acceptable. By a decree of the seditious, approval of virtues was banned from the Church. Because of their refusal to admit error, Julian *cum suis* were discredited by the common people "who weigh the merit of an opinion by its success and judge that opinion to be more true which they see wins the flavor of the majority".¹⁸ Bitterly, Julian remarked that it delighted people to defame whatever the lives of saints indicated in order that they might not be reproved by the examples of these famous men.¹⁹ People love to talk about the weakness of nature and the flesh, subject to innate sins, in order to no longer attribute conversion to the free will of man.²⁰ Who holds a plea in favor of a good and just God, is of the opinion that human beings are able to convert from sin and can become splendid through their search for virtue, is accused of idle and heretical talk.²¹ Therefore, the synod

be both Christians and secular; cf. I,69, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 76. With regard to Julian's position, see J.-M. SALAMITO, *Les virtuoses et la multitude. Aspects sociaux de la controverse entre Augustin et les pélagiens* (Collection Nomina), Genoble, 2005, pp. 208-212.

¹⁴ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 308-312, *CCSL* 88, pp. 392-394.

¹⁵ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 154, *CCSL* 88, p. 373. Julian considered his debate as a defense of the truth, now abandoned; cf. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 155, *CCSL* 88, p. 373.

¹⁶ *Ad Florum* II,1, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 164.

¹⁷ *Ad Florum* II,2, *CSEL* 85,1, pp. 164-165.

¹⁸ *Ad Florum* II,3, *CSEL* 85,1, pp. 165-166: "(...) qui sententiae meritum de prosperitatibus ponderans eam veriore aestimat, quam pluribus placere conspexerit." Already in *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 4, *CCSL* 88, Julian had argued that arguments should be pondered not numbered and that a mass of blind people could not contribute to the matter under debate.

¹⁹ See *Ad Florum* II,5, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 166.

²⁰ *Ad Florum* II,6, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 167; see also VI,3, *CSEL* 85,2, pp. 293-294 where it is said that people of the arena, circus, or the stage, because of their lustful desires, find excuses under the pretext of necessity.

²¹ *Ad Florum* II,7, *CSEL* 85,1, p. 167. Julian clearly belonged to those who believed that qualities such as work performance, virtue, commitment, qualities that had made Rome great, would even in these Christian times inspire the Empire anew; see, in this regard, P. BROWN, *Pelagius and his Supporters. Aims and Environment*, in *Id.*, *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine*, London, 1972, pp. 208-226.

desired should be organized in such a way that the uproar of the crowds was excluded.²² In fact, by introducing terror – clearly a hint to the events of 418/419, resulting in the condemnation of the Pelagians²³ –, people could only extort blind assent from the fearful, but would never get the support from the wise, for terror in discussion proves a lack of rational support.²⁴ Julian claimed that he himself only found understanding with a few wise men.²⁵ What was needed was wisdom and the small group that reason, learning and liberty make eminent, and not officials, be they bishops, administrators, or prefects,²⁶ because the ambitions and worldliness of the flagitious ones would not disturb these wise men. Indirectly, Julian offered criteria that should be followed in order to qualify statements as true and

²² *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 6, CCSL 88, p. 341.

²³ For the details, see WERMELINGER, *Rom und Pelagius*, pp. 196-209; M. LAMBERIGTS, *Co-operation Between Church and State in the Condemnation of the Pelagians*, in T.L. HETTEMMA & A. VAN DER KOOIJ (Eds.), *Religious Polemics in Context* (Studies in Theology and Religion, 11), Assen, 2004, pp. 363-375 (with further literature).

²⁴ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 11, CCSL 88, p. 342.

²⁵ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 154, CCSL 88, p. 373: “(...) iactatis (...) de paucitate (uelut) prudentium quibus uos placere gaudetis.”; cf. also frg. 271-272, CCSL 88, p. 387.

²⁶ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 6, CCSL 88, pp. 341-342; frg. 271a-b, CCSL 88, p. 387. In frg. 271b Julian seemed to have suggested that Augustine had roused hatred for Julian from the common dregs of workmen, sailors, bartenders, fishermen, cooks, butchers, youth dismissed from monasteries, and the ordinary run of clerics. According to SALAMITO, *Les virtuoses et la multitude*, p. 218-219, this might be an expression of Julian’s “mépris social”. É. REBILLARD, *Dogma Populare: Popular Belief in the Controversy between Augustine and Julian of Eclanum*, in *Augustinian Studies* 38 (2007) 175-187, p. 178 disagrees for he is of the opinion that the critique is directed against Augustine, not against these people. It is hard to decide who is right, given the really fragmentary character of the fragment. Personally, I would put the text within the broader context of what polemics are all about. In any case, the “dreg”-motive is well known in polemical literature since the time of Cicero; see I. OPELT, *Die Polemik in der christlichen lateinischen Literatur von Tertullian bis Augustin* (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften, NF 2,63), Heidelberg, 1980, p. 235. As we will see further, Julian can be very positive about the thinking of the common folk. I also want to remember what was said by Gennadius, *De viris illustribus* 46: in a period of famine, Julian, out of mercy, took care of many in need, especially the noble people and the religious. Gennadius suggests that he did so because he wanted to adhere them to his heresy. It is hard to evaluate such statement, but it should be said that Julian exactly did what was expected from a bishop in need. Moreover, Julian explicitly requested mercy and human attitudes from the rich people towards the poor and their own slaves; see A. KESSLER, *Reich-tumskritik und Pelagianismus. Die pelagianische Diatribe de divitiis: Situierung, Lesetext, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Paradosis, 43), Freiburg, 1999, pp. 56-59. It is hard to describe such attitudes as a “mépris social”.

sound: it should be confirmed by reason and Scripture and be celebrated by the erudition of holy men, who do not give their authority to the truth, but receive testimony and glory from their participation in it.²⁷

Julian was of the opinion that the knowledge of Scripture was suited for only a few learned people.²⁸ Simple people, occupied by profane affairs, did not obtain the erudition needed and should limit themselves to the basics of faith.²⁹ However, Julian really appreciated simple people's faith for these people were careful enough *sola fide* to enter the Church of Christ. They embraced the faith and despised every authority and every group that tried to persuade them to the contrary.³⁰ Moreover, there was also a great concern for these people: because of them and his love for God he did not want to stop his battle with Augustine.³¹

Julian was convinced that his own position was supported by reason, all learning, all justices, all pieties and all sacred testimonies,

²⁷ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 313, CCL 88, p. 394: "(...) hanc sanam et ueram esse sententiam, quam primo loco ratio, deinde scripturarum munivit auctoritas, et quam sanctorum uirorum semper celebrauit eruditio, qui tamen ueritati auctoritatem non suo tribuere consensu, sed testimonium et gloriam de eius susceperunt consortio (...)". It is interesting to see that Julian comes to this conclusion after having quoted from John Chrysostom and Pseudo-Basil (=Serapion of Thmuis). The common critique on Julian's rationalism is profoundly nuanced and put in historical perspective by J. Lössl, *Julian von Aeclanum*, pp. 110-114; *Julian of Aeclanum's "Rationalist" Exegesis*. Albert Bruckner Revisited, in *Augustiniana* 53 (2003) 77-106 (with further literature), esp. pp. 87-94. For the traditional view, see, e.g., SALAMITO, *Les virtuoses et la multitude*, p. 210.

²⁸ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 156, CCL 88, p. 373: "(...) difficilis paucisque conueniens eruditis sanctorum cognitio litterarum (...)"; cf. also frg. 159, CCL 88, p. 373.

²⁹ Cf. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 158, CCL 88, p. 373; see also *Ad Florum* II,14, CSEL 85,1, p. 172.

³⁰ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 158, CCL 88, p. 373: "(...) sola tamen fide ad ecclesiam Christi peruenire curarunt, ne facile obscuris quaestionibus terreantur, sed credentes Deum uerum conditorem esse hominum, indubitanter quoque teneant quia pius est, quia uerax, quia iustus; atque hanc aestimationem de illa trinitate seruantes, quicquid audierint huic conuenire sententiae, amplectentur atque collaudent, nec hoc eis ulla uis argumentationis euellat, sed detestentur omnem auctoritatem atque omnem societatem contraria persuadere nitentem." See also the comments of REBILLARD, *Dogma Populare*, pp. 179-180. Also Augustine is of the opinion that one can be able to adhere to the Christian faith without being an expert in Scripture; see *Contra Iulianum* VI,39, PL 44, 843. Therefore I think that the position of SALAMITO, *Les virtuoses et la multitude*, p. 221, that Julian had no sympathy for the common people should be nuanced, as he indirectly does on p. 223 (referring to *Ad Florum* II,11; see next note).

³¹ *Ad Florum* II,11, CSEL 85,1, p. 170: "(...) primo benignitas, quam generi debemus humano, deinceps spes et fides, quam habemus in Deum (...)".

and that Augustine, with his doctrine, was most imprudent toward the learned, most contemptuous toward the saints, and most irreverent toward God.³² Julian regularly complained about the fact that Augustine had stirred up the common folk against him,³³ and had run to it because Augustine wanted to avoid a man-to-man fight.³⁴ Instead of accepting a fair discussion on the basis of what is present in both philosophers and Catholic authors, Augustine riled-up the working folk and the common people against Julian.³⁵ He shouted with women, stable hands and tribunes and brought, with the help of Alypius, 80 or more well-fed horses to Italy,³⁶ but would never accept the views of learned people.³⁷ Every learned reader of my work, Julian claimed,

³² *Ad Florum* I,13, CSEL 85,1, p. 171: "Nam si, ut et superior sermo patefecit et secuturus docebit, quicquid ratio est, quicquid eruditio, quicquid iustitia, quicquid pietas, quicquid testimoniorum sacrorum huic quod tuemur dogmati suffragatur, nihil aliud inimici nostri toto adipiscuntur conatu, quam ut doctis quibusque impudentissimi, sanctis contumacissimi, in Deum profanissimi comprobentur."

³³ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 251, CSEL 88, p. 385; frg. 255-256; CCSL 88, p. 385; frg. 314, CCSL 88, p. 394.

³⁴ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 253: "(Dicis quod) certaminis singularis oblitus in uulgus refugerim."

³⁵ *Ad Florum* I,41, CSEL 85,1, p. 30: "Equidem affatim mihi tam philosophantium quam eorum qui catholici fuerunt, quod quaerimus, scripta suppeditant; sed uereor, ne refrageris et, si philosophorum ego senatum aduocauero, tu continuo sellarios opifices omneque in nos uulgus accendas." According to SALAMITO, *Les vertueuses et la multitude*, pp. 219-220, this is a proof that Julian was "issu d'une prestigieuse famille italienne, nourri de culture classique, le jeune et brillant évêque d'Éclane, confronté à l'opposition populaire que suscitent contre lui les partisans d'Augustin, s'identifie en imagination à Cicéron en lutte, par sa seule éloquence, contre les bandes de Clodius." However, the accusations against Augustine are very serious and, at least from Julian's perspective, justify his critique. See also REBILLARD, *Dogma Populaire*, pp. 182-184.

³⁶ *Ad Florum* I,42, CSEL 85,1, p. 30: "Vociferans cum feminis cunctisque caloniibus et tribunis, quibus octoginta aut amplius equos tota Africa saginatos collega tuus nuper adduxit Alypius (...)." In I,74, CSEL 85,1, p. 90, the following accusations can be found: outlays of money, bestowal of inheritances, the sending of horses, the uproar of people, and the corruption of the official powers. In III,35, CSEL 85,1, pp. 374-375, these accusations are repeated and further specified: Augustine is accused of having upset the whole of Italy with great divisions. He has hired people to stir up rebellions at Rome, and sent horses (under the care of Alypius), collected throughout almost the whole of Africa but at the expense of the poor, to tribunes and centurions. The powers of the world have been bribed with the inheritances from matrons in order to stir up the furor of the public against Julian and his companions. Augustine has destroyed the rest in the churches. Finally he has stained the reign of the emperor with the impiety of persecutions. With regard to the complaint about persecutions, see also *Ad Florum* VI,2, CSEL 85,2, p. 293. It should be said that since the loss of Spain Africa had become the most important supplier of horses; cf. Y.-M. DUVAL, *Julien d'Éclane et Rufin d'Aquilée. Du concile de Rimini à la repression pélagienne. L'intervention imperial en matière religieuse*, in *REA* 24 (1978) 243-271, esp. p. 250.

³⁷ *Ad Florum* I,43, CSEL 85,1, p. 31.

understands that Augustine misuses the ignorance of his supporters, deceived by their common inference.³⁸ Julian was convinced that if the opportunity would have been given to discuss the matter among learned people, Augustine would have been squarely defeated.³⁹ Indeed, among prudent and pious people no one could be found who dared to state that with God as good creator of the human soul and body any sin could exist in babies.⁴⁰ He even suggested that Augustine could not find any defender in so great a multitude of his doctrine.⁴¹ In any case, Julian hoped that in the course of time the storm would subside and that common folk, no longer able to win through their uproar, would finally be corrected by the authority of wise men.⁴²

Further, Julian was upset by the way Augustine replied in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II to Julian's *Ad Turbantium*. According to Julian, his positions as explained in *Ad Turbantium*, were dramatically misinterpreted and falsely presented by Augustine.⁴³ Augustine was accused of a lack of gravity and a failure in the duty of writing, a crime among learned people.⁴⁴ Julian accused Augustine of having incited hatred against Julian by truncating Julian's work, a sign of Augustine's dishonesty and malice, who, by doing so, also roused the hearts of the common people against Julian!⁴⁵ The way in which Augustine, on the basis of a summary, with *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II had replied to Julian's *Ad Turbantium* was qualified by Julian as

³⁸ *Ad Florum* II,36, CSEL 85,1, p. 188; for a similar critique, see II,46, CSEL 85,1, p. 195; IV,90, CSEL 85,2, p. 95.

³⁹ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 3a-b, CCSL 88, p. 341; frg. 6, CCSL 88, pp. 341-342; cf. also *Ad Florum* II,2, CSEL 85,1, p. 164. Time and again, Julian will repeat that no educated person would choose the side of Augustine; see, e.g., II,26, CSEL 85,1, p. 180.

⁴⁰ With regard to Julian's view on the goodness of creation, see M. LAMBERIGTS, *Julian of Aeclanum: A Plea for a Good Creator*, in *Augustiniana* 38 (1988) 5-24. In my view, Julian really wanted to be a Christian bishop and theological thinker. I do think one is unfair to Julian by describing him as a bishop philosopher; see SALAMITO, *Les virtuoses et la multitude*, p. 209.

⁴¹ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 315, CCSL 88, p. 394: "(...) de tanta multitudine assertorem non potest inuenire."

⁴² *Ad Florum* V,4, CSEL 85,2, p. 170: "Nec illud ergo desperare vel possumus uel debemus, quoniam processu temporum tempestas excitata considat et auctoritate sapientum uulgus ignauum quod nunc perstreptit corrigatur (...)"

⁴³ See Julian's vehement reactions in, e.g., *Ad Florum* IV,4, CSEL 85,2, pp. 6; IV,90, CSEL 85,2, p. 94. Therefore, I think not all of what was said by Julian can be reduced to simply rhetorical talk; cf. LAMBERIGTS, *The Italian Julian of Aeclanum*, pp. 88; 92-93. With regard to the technical aspect of the way in which the excerptor of Julian's *Ad Turbantium* did his summary, see WEBER, *Some Literary Aspects of the Debate between Julian of Eclanum and Augustine*, pp. 297-299.

⁴⁴ *Ad Florum* I,19, CSEL 85,1, p. 16.

⁴⁵ *Ad Florum* I,19, CSEL 85,1, p. 16.

"the shamelessness of Numidia" for in the one and the same work Augustine dared to say that Julian was wrong and that Augustine had not read what Julian had written.⁴⁶ On the basis of a truncated summary of Julian's *Ad Turbantium*, Augustine claimed in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II that Julian had not dared to reply to his position that, according to the very ancient and firm rule of the Catholic faith, the baptism of children was needed for the remission of sin.⁴⁷ However, Julian, in his *Ad Turbantium*, had clearly emphasized the need of baptism for all human beings, including babies.⁴⁸ However, the idea that baptism for babies was due to the guilt of original sin did, according to Julian, not belong to the faith "antiquitus tradita atque fundata".⁴⁹ It was a doctrine inspired by the devil, formulated by Mani, celebrated by Marcion, Faustus, and Adimantus and all their disciples, and now introduced by the Punic disputer⁵⁰ Augustine in Italy.⁵¹ Julian thus

⁴⁶ *Ad Florum* I,16, CSEL 85,1, pp. 13-14. On this and the following accusations, see N. CIPRIANI, *La polemica antiafricana di Giuliano d'Eclano: artificio letterario o scontro di tradizione teologica?*, in *Cristianesimo e specificità regionali nel Mediterraneo latino (sec. IV-VI)* (Studia ephemeridis Augustinianum, 46), Rome, pp. 147-180; D. WEBER, "For What is so Monstrous as What the Punic Fellow Says?" *Reflections on the Literary Background of Julian's Polemical Attacks on Augustine's Homeland*, in P.-Y. FUX, J.-M. ROESSLI, O. WERMELINGER (Eds.), *Saint Augustin: africanité et universalité. Actes du colloque international Alger-Annaba, 1-7 avril 2001* (Paradosis, 45/1), Fribourg, 2003, pp. 75-82, esp. pp. 79-81; cf also LAMBERIGTS, *The Italian Julian of Aeclanum about the African Augustine of Hippo*. This rhetorical and polemical motive is not very much taken into consideration by SALAMITO, *Les vertus et la multitude*, pp. 211-212.

⁴⁷ *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II,4, CSEL 42, p. 256.

⁴⁸ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 16, CCSL 88, pp. 344-345: "Nos igitur in tantum gratiam baptismatis omnibus utilem aetatibus confitemur, ut cunctos qui illam non necessariam etiam paruulis putant, aeterno feriamus anathemate. (...) Sed haec gratia non aduersatur iustitiae, quae maculas eluit iniquitatis; nec facit peccata, sed purgat, quae absoluit reos, non calumniatur innocuos. Christus enim, qui est sui operis redemptor, augeat circa imaginem suam continua largitate beneficia; et quos fecerat condendo bonos, facit innouando adoptandoque meliores."

⁴⁹ In *Ad Florum* II,178, CSEL 85,1, p. 297, Julian drew a line from Augustine's *tradux peccati*-doctrine to Tertullian's *tradux animarum*-doctrine, a doctrine, Julian added, condemned. The link from one heresy to the other is clear!

⁵⁰ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 52, CCSL 88, p. 352; cf. also *Ad Florum* I,48, CSEL 85,1, pp. 36-38, where Julian sarcastically praises Augustine's intelligence and learning and calls him a very pious priest and very learned orator; see also III,154, CSEL 85,1, p. 458; IV,75, CSEL 85,2, p. 76. With regard to this well known rhetorical locus, see N. CIPRIANI, *Aspetti letterari dell'Ad Florum di Giuliano d'Eclano*, in *Augustinianum* 15 (1975) 125-167, p. 147.

⁵¹ *Ad Florum* I,59, CSEL 85,1, p. 55: "Non est haec fides antiquitus tradita atque fundata nisi in conciliis malignantium, inspirata a diabolo, prolata a Manicheo, celebrata a Marcione Fausto Adimanto omnibusque eorum satellitibus et nunc a te in Italiam, quod grauiter gemimus, eructata." See also V,9, CSEL 85,2, p. 177: "Non

suggested that the idea of original sin and the topics related to it – if there were sound judges, one should ask for Augustine's excommunication, for he gave up religion, erudition, and the common sense⁵² – were an invention, opposed to the ancient Christian faith. Julian regularly complained about the Punic or Numidian theological invasion in Italy,⁵³ an invasion, as already mentioned, introduced by the Punic disputer and orator,⁵⁴ the bad philosopher,⁵⁵ the Aristotle of the Punic people,⁵⁶ the writer Augustine.⁵⁷ It was a debauchery by African robbers,⁵⁸ with Augustine as their leader, a leader revealing Manichean doctrinal perfidy.⁵⁹ Julian considered his debate as a war against the Numidians armed only with a small shield,⁶⁰ and it will be no surprise that the pagans referred to when speaking about natural virtues were all involved in the Punic wars⁶¹

hoc ea catholica fides credit antiquitus (...).” On Julian's arguments with regard to the Manichean character of Augustine's doctrine, see M. LAMBERIGTS, *Was Augustine a Manichaean? The Assessment of Julian of Aeclanum*, in J. VAN OORT, O. WERMELINGER & G. WURST (Eds.), *Augustine and Manichaeism in the Latin West. Proceedings of the Fribourg-Utrecht Symposium of the International Association of Manichaean Studies (IAMS)* (Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, 49), Leiden, Boston & Cologne, 2001, pp. 113-136.

⁵² *Ad Florum* I,48, CSEL 85,1, p. 38; in I,114, CSEL 85,1, p. 132, it is said that Augustine's view is against all learning and reason, and the law of God; in III,92, CSEL 85,1, pp. 417-418, Julian criticizes the improper way of arguing of Augustine.

⁵³ See, e.g., *Ad Florum* VI,18, CSEL 85,2, p. 350. Both have a very negative connotation; see WEBER, “For What is so Monstruous as What the Punic Fellow Says?”, p. 79. For the topos as such, see CIPRIANI, *Aspetti letterari dell' Ad Florum di Giuliano d'Eclano*, p. 149; ID., *La polemica antiafricana di Giuliano d'Eclano*, p. 147.

⁵⁴ *Ad Florum* I,48, CSEL 85,1, p. 37.

⁵⁵ *Ad Florum* V,11, CSEL 85,2, p. 180.

⁵⁶ *Ad Florum* III,199, CSEL 85,1, p. 498.

⁵⁷ *Ad Florum* I,73, CSEL 85,1, p. 89.

⁵⁸ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 51, CCSL 88, p. 352.

⁵⁹ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 78, CCSL 88, p. 360: “Perfecte itaque Manichaeus est, qui malum originale defendit.”; *Ad Florum* III,21, CSEL 85,1, p. 363: “(...) Manicheorum reuelata perfidia (...); cf. also IV,23, CSEL 85,2, p. 24. In I,120, CSEL 85,1, p. 136 it is suggested that Augustine is even worse than Mani. Such approaches are very common in polemics; see OPELT, *Die Polemik in der christlichen lateinischen Literatur*, pp. 157ff.

⁶⁰ *Ad Florum* VI,6, CSEL 85,2, p. 298: “(...) ueniamus iam ad discussionem primorum hominum, quorum taxatione aciei nostrae Numida quasi caetratus occurrat.” With regard to Julian's way of disputing, see J.H. BAXER, *Notes on the Latin of Julian of Aeclanum*, in ALMA 21 (1954), 5-54, p. 10-11; LÖSSL, *Julian von Aeclanum*, p. 107; LAMBERIGTS, *The Italian Julian*, pp. 84-88.

⁶¹ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 106, CCSL 88, p. 364.

Further, in his *Ad Turbantium*, Julian had appealed to Eastern authors such as Chrysostom⁶² and Serapion of Thmuis,⁶³ thereby putting the debate in a broader context.

In sum, according to Julian, the Church of his days was corrupted by a new, impious, stupid, Manichean doctrine, introduced by force, even though it was unacceptable to wise and learned people, to whom a qualified board of judges had been denied, while approval of the Manichean doctrine was obtained by force.

II. Augustine's Appeal to the Fathers: Some Introductory Remarks

Given the critique as formulated by Julian, it is obvious that Augustine considers it his task to resist Julian with the help of his predecessors in order that the Christian people would prefer their teaching over Julian's impious novelties.⁶⁴ Like Julian, Augustine is also a rhetor, that means that he uses all rhetorical techniques, being at his disposal.⁶⁵

It should be restated that for Augustine Scripture's authority was still prevailing over tradition, for Scripture was and remained the first and most important norm.⁶⁶ According to Augustine, the Fathers

⁶² See *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 311-312, CCSL 88, pp. 393-394. Julian quoted from a Latin translation of John Chrysostom's *Ad Neophytos* 6 (A. WENGER, *Jean Chrysostome. Huit catéchèses baptismales inédites* [SC, 50], Paris, 1957, pp. 151-167, here p. 154). With regard to the manuscript tradition and the problems related to a correct reading of the text, see J.-P. BOUHOT, *Version inédite du sermon "Ad Neophytos" de S. Jean Chrysostome, utilisée par S. Augustin*, in *RÉA* 17 (1971) 27-41. For a possible Greek influence on Julian's theology, see N. CIPRIANI, *Sulle fonti orientali della teologia di Giuliano d'Eclano*, in A.V. NAZZARRO (Ed.), *Giuliano d'Eclano e l'"Hirpinia Christiana"*, Naples, 2004, pp. 157-170, here pp. 158-162.

⁶³ Julian wrongly attributed the work of Serapion against the Manichees to Basil; see *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 310, CCSL 88, p. 393; cf. 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 studio I (*Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum*, 24) Rome, 1987, pp. 439-449.

⁶⁴ *Contra Iulianum* II,1, PL 44, 671.

⁶⁵ D. WEBER, *Textkritische Spezifika aus Augustins Schriften gegen Julian von Eclanum*, in A. PRIMMER, K. SMOLAK & D. WEBER (Eds.), *Textsorten und Textkritik. Tagungsbeiträge* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, Bd. 693; Veröffentlichungen der Kommission zur Herausgabe des Corpus der lateinischen Kirchenväter, Heft 21), Wien, 2002, pp. 193-209, here pp. 194-195.

⁶⁶ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,20, CSEL 60, pp. 542-543: " (...) ad curam nostram existimo pertinere non solum scripturas sanctas canonicas aduersus

should be qualified as *diuinarum Scripturarum tractatores*,⁶⁷ for their commentaries were dealing with and inspired by Scriptural texts. At the same time, these Fathers discussed the Sacred Scriptures with great renown,⁶⁸ faithfully and remarkably.⁶⁹ What they taught, they had learned from the apostles.⁷⁰ These men, learned in the sacred writings, enjoy a brilliant reputation and are praised for the way in which they governed the Church.⁷¹

The faith of these *doctores* shows both a historical continuity and a geographical unanimity. With regard to the historical continuity, Augustine quotes in *Contra Iulianum* I,5-13, in chronological order, texts from Irenaeus, Cyprian, Reticius of Autun, Olympius of Barcelona, Hilary of Poitiers and Innocent I. With regard to the universality of what was believed, Eastern Fathers are added to the dossier, namely Gregory of Nazianz, Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, and the Synod of Diospolis, for, in Augustine's view, a *consensio* exists between the Eastern and Western Fathers with regard to the doctrine of original sin and the topics related to it.⁷²

eos testes adhibere, quod iam satis fecimus, uerum etiam de sanctorum litteris, qui eas ante nos fama celeberrima et ingenti gloria tractauerunt, aliqua documenta proferre, non quo canonicis libris a nobis ullius disputatoris aequetur auctoritas, tamquam omnino non sit quod melius seu uerius ab aliquo catholico quam ab alio itidem catholico sentiatur, sed ut admoneantur qui putant istos aliquid dicere, quemadmodum de his rebus ante noua istorum uaniloquia catholici antistites eloquia diuina secuti sint, et sciant a nobis rectam et antiquitus fundatam catholicam fidem aduersus recentem Pelagianorum hereticorum praesumptionem perniciemque defendi." Cf. also *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II,51, CSEL 42, p. 307; *Contra Iulianum* II,30, PL 44, 694; *Opus imperfectum* IV,112, CSEL 85,2, p. 122. See also MARTL, *La tradición en San Agustín*, pp. 175-191; PERAGO, *Il valore della tradizione nella polemica tra sant' Agostino e Giuliano d'Eclano*, p. 143; MASCHIO, *L'argumentazione patristica di S. Agostino*, p. 477; A.-M. LA BONNARDIÈRE, *Le canon des Écritures*, in EAD. (Ed.), *Saint Augustin et la Bible* (La Bible de tous les temps, 3) Paris, 1986, pp. 287-301.

⁶⁷ Cf. *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II,51, CSEL 42, p. 307; *Opus imperfectum* I,67, CSEL 85,1, p. 71 ("catholici intellectores apostoli"); II,178, CSEL 85,1, p. 299 ("catholici doctores secundum scripturas sanctas").

⁶⁸ *Contra Iulianum* II,1, PL 44, 671: "(...) Scripturas sanctas ingenti gloria tractauerunt (...)".

⁶⁹ *Contra Iulianum* II,19, PL 44, 686.

⁷⁰ *Contra Iulianum* II,30, PL 44, 694: "(...) ex apostolis ista didicerunt, et secundum apostolos ista docuerunt (...)"; *Opus imperfectum* I,67, CSEL 85,1, p. 71: "(...) catholicos intellectores apostoli (...)".

⁷¹ *Contra Iulianum* III,1, PL 44, 701: "(...) tot tantorumque sanctorum, et in sacris Litteris eruditorum, et in Ecclesiae regimine tam clara memoria et laude polletium (...)".

⁷² With the exception of two texts from Ambrose, no new texts will be added to Augustine's dossier in *Opus imperfectum*.

III. Presentation of the Individual Doctores

By way of an introduction, it should be said that Augustine seldom mentions the names of his predecessors without appreciative epithet, neither as individuals, as we will see further, nor as group.⁷³ The doctors he invokes are giants, worthy of being followed, as Augustine claims to do: I teach what I have learned from these holy and learned men.⁷⁴ These men were brilliant in the Catholic Church because of their search for sound doctrine. Protected and stimulated by spiritual weapons they waged strenuous wars against the heretics. After having faithfully performed the labors of their ministry, they passed away in peace.⁷⁵ Quite regularly, when giving the list of his heroes, Augustine, in order to give the impression that he is not exhaustive, adds a phrase such as, "aliique quam plurimi" and the like in order to make clear to the reader that the positions he is defending are held by many others.⁷⁶

a. The Latin Fathers

1. Irenaeus

Irenaeus is the oldest of the doctors, Augustine makes use of in his debate with Julian.⁷⁷ The bishop of Lyon, who lived *non longe a temporibus apostolorum*, is described as a *sanctus*⁷⁸ *antiquus homo Dei*.⁷⁹ Whenever Augustine presents the long(er) list of his doctors, Irenaeus, for evidently chronological reasons, is put in the first spot.⁸⁰

⁷³ Cf. *Contra Iulianum* I,32, PL 44, 697: "Propter quam catholicam ueritatem sancti ac beati et in diuinorum eloquiorum pertractatione clarissimi sacerdotes, Irenaeus, Cyprianus, Reticius, Olympius, Hilarius, Ambrosius, Gregorius, Innocentius, Ioannes, Basilius, quibus addo presbyterum, velis nolis, Hieronymum, ut omittam eos qui nondum dormierunt ...".

⁷⁴ *Contra Iulianum* I,29-30, PL 44, 661-662.

⁷⁵ *Contra Iulianum* I,30, PL 44, 661-662: "In Ecclesia catholica doctrinae sanae studiis claruerunt; spiritualibus armis muniti et accincti strenua contra haereticos bella gesserunt; perfuncti fideliter suae dispensationis laboribus in pacis gremio dormierunt."

⁷⁶ See, e.g., *Contra Iulianum* II,33, PL 44, 696; VI,70, PL 44, 866; *Opus imperfectum* I,9, CSEL 85,1, p. 10; I,117, CSEL 85,1, p. 134.

⁷⁷ For Augustine's knowledge of Irenaeus' work, see B. ALTANER, *Augustinus und Irenäus*, in ID., *Kleine Patristische Schriften* (TU, 83), Berlin, 1967, pp. 194-203; G. BARTELINK, *Die Beeinflussung Augustins durch die griechischen Patres*, in J. DEN BOEFT & J. VAN OORT (Eds.), *Augustiniana Traiectina. Communications présentées au Colloque International d'Utrecht (13-14 novembre 1986)* (Études augustiniennes), Paris, 1987, pp. 9-24, p. 14 (with further literature).

⁷⁸ *Contra Iulianum* I,32, PL 44, 662.

⁷⁹ *Contra Iulianum* I,5, PL 44, 644.

⁸⁰ *Contra Iulianum* II,33, PL 44, 697; II,37, PL 44, 700-701 (two times); III,32, PL 44, 719; IV,72, CSEL 85,2, p. 75; IV,73, CSEL 85,2, p. 75.

From Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses*, only two texts are quoted in *Contra Iulianum* I,5.⁸¹ In Augustine's further development of the tradition-argument, they will not really function.⁸² Therefore, in my view, the function of Irenaeus in the list of the quoted Fathers seems to be limited to being a link between the apostles and the period immediately thereafter.

2. Cyprian

The second witness, the most victorious⁸³ Cyprian,⁸⁴ a holy man,⁸⁵ bishop,⁸⁶ outstanding doctor,⁸⁷ extraordinary soldier of Christ,⁸⁸ and blessed African martyr,⁸⁹ who shed his life for the most solidly

⁸¹ PL 44, 644; the texts are quoted from Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, IV,2,7; V,19,1. Augustine used the Latin translation of this work; see B. ALTANER, *Augustinus und Irenäus*, p. 194; E. LUPIERI, *Agostino e Ireneo*, in *Vetera Christianorum* 15 (1978) 113-115.

⁸² It is a bit strange to read in J. GROSS, *Entstehungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas* I (Geschichte des Erbsündendogmas), München-Basel, 1960, p. 86 that Augustine quoted Irenaeus as the first one because in antiquity an important role was given to the bishop of Lyon with regard to the dogma of original sin. First, I do not think that one can rightly speak of a dogma of original sin in Irenaeus. Secondly, as Augustine explicitly states, he is interested in this man because he lived not long after the time of the apostles. Finally, as already mentioned by ALTANER, *Augustinus und Irenäus*, pp. 194, one should recognize that Augustine did not use the best texts in order to substantiate his own position. But even the two texts quoted do not play any considerable role after *Contra Iulianum* I.

⁸³ *Contra Iulianum* II,6, PL 44, 676; II,25, PL 44, 690.

⁸⁴ Augustine already referred to Cyprian, *Epistula* 64, in *De peccatorum et remissione* III,10, CSEL 60, pp. 135-136. Only in 418, Augustine added new texts to his anti-pelagian dossier. With regard to Augustine's use of Cyprian in general, see A.A.R. BASTIAENSEN, *Augustin et ses prédécesseurs latins chrétiens*, in J. DEN BOEFT & J. VAN OORT (Eds.), *Augustiniana Traiectina. Communications présentées au Colloque International d'Utrecht (13-14 novembre 1986)* (Études augustiniennes), Paris, 1987, pp. 25-57, pp. 34-36; E. DASSMANN, *Cyprianus*, in *AL* I, Basel, 1986-1994, 196-211; with regard to the appeal to Cyprian in the Pelagian controversy, see esp. pp. 208-209. In opposition to the appeal to Cyprian in the Donatist controversy it should be stressed that Augustine nowhere criticizes Cyprian during the Pelagian controversy; with regard to the differences between Cyprian and Augustine, see, among others, A. PANNIER, *Saint Augustin, Saint Cyprien: La postérité de deux ecclésiologies*, in *Saint Augustin. Dossier conçu et dirigé par P. RANSON* (Les dossiers H), Lausanne, 1988, pp. 237-247; M. LABROUSSE, *Le baptême des hérétiques d'après Cyprien, Optat et Augustin: influences et divergences*, in *RÉA* 42 (1996) 223-242.

⁸⁵ *Contra Iulianum* I,32, PL 44, 662.

⁸⁶ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,24, CSEL 60, p. 548; *Contra Iulianum* I,6, PL 44, 655; *Opus imperfectum* I,106, CSEL 85,1, p. 125; VI,10, CSEL 85,1, p. 313.

⁸⁷ *Contra Iulianum* I,22, PL 44, 655; II,9, PL 44, 679.

⁸⁸ *Opus imperfectum* VI,6, CSEL 85,2, p. 299.

⁸⁹ *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II,51, CSEL 42, p. 308; *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,21, CSEL 60, p. 544; IV,24, CSEL 60, p. 548; *Contra Iulianum* I,6,

grounded faith of the Church,⁹⁰ is of much more importance for Augustine, and this so for many reasons. He is a very renowned commentator on the divine words⁹¹ in his speeches and writings, teaching in the Catholic, not the Manichean, Church.⁹² He is called a memorable teacher of the truth in the churches.⁹³ He was a model; worthy of being imitated for this man fought throughout his life and doctrine for the truth of Christ and was victorious thanks to the grace of Christ.⁹⁴ He is famous not only in the churches of Africa and the West, but also in those of the East, and his writings are dispersed everywhere.⁹⁵ Augustine insists that Cyprian in his letters has shown how truly Christian and Catholic the faith is which we hold (*tenemus*). He was my teacher and, just like me, defended doctrine of original sin, Augustine claims.⁹⁶ It is this sound⁹⁷ faith, transmitted through the Sacred Scriptures from antiquity, handed down to Cyprian and transmitted by him,⁹⁸ which we must grasp and preserve today. Augustine has a very good reason to refer to Cyprian: Pelagius recognized the authority of Cyprian and wanted to imitate Cyprian's *Ad Quirinum* in his own *Liber testimoniorum*.⁹⁹ Throughout the discussion with Julian,

PL 44, 655; II,6, PL 44, 677; II,18, PL 44, 685; III,31, PL 44, 718. In *Opus imperfectum* I,50, CSEL 85,1, p. 44, Cyprian's martyrdom gets a special emphasis, because Julian had stated that nobody is willing to give his life for the God of Augustine. In his reply, Augustine states that Cyprian not only believed in the existence of original sin, but also gave his life for his faith.

⁹⁰ *Opus imperfectum* I,106, CSEL 85,1, p. 125.

⁹¹ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,24, CSEL 60, p. 549; IV,28, CSEL 60, p. 558.

⁹² *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,27, CSEL 60, p. 554.

⁹³ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,26, CSEL 60, p. 552.

⁹⁴ Cf. *Contra Iulianum* II,25, PL 44, 691; *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,26, CSEL 60, p. 552.

⁹⁵ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,21, CSEL 60, p. 543: "Beatissimum, corona etiam martyrii gloriosissimum Cyprianum nec Africanis atque occidentalibus tantum, uerum et orientalibus ecclesiis fama praedicante et scripta eius longe lateque diffundente notissimum (...)". In IV,32, CSEL 60, p. 568, Augustine explicitly mentions that he only quoted partially from both Ambrose and Cyprian, for otherwise his treatise would be too long.

⁹⁶ *Opus imperfectum* VI,21, CSEL 85,2, p. 363.

⁹⁷ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,32, CSEL 60, p. 569.

⁹⁸ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,32, CSEL 60, p. 568: "(...) Cyprianus (...) demonstretur, quam sit haec, quam tenemus, fides uera uereque christiana atque catholica, sicut per scripturas sanctas antiquitus tradita sic a patribus nostris et usque ad hoc tempus (...) retenta atque seruata et deinceps propitio Deo retinenda atque seruanda. Nam sic Cypriano et a Cypriano traditam haec atque huiusmodi ex eius litteris testimonia prolata testantur, sic autem usque ad tempora nostra seruata (...)".

⁹⁹ See, e.g., *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,21, CSEL 60, p. 543; IV,25, CSEL 60, p. 552; See also F.-J. THONNARD, *Le témoignage de saint Cyprien*, in BA 23, Paris, 1974, pp. 824-825; A. DE VEER, *Les relations de saint Augustin et de Pélage avec Albine, Pinien et Mélanie*, in BA 22, pp. 674-675.

Augustine quotes twenty four texts from the bishop of Carthage, taken from five works and one letter.¹⁰⁰ As a result, Cyprian becomes the second most important witness in the debate with Julian, Ambrose being the first. It should be noted that the Cyprian-dossier, is already complete in *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV.¹⁰¹ However, one gets the impression that Augustine, in comparison to *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum*, less often refers to Cyprian in both *Contra Iulianum* and *Opus imperfectum*, probably because Julian was so negative with regard to the Punic people.

3. Reticius of Autun and Olympius of Barcelona

The next witnesses are Reticius of Autun¹⁰² and Olympius of Barcelona.¹⁰³ Both bishops participated in the synod of Rome (313). In this synod, held because of the nascent Donatist controversy, with Melchiades¹⁰⁴ as president, Donatus, the father of the schism was condemned and Caecilian of Carthage absolved of wrongdoing.¹⁰⁵ Augustine's information about these bishops' individual data is rather limited: most often the praises they receive are common to all doctors in the lists as given by Augustine.¹⁰⁶ On a more individual level, the only thing Augustine knows about Olympius, a man of great glory in the Church and in Christ, is that he was a Spanish bishop.¹⁰⁷ Reticius is called a man of great authority,¹⁰⁸ a man of God:¹⁰⁹ given his expertise in the Donatist controversy, he deserves a place in the court, Julian was asking for. Further, both bishops function as chronological

¹⁰⁰ Augustine quotes from Cyprian, *De opere et eleemosynis* 1; 3 (two citations); 18; 22; *De mortalitate* 2; 4; 7; 26; *De oratione dominica* 10; 12 (2 citations); 14; 16; 17; 18; 22; 26; *Testimonia* III,4 (2 citations); III,54; *De bono patientiae* 3; 11 (2 citations); 17; *Epistula* 64,2,4,5.

¹⁰¹ See the pertinent remarks of DASSMANN, *Cyprianus*, 208. For a different opinion, see THONNARD, *Le témoignage de saint Cyprien*, p. 825.

¹⁰² For Reticius, see, e.g., M. FIEDROWICZ, *Reticius*, in *LThK*³ 8, 1132.

¹⁰³ With regard to Augustine's use of Olympius, see V. MENOSA, *San Agustín y Olympio, Obispo de Barcelona*, in *Augustinus* 25 (1980) 17-21. In *Opus imperfectum*, Augustine will no longer appeal to Olympius.

¹⁰⁴ See Ch. PIETRI & L. PIETRI (dir.), *Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313-604)* (Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire, 2), Vol. 2, Rome, 2000, p. 1513, s.v. *Miltiades*.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. *Contra Iulianum* I,7, PL 44, 644; *Opus imperfectum* I,55, CSEL 85,1, p. 52.

¹⁰⁶ See, e.g., *Contra Iulianum* II,33, PL 44, 697; II,37, PL 44, 700-701; III,32, PL 44, 719.

¹⁰⁷ *Contra Iulianum* I,8, PL 44, 644-645.

¹⁰⁸ *Contra Iulianum* I,7, PL 44, 644: Augustine bases his praise on the *gesta ecclesiastica* of the process in Rome.

¹⁰⁹ *Opus imperfectum* I,55, CSEL 85,1, p. 52.

links between Cyprian and Hilary.¹¹⁰ From each of these bishops, one text is quoted.¹¹¹

4. Hilary of Poitiers

With Hilary of Poitiers,¹¹² *episcopus Gallus*,¹¹³ a holy¹¹⁴ and blessed man,¹¹⁵ worthy of veneration,¹¹⁶ an important, well known, and extraordinary¹¹⁷ Catholic doctor¹¹⁸ of the Church, highly praised among Catholic bishops, outstanding for his knowledge and reputation, we have a *defensor acerrimus* of the Catholic Church against heretics.¹¹⁹ It is evident that he is worthy of being a member of the court.¹²⁰ Within the list of doctors, Hilary is given a rather important place.¹²¹ He is evidently present whenever Augustine offers a long list of all the doctors, but even in cases Augustine mentions only a few, Hilary quite regularly is on the list.¹²² In this regard, one should

¹¹⁰ See, e.g., *Contra Iulianum* I,32, PL 44, 662; II,33, PL 44, 697; II,37, PL 44, 700; III,32, PL 44, 719.

¹¹¹ Both writings are lost.

¹¹² On Augustine's use of Hilary in the Pelagian controversy, see H.C. BRENNER, *Hilarius*, in *AL* III,3/4, Basel, 2006, 341-348, esp. 344-346.

¹¹³ *Contra Iulianum* I,9, PL 44, 645; I,22, PL 44, 655; *Opus imperfectum* II,33, CSEL 85,1, p. 186. In *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,7, CSEL 60, p. 520, Augustine wrongly attributed a text of Ambrosiaster on Rom. 5,12 to Hilary. In this regard, see A. de VEER, *Saint Augustin et l'Ambrosiaster*, in *BA*, 23, Paris, 1974, pp. 817-824. According to de Veer, the text, with attribution to Hilary, returns in *Opus imperfectum* II,33, CSEL 85,1, p. 186 and in II,164, CSEL 85,1, p. 285. In my view, in the first case, there is no evidence that Augustine really had in mind the Ambrosiaster text.

¹¹⁴ *Contra Iulianum* I,32, PL 44, 662; II,28, PL 44, 693; II,33, PL 44, 696.

¹¹⁵ *Contra Iulianum* II,26, PL 44, 691; II, 29, PL 44, 693.

¹¹⁶ *Contra Iulianum* II,8, PL 44, 678.

¹¹⁷ *Contra Iulianum* II,28, PL 44, 693.

¹¹⁸ *Opus imperfectum* I,71, CSEL 85,1, p. 83.

¹¹⁹ *Contra Iulianum* I,9, PL 44, 645: "Ecclesiae catholicae aduersus haereticos acerrimum defensorem uenerandum quis ignoret Hilarium episcopum Gallum? (...) Hunc uirum tanta in episcopis catholicis laude praeclarum, tanta notitia famaue conspicium (...)"

¹²⁰ *Opus imperfectum* II,37, CSEL 85,1, p. 189.

¹²¹ For a different opinion, see O'DONNELL, *The Authority of Augustine*, p. 11.

¹²² *Contra Iulianum* I,22, PL 44, 655 (mentioned together with the Roman Innocent, the Carthaginian Cyprian, the Cappadocian Basil, the Niasianean Gregory and the Milanese Ambrose); II,30, PL 44, 693 (together with Cyprian, Gregory and Ambrose); II,33, PL 44, 696 (explicitly mentioned, together with Cyprian and Gregory in support of Ambrose); II, 35, PL 44, 698 (together with Gregory and Ambrose); VI,71, PL 44, 866 (together with Gregory and Ambrose); *Opus imperfectum* I,9, CSEL 85,1, p. 10 (together with Ambrose, Gregory, and Cyprian); I,52, CSEL 85,1, p. 47 (together with Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory, and John Chrysostom); I,59, CSEL

be reminded that Pelagius himself had quoted from Hilary in his *De natura*. By often mentioning the bishop of Poitiers, Augustine evidently wants to show that he is in line with this Hilary. Seven texts from Hilary are quoted.¹²³

5. Ambrose of Milan

It will be no surprise that Ambrose is the one to whom Augustine most often appealed.¹²⁴ He is called a holy,¹²⁵ great,¹²⁶ and blessed man,¹²⁷ a man of God,¹²⁸ an excellent steward of God,¹²⁹ a lucid and clear river of eloquence,¹³⁰ steadfast in the Catholic faith,¹³¹ and the

85,1, p. 56 (together with Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory, Basil, and John Chrysostom); I,117, CSEL 85,1, p. 134 (together with Ambrose, Gregory, and Cyprian); II,33, CSEL 85,1, p. 186 (together with Cyprian, Ambrose, and Gregory); II,37, CSEL 85,1, p. 189 (together with Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory, Basil, and John); IV,109, CSEL 85,2, p. 117.

¹²³ *Tractatus in Psalmum* 1,1; *Tractatus in Psalmum* 51,23; *Tractatus in Psalmum* 118,27; 118,175; 118,22; *Expositio in Iob*; the seventh text is a compilation of *De Trinitate* 10,24-25 and *In Matthaum* 10,23-24. The commentary on Job is lost; cf. G. FOLLIET, *Le fragment d'Hilaire 'Quas Iob litteras'. Son interprétation d'après Hilaire, Pélage et Augustin*, in *Hilaire et son temps* (Actes du colloque de Poitiers [29 septembre-3 octobre 1968] à l'occasion du XVI^e centenaire de la mort de saint Hilaire), Paris, 1969, pp. 149-158; cf. also J. DOIGNON, *Une formule-clé du fragment sur Job d'Hilaire de Poitiers, inspiré d'Origène et transmis par Augustin* (*Contra Iulianum* 2,8,27), in *Vigiliae Christianae* 35 (1981) 209-221. On the compilation of *De Trinitate* and *In Matthaum*, see J. DOIGNON, *Testimonia d'Hilaire de Poitiers dans le 'Contra Iulianum' d'Augustin: Les texts, leur groupement, leur 'lecture'*, in *Revue bénédictine* 91 (1981) 7-19.

¹²⁴ With regard to the relation between Ambrose and Augustine, studies are abundant; see, e.g. BASTIAENSEN, *Augustin et ses prédécesseurs latins chrétiens*, pp. 30-34 (with further literature). On the epithets as given by Augustine to Ambrose, see B. BEYENKA, *The Names of St. Ambrose in the Works of St. Augustine*, in *Augustinian Studies* 5 (1974) 19-28; with regard to the topics under discussion, see G. FERRETTI, *L'influsso di S. Ambrogio in S. Agostino*, Faenza, 1951, pp. 41-75; C. BASEVI, *Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana dell' Incarnazione: l'influenza della cristologia di sant'Ambrogio*, in *Scripta Theologica* 7 (1975) 499-529.

¹²⁵ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,29, CSEL 60, p. 561; IV,30, CSEL 60, p. 562; IV,32, CSEL 60, p. 568; *Contra Iulianum* I,32, PL 44, 662; II,4, PL 44, 674; II,10, PL 44, 680; II,19, PL 44, 686; II,23, PL 44, 689; II,24, PL 44, 690; III,2, PL 44, 702; *Opus imperfectum* I,115, CSEL 85,1, p. 133; VI,14, CSEL 85,2, p. 329.

¹²⁶ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,30, CSEL 60, p. 563.

¹²⁷ *Contra Iulianum* II,4, PL 44, 674; II,8, PL 44, 678; II,9, PL 44, 679; II,13, PL 44, 683; II,14, PL 44, 684; II,32, PL 44, 695; II,33, PL 44, 696; *Opus imperfectum* I,71, CSEL 85,1, p. 82; IV,108, CSEL 85,2, p. 116; VI,12, CSEL 85,2, p. 319.

¹²⁸ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,30, CSEL 60, p. 563.

¹²⁹ *Contra Iulianum* I,10, PL 44, 645.

¹³⁰ *Contra Iulianum* II,11, PL 44, 681.

¹³¹ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,29, CSEL 60, p. 561; IV,30, CSEL 60, p. 563.

Catholic conquerer of heretics.¹³² He understands Scripture,¹³³ is gifted with Christian wisdom,¹³⁴ worthy of being honored,¹³⁵ in sum, a memorable, Catholic doctor,¹³⁶ a *pontifex magnus*.¹³⁷ With the weight of his authority, Ambrose will destroy Julian.¹³⁸ For Augustine, Ambrose was his teacher,¹³⁹ and still is his solace,¹⁴⁰ whom he honors as a father for he gave Augustine his birth in Christ through the Gospel.¹⁴¹ With some pride, Augustine mentions that he was baptized by the bishop of Milan.¹⁴² Moreover, Augustine was an eyewitness of Ambrose's efforts to defend the faith and the Roman world rightly praises him for that.¹⁴³ He heard him speak and read his works.¹⁴⁴ Augustine emphasizes that he is minor to Ambrose but remains convinced that with regard to the doctrine of original sin, both hold the same opinion.¹⁴⁵

Needless to say, Augustine explicitly mentions that Pelagius had praised Ambrose in his treatise *Pro libero arbitrio*. In this work, Pelagius had described Ambrose as the flower of the Latin authors. Furthermore, he had stressed that the faith and the interpretation of

¹³² *Opus imperfectum* IV,50, CSEL 85,1, p. 56.

¹³³ *Opus imperfectum* I,135, CSEL 85,1, p. 151; V,25, CSEL 85,2, p. 219.

¹³⁴ *Opus imperfectum* I,71, CSEL 85,1, p. 83.

¹³⁵ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,30, CSEL 60, p. 561; *Contra Iulianum* I,11, PL 44, 647; II,14, PL 44, 683.

¹³⁶ *Contra Iulianum* II,15, PL 44, 684; *Opus imperfectum* IV,114, CSEL 85,2, p. 125; VI,6, CSEL 85,2, p. 299.

¹³⁷ *Opus imperfectum* II,8, CSEL 85,1, p. 168.

¹³⁸ *Contra Iulianum* II,5, PL 44, 675.

¹³⁹ *Contra Iulianum* II,21, PL 44, 688: "(...) Ambrosium, doctorem meum (...)"; *Opus imperfectum* I,48, CSEL 85,1, p. 38: "(...) Ambrosius doctor meus (...)"; V,25, CSEL 85,2, p. 219: "meumque doctorem"; V,41, CSEL 85,2, p. 243: "meus doctor".

¹⁴⁰ *Opus imperfectum* IV,109, CSEL 85,2, p. 117.

¹⁴¹ *Contra Iulianum* I,10, PL 44, 645: "(...) quem ueneror ut patrem: in Christo enim Jesu per Euangelium ipse me genuit (...)".

¹⁴² *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I,40, CSEL 42, p. 251: "(...) beatus Ambrosius Mediolanensis episcopus, cuius sacerdotali ministerio lauacrum regenerationis accepi (...)"; *Contra Iulianum* I,10, PL 44, 645; *Opus imperfectum* I,59, CSEL 85,1, p. 57; VI,21, CSEL 85,2, p. 364.

¹⁴³ *Contra Iulianum* I,10, PL 44, 645: "Beatum loquor Ambrosium, cuius pro catholica fide gratiam, constantiam, labores, pericula, sive operibus sive sermonibus, et ipse sum expertus, et mecum non dubitat orbis praedicare Romanus."

¹⁴⁴ *Opus imperfectum* VI,21, CSEL 85,2, p. 364: "Meus est praeceptor Ambrosius, cuius non solum libros legi, sed uerba etiam loquentis audiui (...)".

¹⁴⁵ *Opus imperfectum* VI,21, CSEL 85,2, p. 364: "Longe sum quidem impar meritis eius: sed confiteor et profiteor me in hac causa nihil ab hoc meo praeceptore differre."; cf. also *Contra Iulianum* III,48, PL 44, 726: "hoc sentio, quod sentit Ambrosius" (with regard to lust).

Scripture of the bishop of Milan was so pure that even his enemies did not dare to criticize him on these two points: at least for Pelagius, Ambrose was an uncontested authority. It is precisely for that reason that Augustine already quotes from Ambrose in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I,40. During the controversy with Julian, Augustine will, time and again, confront Julian with this attitude of Pelagius towards Ambrose,¹⁴⁶ and will add that Julian will never find a better judge than Ambrose.¹⁴⁷ The fact that Ambrose was an Italian also plays a role: Julian regarded the Punic Augustine with disdain but now will be confronted with an Italian and a Catholic.¹⁴⁸

From Ambrose, forty four texts, taken from twelve works, are quoted,¹⁴⁹ Ambrose thus being the most important witness for Augustine.

¹⁴⁶ See *De gratia Christi et peccato originali* I,47, CSEL 42, pp. 159-160. The fact that Pelagius highly esteemed Ambrose is quite often mentioned by Augustine; see also *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I,40, CSEL 42, p. 252; II,15, CSEL 42, p. 268; II,51, CSEL 42, pp. 307; II,52, CSEL 42, p. 308; *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,29, CSEL 60, pp. 559-561; *Contra Iulianum* I,30, PL 44, 661; I,35, PL 44, 666 (Pelagius is called here Julian's bad doctor and teacher); I,44, PL 44, 671 (Pelagius is, again, called a bad doctor); II,11, PL 44, 681; II,15, PL 44, 684 ("quod saepe dicendum est"); II,21, PL 44, 688; II,32, PL 44, 695; *Opus imperfectum* I,2, CSEL 85,1, p. 7; I,48, CSEL 85,1, p. 39; I,52, CSEL 85,1, p. 47; I,59, CSEL 85,1, p. 57; II,8, CSEL 85,1, p. 168 (Pelagius, excellently praising Ambrose, "pontifex magnus", is called here heresiarch); II,36, CSEL 85,1, pp. 188-189; II,202, CSEL 85,1, p. 314; II,208, CSEL 85,1, p. 319; III,56, CSEL 85,1, p. 395; III,178, CSEL 85,1, p. 479; III,213, CSEL 85,1, p. 505; IV,10, CSEL 85,2, p. 15; IV,67, CSEL 85,2, p. 72; IV,89, CSEL 85,2, p. 93; IV,106, CSEL 85,2, p. 114; IV,118, CSEL 85,2, p. 130; VI,21, CSEL 85,2, p. 364. No wonder that Augustine exhorts Julian to imitate Ambrose, praised by Pelagius, instead of Pelagius himself; see *Contra Iulianum* I,11, PL 44, 646; *Opus imperfectum* I,2, CSEL 85,1, p. 7; I,48, CSEL 85,1, p. 39; I,67, CSEL 85,1, p. 395; III,200, CSEL 85,1, p. 499.

¹⁴⁷ *Opus imperfectum* I,2, CSEL 85,1, pp. 6-7: "Quem uero iudicem potes Ambrosio reperire meliorem?"; see M. ZELZER, *Quem vero iudicem potes Ambrosio reperire meliorem?* (Aug., *Op. imperf. I,2*), in *Studia Patristica* 33, Leuven, 1997, pp. 280-285.

¹⁴⁸ *Opus imperfectum* I,59, CSEL 85,1, pp. 56-57.

¹⁴⁹ *De paradiso* 6,29,30; 10,47; 11,53; 11,54; 12,60; 13,67; 15,77; *Apologia prophetae David* I,11,56 (2 citations); 11,57 (2 citations); *Expositio in Lucam* 1,37; 2,56; 2,84; 4,67; 7,27; 7,73; 7,141-143; 7,234; *Enarrationes in Psalmos* 48,8; *De bono mortis* 11,49; *De fuga saeculi* 1-2; 3,15; 7,39; *De paenitentia* I,13; *De Noe* 3,7; *De Isaac uel anima* 7,60; 8,65; *De Tobia* 9,33; 23,88; Thanks to Augustine, we have 6 texts from *De sacramento regenerationis siue de philosophia* and 7 texts from *Expositio In Isaiam*, works that are otherwise lost.

6. Innocent, Bishop of Rome

Innocent, holy¹⁵⁰ bishop of Rome, also belongs to the court of judges, and this for good reasons.¹⁵¹ Under Innocent, Julian became bishop of Aeclanum. Caelestius himself had expressed his agreement within the content of Innocent's letters to the Africans.¹⁵² Pelagius was willing to be corrected by this man who held both the chair and faith of Peter.¹⁵³ Therefore, this man deserves the first rank in the court of judges.¹⁵⁴ The same bishop had, in the letters sent to Africa, followed the positions as held by the Apostolic See and the Roman Church from the very beginning and this along with the other churches: what else could he have done?, Augustine cries out.¹⁵⁵ His

¹⁵⁰ *Contra Iulianum* I,32, PL 44, 663.

¹⁵¹ Although Augustine clearly considers Innocent as being at the African side, the correct interpretation of Innocent's own positions on the topics under discussion is still matter of debate; see M. LAMBERIGTS, *Innocentius episcopus Romanus*, in *AL* III,3/4, Basel, 2006, 613-619 (with further literature). In any case, in the debate with Julian, Augustine prefers to refer to Innocent's attitude towards the controversy over the one of Zosimus, who, to say the least, was rather unstable in his subsequent positions. However, Augustine tries to explain Zosimus' attitude as benevolent because he still hoped for a conversion of Caelestius; see, e.g. *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, p. 465. With regard to the problematic character of this explanation, see M. LAMBERIGTS, *Augustine and Julian of Aeclanum on Zosimus*, in *Augustiniana* 42 (1992) 311-330.

¹⁵² *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, p. 465: "(...) propter illud quod se papae Innocentii litteris consentire ipse responderat (...)"; cf. also II,6, CSEL 60, p. 466.

¹⁵³ Pelagius, *Libellus fidei* 14, PL 45, 1718: "In qua si minus perite aut parum caute aliquid forte positum est, emendari cupimus a te qui Petri et fidem et sedem tenes." Augustine stresses the fact that Innocent was bishop of Rome, the place of Peter's death; see *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,6, CSEL 60, p. 466; II,7, CSEL 60, p. 467; *Contra Iulianum* I,13, PL 44, 648.

¹⁵⁴ *Contra Iulianum* I,13, PL 44, 648: "Cum his etiam ipse considet, etsi posterior tempore, prior loco." On Augustine's position, see, among others, BATIFFOL, *Le catholicisme de saint Augustin*, p. 484; HOFMANN, *Der Kirchenbegriff des hl. Augustinus*, pp. 446-448; MÁRTIL, *La tradición en san Agustín*, pp. 210-212; ZUMKELLER, *Schriften gegen die Pelagianer* III, pp. 513-516; DE VEER, *Primauté du pape et collegialité*, in *BA* 23, pp. 748-753. Innocent was aware of this; cf. WERMELINGER, *Rom und Pelagius*, pp. 117-123. However, with one exception (*Contra Iulianum* I,22, PL 44, 655), Augustine never puts Innocent on the first place in his list of giants; see, e.g., *Contra Iulianum* II,33, PL 44, 697; II,37, PL 44, 701; III,32, PL 44, 719. Quoted is from Innocent's letters to the Synod of Carthage (*Inter epistulas Augustini* 181,7), and Milev (*Inter epistulas Augustini* 182,4.5).

¹⁵⁵ *Contra Iulianum* I,13, PL 44, 648: "Quid enim potuit ille uir sanctus Africanis respondere conciliis, nisi quod antiquitus apostolica sedes et Romana cum caeteris tenet perseueranter Ecclesia?"; cf. also *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,8, CSEL 60, p. 468.

letters had removed all doubt on the matter under discussion.¹⁵⁶ He had condemned Pelagius and Caelestius.¹⁵⁷ As a member of the Western Church, Julian should submit to the authority of this Western bishop.¹⁵⁸ In any case, it would have been better if Julian, from his youth onwards, had listened to Innocent so that he could have been rescued from Pelagian snares.¹⁵⁹

7. Jerome

Although Jerome is only a priest, he deserves a place in the college of doctors.¹⁶⁰ He was a man learned in Greek and Latin, very familiar with the Hebrew language,¹⁶¹ and contributed much to the development of Catholic education in the Latin language.¹⁶² Jerome moved from the Western to the Eastern Church. He had read most of what was written before him about the teaching of the Church and this from both parts of the world. In the matter under discussion, he shares our position, so Augustine claims.¹⁶³ One gets the impression that Augustine's praise of the person Jerome is not completely in proportion with the use the bishop of Hippo makes of him. One has to wait until *Contra Iulianum* I,34 before one comes across the name of Jerome. Moreover, only one text of Jerome will be quoted, *In Ionam* III,5, a text which was, more substantially, already used in *De peccatorum*

¹⁵⁶ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, p. 464; II,7-8, CSEL 60, pp. 467-468.

¹⁵⁷ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,5, CSEL 60, p. 465; *Contra Iulianum* II,36, PL 44, 699.

¹⁵⁸ *Contra Iulianum* I,14, PL 44, 648-649: "Non est ergo cur prouoces ad orientis antistites; quia et ipsi utique christiani sunt, et utriusque partis terrarum fides ista una est; quia et fides ista christiana est: et te certe occidentalis terra generauit, occidentalis regenerauit ecclesia."

¹⁵⁹ *Contra Iulianum* I,13, PL 44, 648.

¹⁶⁰ On Jerome and his contacts with Augustine, see A. FÜRST, *Hieronymus*, in *AL* III,2-3, Basel, 2004-2006, 317-336 (with further literature); for his place in Augustine's tradition argument, see also DE SIMONE, *Modern Research on the Sources of Saint Augustine's Doctrine of Original Sin*, pp. 224-227.

¹⁶¹ *Contra Iulianum* I,34, PL 44, 665.

¹⁶² *Contra Iulianum* II,36, PL 44, 699.

¹⁶³ *Contra Iulianum* I,34, PL 44, 665: "(...) ex occidentali ad orientalem transiens ecclesiam, in locis sanctis atque in litteris sacris, usque ad decrepitam uixit aetatem: omnesque uel pene omnes qui ante illum aliquid ex utraque parte orbis de doctrina ecclesiastica scripserant legit, nec aliam de hac re tenuit prompsitque sententiam." Also in II,33, PL 44, 697 (uelis nolis [meant is Julian]) and II,36, PL 44, 699, Augustine explicitly mentions the fact that Jerome is a priest. Cf. also WERMELINGER, *Rom und Pelagius*, pp. 276-277.

meritis et remissione III,12.¹⁶⁴ Jerome's *Dialogus aduersus Pelagianos* is never referred to, although the bishop of Hippo is aware of its existence.¹⁶⁵

In my opinion, Augustine is conscious of the fact that the presence of both Innocent and Jerome (the latter was considered by Pelagius as his rival)¹⁶⁶ in the court might be a problem for Julian. Indeed, the first had condemned Pelagius and Caelestius, the second, had defended in the East, the Catholic faith against Pelagius.¹⁶⁷ With regard to the first, Julian should reread what Pelagius said about this man. In the case of Jerome, Augustine states that he did not use Jerome's work against the Pelagians, but quoted from his writings, written at the time he was free of all bias.¹⁶⁸ But even then, one cannot say that Jerome gets a considerable place in Augustine's appeal to the Fathers. Further, as it becomes clear in *Opus imperfectum* IV,88, Jerome's positions in his *Dialogus aduersus Pelagianos* are a bit problematic. One might even suggest that Augustine, in a sense, is distancing himself from Jerome's positions with regard to Pelagianism. Indeed, in *Ad Florum* IV,88,¹⁶⁹ Julian referred to two passages of Jerome's *Dialogus*. In the first passage, Jerome remarked that in a gospel *iuxta Hebraeos*, which was written in the Chaldaic and Syriac language, but in Hebrew letters, it was said that the mother and brothers of Jesus invited him to go with them to John the Baptist in order to receive baptism for the remission of sin. Jesus wondered why he should do so, "Nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi, ignorantia est".¹⁷⁰ The conclusions as drawn by Julian are not present in this text of Jerome: Jerome did not speak of the presence of natural or voluntary sin in Christ, but, as we know, sins out of ignorance were considered by Augustine as signs of the existence of original sin, and this is not excluded by Jesus.¹⁷¹ A much better argument

¹⁶⁴ *Contra Iulianum* I,34, PL 44, 665. See also Y.-M. DUVAL, *Saint Augustin et le Commentaire sur Jonas de saint Jérôme*, in *RÉA* 12 (1966) 9-40, esp. pp. 14-21.

¹⁶⁵ See DUVAL, *Saint Augustin*, p. 20.

¹⁶⁶ *Contra Iulianum* II,36, PL 44, 699: "(...) quod ei tanquam aemulo inuiderit."

¹⁶⁷ *Contra Iulianum* II,36, PL 44, 699: "Ex quibus papam Innocentium et presbyterum Hieronymum retrahere fortasse tentabis: istum, quia Pelagium Coelestiumque damnauit; illum, quia in oriente contra Pelagium catholicam fidem pia intentione defendit."

¹⁶⁸ *Contra Iulianum* II,36, PL 44, 700.

¹⁶⁹ CSEL 85,2, p. 90.

¹⁷⁰ Jerome, *Dialogus aduersus Pelagianos* III,2, CCSL 80, p. 99.

¹⁷¹ *Ad Florum* IV,88, CSEL 85,2, p. 90: "Verum his ut res postulabat impletis iuuat te uel mediocriter conuenire, qua fiducia tu, cum Hieronymi scripta collaudes, dicas in Christo non fuisse peccatum, cum ille in eo dialogo, quem sub nomine Attici

against Jerome's orthodoxy Julian finds in *Dialogus aduersus Pelagianos* II,17 where Atticus (the anti-Pelagian in the dialogue), on the basis of John 7,10, makes clear that the man Jesus is a liar: "Iterum se negauit, et fecit quod prius negauerat" and that this should be attributed "ad carnem".¹⁷² In a no longer extant letter to Alexandria,¹⁷³ Augustine praised Jerome's work to the extent that he claimed that Pelagius, overwhelmed by the work's scriptural references, could no longer defend the existence of free choice. However, Julian continues, Pelagius did react to this work. Anyway, Julian claims, you (Augustine) are not in agreement with Scripture, but not even with the supporters of your doctrine. Julian is upset that Augustine could praise a man who was not afraid to blaspheme Christ to the point that he claimed that Christ had sinned!¹⁷⁴ In any case, according to Julian, Jerome's view – Augustine is called here a servant (*assecla*) of Jerome – is contradicted by Ambrose for whom Christ was always free from any lie.¹⁷⁵

Although Augustine knows Jerome's work, his first reaction is that Julian should have quoted these texts in order to see what was wrong with Jerome's view.¹⁷⁶ Next, he quotes a text from Ambrose, introducing it as following: "I, in fact, set before you the statement, not of Jerome, but of Ambrose, and not rephrased in my own words, but expressed in his words".¹⁷⁷ Further, two times, Augustine explicitly recognizes the possibility that Jerome might have said things which were not in line with the other illustrious teachers of the Catholic Church.¹⁷⁸ Finally, he admits that when anything displeases him in his own writings like in those of his friends, he will criticize it.¹⁷⁹

et Critoboli mira [et] ut talem fidem decebat uenustate composuit, etiam quinti euan-gelii, quod a se translatus dicit, testimonio nitatur ostendere Christum non solum naturale, uerum etiam uoluntarium habuisse peccatum, propter quod se cognouerit Iohannis baptisate diluendum."

¹⁷² Jerome, *Dialogus aduersus Pelagianos* II,17, CCSL 80: "Iterum se negauit, et fecit quod prius negauerat: latrat Porphyrius, inconstantiae ac mutationis accusat, nesciens omnia scandala ad carnem esse referenda."

¹⁷³ See Y.-M. DUVAL, *Notes complémentaires. Lettre 4**, in BA, 46B, pp. 430-442, esp. pp. 434-435.

¹⁷⁴ *Ad Florum* IV,88, CSEL 85,2, pp. 90-91.

¹⁷⁵ *Ad Florum* IV,121, CSEL 85,2, pp. 137-138.

¹⁷⁶ *Opus imperfectum* IV,88, CSEL 85,2, p. 91.

¹⁷⁷ *Opus imperfectum* IV,88, CSEL 85,2, p. 91: "Ego sane non Hieronymi sed Ambrosii nec meis commemoratam, sed uerbis eius expressam sententiam tibi opposui (...)"

¹⁷⁸ *Opus imperfectum* IV,88, CSEL 85,2, p. 91; IV,89, CSEL 85,2, p. 93.

¹⁷⁹ *Opus imperfectum* IV,88, CSEL 85,2, p. 93: "(...) ac per hoc si quid mihi displicet, reprehendo in amici scriptis sicut in meis ...".

In any case, Augustine does not think that there is any validity in Julian's accusation Augustine being Jerome's servant,¹⁸⁰ but the fact remains, that Jerome gets a low profile in the debate with Julian.

b. The Greek Fathers

According to Augustine, there was no need for Julian to appeal to Eastern bishops, for the West was the land of his birth, the Western Church was also the church of his rebirth. Moreover, the Christian faith in both West and East is one.¹⁸¹ In other words, Julian's appeal to the East will not change the situation. However, Augustine rethorically assures, Julian will have an Eastern bishop in his court of judges, and which one: Gregory of Nazianz!

1. Gregory of Nazianz

Gregory is introduced by Augustine as a man with a great name, excellent fame, and an illustrious bishop, whose speeches have rightly been translated in Latin.¹⁸² Surprisingly, Augustine does not seem to be very familiar with the biography of Gregory. In *Contra Iulianum* I,19, Gregory, instead of Gregory of Nyssa, is called the brother of Basil: "tam insignes uiri ... et, sicut fertur, etiam carne germani". The *fertur* might suggest that Augustine's information is second-hand.¹⁸³ Further, Augustine clearly does not know when Gregory wrote his books. The work *De fuga sua*, written in 362, is placed in the period when Gregory was already bishop.¹⁸⁴ This unfamiliarity

¹⁸⁰ *Opus imperfectum* IV, 122, CSEL 85,2, p. 139. Augustine then repeats his argument: I need Jerome's text in order to interpret it or to reject it.

¹⁸¹ *Contra Iulianum* I,14, PL 44, 648: "Non est ergo cur prouoces ad Orientis antistites; quia et ipsi utique christiani sunt, et utriusque partis terrarum fides ista una est; quia et fides ista christiana est: et te certe occidentalis terra generauit, occidentalis regeneravit ecclesia."

¹⁸² *Contra Iulianum* I,15, PL 44, 649: "Sed non tibi deerit magni nominis et fama celeberrima illustris episcopus etiam de partibus Orientis, cuius eloquia ingentis merito gratiae, etiam in linguam latinam translata usquequaque claruerunt." Translator was Rufinus; see B. ALTANER, *Augustinus und Gregor von Nazianz, Gregor von Nyssa*, in ID., *Kleine Patristische Schriften* (TU, 83), Berlin, 1967, pp. 277-285, p. 279. Augustine only seems to know these works of Gregory that are translated by Rufinus; see P. COURCELLE, *Les lettres grecques en occident: de Macrobe à Cassiodore*, Paris, 1948, p. 189; cf. also B. BARTELINK, *Die Beeinflussung Augustins durch die griechischen Patres*, p. 20, n. 57.

¹⁸³ *Contra Iulianum* I,19, PL 44, 652.

¹⁸⁴ *Opus imperfectum* I,69, CSEL 85,1, p. 77; for the date of his ordination, see J. BERNARDI (ed.), *Grégoire de Nazianze. Discours 1-3* (SC, 247), Paris, 1978, p. 17.

with Gregory's life and work does not prevent Augustine from putting the *Graecus*,¹⁸⁵ *catholicus doctus doctor*¹⁸⁶ on his list of famous doctors, quite often as the first of the Eastern Fathers,¹⁸⁷ for his doctrine is in harmony with that of his brothers and co-doctors.¹⁸⁸ Julian would be better off listening to him than to Caelestius.¹⁸⁹ In the debate with Julian, Augustine quotes all in all six texts, taken from the *Apologia pro sua fuga* and five *Orationes*.¹⁹⁰

Quite rhetorically, Augustine asks Julian if Gregory alone is not enough to demonstrate the authority of the Eastern bishops: he is a great man but Gregory was well aware that all he said he had learned "ex fide Christiana". He is famous and venerated by the faithful but only because they know that what he has taught is in accord with the rule of the truth.¹⁹¹ In order to "satisfy" Julian, Augustine deliberately adds a second Eastern witness, Basil of Caesarea, an authority recognized by Julian himself.¹⁹²

Another proof of Augustine's unfamiliarity with Gregory's work was already present in his *Ep.* 148,10.15, CSEL 44, pp. 340.345, where he referred to Gregory, *sanctus episcopus orientalis*, quoted from work he attributed to Gregory, while the text is found in Gregory of Elvira's *De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos*. See ALTANER, *Augustinus und Gregor von Nazianz, Gregor von Nyssa*, p. 278.

¹⁸⁵ *Opus imperfectum* II,33, CSEL 85,1, p. 186.

¹⁸⁶ *Opus imperfectum* I,53, CSEL 85,1, p. 50.

¹⁸⁷ See, e.g., *Contra Iulianum* II,33, PL 44, 697; II,37, PL 700-701 (2 times); III,32, PL 44, 719; *Opus imperfectum* I,59, CSEL 85,1, p. 59; II,37, CSEL 85,1, p. 189; IV,72, CSEL 85,2, p. 75; IV,73, CSEL 85,2, p. 75.

¹⁸⁸ *Contra Iulianum* II,7, PL 44, 677.

¹⁸⁹ *Opus imperfectum* I,67, CSEL 85,1, p. 71.

¹⁹⁰ *Apologia pro sua fuga* 2,91; *Oratio* 17,5; 36,15; 38,4; 38,17; 41,14.

¹⁹¹ *Contra Iulianum* I,16, PL 44, 650; "Est quidem tanta persona, ut neque ille hoc nisi ex fide christiana omnibus notissima diceret, nec illi eum tam clarum haberent atque uenerandum, nisi haec ab illo dicta ex regula notissimae ueritatis agnoscerent."

¹⁹² *Contra Iulianum* I,16, PL 44, 650: "Sed si uis addimus huic et sanctum Basilium, imo uelis nolis addendus est, maxime quia et tu de libro eius, quem scripsit aduersus Manichaeos, in quarto uolumine huius operis tui aliquid putasti esse ponendum, quod ad causam peccati originalis per unum intrantis in mundum, et per omnes homines transeuntis omnino non pertinet." With regard to Augustine's use of the work of Basil, see ALTANER, *Augustinus und Basilius der Große*, in ID., *Kleine Patristische Schriften*, pp. 269-276; BARTELINK, *Augustin und die griechischen Patres*, pp. 19-20; ID., *Basilius*, in AL I, Basel, 1986/1994, 614-617 (with further literature), esp. 615-616. It is clear that Augustine only knows this pseudo-Basilian work through his reading of Julian; see LÖSSL, *Intellectus gratiae*, p. 336, n. 134, with further literature. With regard to the rhetorical aspect, see WEBER, *Some Literary Aspects of the Debate between Julian of Eclanum and Augustine*, p. 293.

2. Basil the Great

Given Julian's recognition of the authority of Basil (and Chrysostom),¹⁹³ Augustine himself wants to prove that, through the works of these men, he can refute Julian.¹⁹⁴ Like the other doctors Basil is called a holy, learned, and famous man, a Christian bishop.¹⁹⁵ Although translations are available, Augustine prefers to offer his own word by word translation from the Greek of a sermon of Basil on fasting in order to remain more faithful to the original text.¹⁹⁶ By quoting Basil he wants to make clear that if Julian had more carefully read this author, he would never have quoted a text from Basil that had nothing to do with the topic under discussion.¹⁹⁷ Apart from reinterpreting the texts as offered by Julian, Augustine will quote two texts from Basil himself, texts he knows through translation, but one of the two he wrongly attributes to Chrysostom.¹⁹⁸

3. John Chrysostom

It is well known that John Chrysostom was highly esteemed, not only in the inner circle of Julian's family and friends, but also by Pelagius, who, in his debate with Augustine, had already referred to Chrysostom.¹⁹⁹ Further, Julian had referred to Chrysostom's *Oratio*

¹⁹³ *Contra Iulianum* I,35, PL 44, 666: "(...) sic et tu loquentibus tibi tot uenerabilibus uiris (...) episcopis Basilio et Ioanne, quos tu quoque in sanctis eruditissimis ueridica attestazione posuisti (...)".

¹⁹⁴ See *Contra Iulianum* VI,69, PL 44, 865.

¹⁹⁵ See, e.g., *Contra Iulianum* I,16, PL 44, 650 (sanctus); I,35, PL 44, 666 (Christian bishop); II,33, PL 44, 697 (one of the clarissimi sacerdotes); II,37, PL 44, 700 (one of the learned, earnest, holy, and sharp defenders of the faith).

¹⁹⁶ *Contra Iulianum* I,18, PL 44, 652: "Quod etsi reperi interpretatum, tamen propter diligentiores ueri fidem, uerbum e uerbo malui transferre de Graeco."

¹⁹⁷ *Contra Iulianum* I,18, PL 44, 652; that the text quoted by Julian is not relevant for the dispute, is repeated in I,30, PL 44, 661.

¹⁹⁸ *Sermo I De ieiunio* 1,3-4; *Oratio* 13,2 (attributed to Chrysostom); cf. ALTANER, *Augustinus und Basilius der Große*, pp. 274-275.

¹⁹⁹ See *De natura et gratia* 76, CSEL 60, p. 291. With regard to the sympathy of the Pelagian milieu for Chrysostom, see BROWN, *Pelagius and his Supporters*, pp. 214-216. Anianus of Celada, regularly associated with Pelagius, translated quite a number of Chrysostom's works; see B. ALTANER, *Altlateinische Übersetzungen von Chrysostomusschriften*, in Id., *Kleine Patristische Schriften*, pp. 416-436, pp. 418ff.; cf. also BARTELINK, *Augustin und die griechischen Patres*, pp. 22-23. On Anianus, see Ch. BREUER-WINKLER, *Anianus*, in *LThK*³ 1, 677 (with further literature); Ch. PIETRI & L. PIETRI (Eds.), *Anianus*, in *Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313-604)* (*Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, 2), Vol. 1, Rome, 1999, pp. 141-142. C. PIETRI, *Esquisse de conclusion. L'aristocratie chrétienne entre Jean de Constantinople et Augustin d'Hippone*, in Ch. KANNENGIESER (Ed.), *Jean Chrysostome et*

ad Neophytos as a support for his own position that baptism of infants was not needed for the remission of original sin. According to Julian, John denied that there existed original sin in newly born children.²⁰⁰ It is Augustine's challenge to prove that this "friend" of the Pelagians held positions, similar to his own view,²⁰¹ and, indeed, in *Contra Iulianum* I, no other author receives so much attention as Chrysostom (ten lengthy chapters!). John must be member of the court, for the "young" Julian thought he had found in John's writings arguments against the views as held by so many and great colleagues of John.²⁰² Augustine explicitly states that if Julian would have been right, John's position could never have been preferred over that of so many great people with regard to a subject that the Christian faith and Catholic Church have never changed their opinions about. But, as one might expect, this eventuality is immediately excluded.²⁰³ This position is substantiated with a whole series of texts taken from John's homily 10 on Romans in order to conclude that John is far from Julian's way of argumentation for he does not deviate from the Catholic way of thinking.²⁰⁴

Augustin (*Actes du colloque de Chantilly, 22-24 septembre 1974*) (Théologie historique, 35), Paris, 1975, pp. 283-305, pays much attention to the contacts between the different noble families in East and West, and their relations with both Chrysostom and Augustine. Augustine came rather late in contact with the writings of Chrysostom; see B. ALTANER, *Augustinus und Chrysostomus*, in *id.*, *Kleine Patristische Schriften*, pp. 302-311, esp. p. 303: "Wir gewinnen den Eindruck, daß Augustinus auch damals (414/415) noch keine Schriften des Konstantinopeler Bischofs kannte."; cf. also BARTELINK, *Augustin und die griechischen Patres*, pp. 22-23. On Chrysostom, Augustine and the Pelagian controversy, see F.-J. THONNARD, *Saint Jean Chrysostome et saint Augustin dans la controverse pélagienne*, in *Revue des Études byzantines* 25 (1967) 189-218; R. BRÄNDLE, *La ricezione di Giovanni Crisostomo nell' opera di Agostino*, in *Giovanni Crisostomo: Oriente e Occidente tra IV e V secolo. XXXIII Incontro di studiosi dell' antichità Cristiana. Roma, 6-8 maggio 2004* (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum, 93), Rome, 2005, pp. 885-895, esp. pp. 888-895; M. ZELZER, *Giovanni Crisostomo nella controversia tra Giuliano d'Eclano e Agostino*, in *Giovanni Crisostomo: Oriente e Occidente tra IV e V secolo*, pp. 927-932.

²⁰⁰ Julianus, *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 312, CCSL 88, pp. 393-394.

²⁰¹ Augustine carefully reads the Greek original and presents then a "uerbum e uerbo" Latin translation of the text; see *Contra Iulianum* I,26, PL 44, 658.

²⁰² *Contra Iulianum* I,23, PL 44, 656: "Ecce etiam ipsum numero illi adiungo sanctorum. Ecce inter meos testes, uel inter nostros constituo iudices, quem putasti patronum tuum. (...) Ingredere, sancte Ioannes, ingredere, et conside cum fratribus tuis, a quibus te nulla ratio et nulla tentatio separauit. Opus est et tua, et maxime tua sententia: quoniam in tuis litteris iste iuuenis inuenisse se putat, unde tot tantorumque coepiscoporum tuorum se arbitratu percellere et euacuare sententias."

²⁰³ *Contra Iulianum* I,23, PL 44, 656.

²⁰⁴ *Contra Iulianum* I,28, PL 44, 660; I,30, PL 44, 661; cf. also I,33, PL 44, 663.

Just like the other members of Augustine's court of judges, John is called blessed and holy,²⁰⁵ a bishop of excellent glory.²⁰⁶ Learned in the Catholic faith and teaching,²⁰⁷ he is its defender.²⁰⁸ With regard to the interpretation of Rom. 5,12, he is said to stand more clearly than daylight in the truth of the Catholic faith.²⁰⁹ With regard to the *fundamenta fidei*, Chrysostom holds the same ideas as the others.²¹⁰ Augustine quotes thirteen texts from six works, attributed to Chrysostom. However, three of the quotations are taken from works, wrongly attributed to Chrysostom.²¹¹

4. The Bishops at Diospolis

The last members of the court of judges are the fourteen bishops, present at the synod of Diospolis. At first sight, the incorporation of these bishops in the court might be a surprise, for indeed, Pelagius had been acquitted by them. However, Augustine offers a series of good reasons why these bishops deserve a seat in the court of judges. These Eastern bishops all "uno eodemque modo" believe that all human beings are subjected to the sin of the first man.²¹² "Ore uno" they set Pelagius free because the latter had condemned those who state that children even without baptism can possess eternal life.²¹³ Augustine is convinced that he believes what they believe, holds what they hold, teaches what they teach and preaches what they preach.²¹⁴ They judged

²⁰⁵ See, e.g., *Contra Iulianum* I,22, PL 44, 655; I,23, PL 44, 656; I,27, PL 44, 658; I,28, PL 44, 660; I,29, PL 44, 661; II,17, PL 44, 685; II,18, PL 44, 685; *Opus imperfectum* VI,9, CSEL 85,2, p. 309; VI,26, CSEL 85,2, p. 390.

²⁰⁶ *Opus imperfectum* VI,7, CSEL 85,2, p. 302.

²⁰⁷ *Contra Iulianum* I,26, PL 44, 658.

²⁰⁸ *Contra Iulianum* I,28, PL 44, 660: " (...) magno christianae fidei atque huius catholici dogmatis defensori (...)".

²⁰⁹ *Contra Iulianum* I,27, PL 44, 658-659. Augustine seems to have the whole 10th homily of John on Romans at his disposal for he explicitly states: "Quod totum quia longum est huic opera intexere, pauca inde contingam."

²¹⁰ *Contra Iulianum* I,22, PL 44, 655.

²¹¹ *Homiliae ad Neophytos in Genesim* 3,6; 3,21; 9,4; 9,14; *De Lazaro resuscitato*; *In triduanam resurrectionem*; *Epistula ad Olympiam* 10,3; *Homilia in Epistolam ad Romanos* 10,1; 10,2; 10,3; *Oratio* 13,2. Augustine attributes Basil's *Oratio* 13, the pseudo-Chrysostom sermon on the resurrection, and (Pseudo)-Potamius of Lissabon's sermon *De Lazaro resuscitato* to Chrysostom; cf. ALTANER, *Augustinus und Johannes Chrysostomus*, pp. 309-310. On the questionable attribution of the sermon to Potamius, see ZELZER, *Giovanni Crisostomo nella controversia tra Giuliano d'Eclano e Agostino*, pp. 931-932.

²¹² *Contra Iulianum* I,20, PL 44, 654.

²¹³ *Contra Iulianum* I,32, PL 44, 663.

²¹⁴ *Contra Iulianum* I,20, PL 44, 654: "... quod credunt credo, quod tenent teneo, quod docent doceo, quod praedicant praedico ...".

all together in one place and thus really functioned as an assembly.²¹⁵ Further, Augustine time and again stresses that Pelagius' acquittal was motivated by the fact that he, fearing a condemnation, condemned positions now under discussion. Augustine regularly suggests that Pelagius deceived the bishops at Diospolis,²¹⁶ who took Pelagius for being a Catholic, because they were only human, and understood Pelagius' comments "secundum catholicam fidem".²¹⁷ In any case, the documentation makes clear that Augustine does not really know that much about the individual profiles of these bishops.²¹⁸ The importance of these bishops' testimony is already modest in *Contra Iulianum*, and becomes marginal in the *Opus imperfectum*.²¹⁹

The profile of the predecessors is clear: they are men of great faith, stay within a tradition, represent chronological and geographical coherence and continuity in doctrine, possess authority, know how to cope with heresies, and are worthy of belonging to the college of judges, for which Julian constantly had asked.²²⁰

IV. Application and Function of the Appeal to Predecessors

1. Julian is Searching for the Wrong Judges

According to Augustine, the type of judges Julian is searching for, are people who must be highly trained experts in the liberal arts and familiar with the philosophers of this world.²²¹ Julian is accused of promoting a few of the "philosophorum saecularium".²²² Julian's problem is that he wants to have learned judges in such a way that he

²¹⁵ *Contra Iulianum* I,19, PL 44, 652: "... quos uno loco simul inuentos in istum consessum introducere ualeamus ...".

²¹⁶ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* II,10, CSEL 60, p. 470. Augustine suggests that Pelagius had condemned the statement that one receives grace according to one's merits, but that in his later writings he would have repeated this position he first had condemned. Similar critiques one will find in *Contra Iulianum* I,19, PL 44, 653; *Opus imperfectum* IV,43, CSEL 85,2, p. 46. For an evaluation of Pelagius' attitude, see WERMELINGER, *Rom und Pelagius*, pp. 78-87.

²¹⁷ *Contra Iulianum* I,19, PL 44, 651-652.

²¹⁸ Diospolis 11; 14; 17 (WERMELINGER, *Rom und Pelagius*, pp. 296-297).

²¹⁹ This nuances Wermelinger's observation in *Rom und Pelagius*, p. 275: "Die anfängliche Zurückhaltung gegenüber Diospolis schwindet im augustinisches Schrifttum immer mehr". In fact, only Diospolis 11 and 14 will be quoted once in *Opus imperfectum*.

²²⁰ *Contra Iulianum* II,8, PL 44, 678.

²²¹ *Opus imperfectum* II,1, CSEL 85,1, p. 164; cf. also *Contra Iulianum* III,2, PL 44, 702.

²²² *Opus imperfectum* II,4, CSEL 85,1, p. 166.

no longer wants to have Catholic Christian judges.²²³ In this context it is interesting to note that Augustine, in the debate, in no way was impressed by the erudition of pagan philosophers, invoked by Julian: certainly they were wise and learned men, but not truly righteous for not living by faith in Christ.²²⁴ By searching for dialecticians, Julian who, according to Augustine, wants to be seen as a clever, learned, and bad philosopher as well as a dialectician, Augustine ironically adds,²²⁵ tries to avoid ecclesiastical judges.²²⁶ What Julian missed, is the eyes of faith of great and important people such as Ambrose, Cyprian, and all the other doctors of the Church.²²⁷ Julian misses a lack of believing carefulness. Not willing to be nourished by the grace of Christ, he is unable to come to those things which have been hidden from the wise and prudent and have been revealed to the little ones.²²⁸

Julian wants to award himself the palm of victory against the many bishops of God who, before Augustine, had learned and taught in the Church of Christ: the new heretic,²²⁹ wants to pollute with novelties²³⁰ this most strongly founded and ancient Catholic faith. He wants to attract people to the novelty of his error.²³¹ Typical of these heretics is that they obscure with their interpretations what has always been clear.²³² Therefore, Augustine does not believe that reason, sound erudition, justice, piety, and Scripture support Julian's position.²³³

²²³ *Opus imperfectum* II,1, CSEL 85,1, p. 164.

²²⁴ *Contra Iulianum* IV,17, PL 44, 745.

²²⁵ *Opus imperfectum* VI,18, CSEL 85,2, p. 351.

²²⁶ *Opus imperfectum* II,36, CSEL 85,1, p. 188.

²²⁷ *Opus imperfectum* II,73, CSEL 85,1, p. 217.

²²⁸ *Contra Iulianum* II,3, PL 44, 673.

²²⁹ *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I,22, CSEL 42, p. 235: "(...) noui haeretici (...)"; cf. also I,40, CSEL 42, p. 251; II,3, CSEL 42, p. 255; II,25, CSEL 42, p. 278. On the use of such accusations in polemics, see OPELT, *Die Polemik in der christlichen lateinischen Literatur*, p. 158. Quite evident that Julian was furious and upset when reading this accusation; cf. *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 10, CCSL 88, p. 342. Julian lamented that by calling him a new heretic, Augustine was stirring up the common folk; frg. 251, CCSL 88, p. 385. However, Julian used the same strategy; cf. *supra*.

²³⁰ *Contra Iulianum* III,1, PL 44, 701.

²³¹ *Contra Iulianum* I,4, PL 44, 643.

²³² *Opus imperfectum* I,22, CSEL 85,1, p. 18: "Nouit enim, quemadmodum soleant haec uerba apostolica quae praetermisit accipere catholicorum corda fidelium, quae uerba tam recta et tanta luce fulgentia tenebrosis et tortuosis interpretationibus noui haeretici obscurare et deprauare moluntur."

²³³ *Opus imperfectum* II,13, CSEL 85,1, p. 171.

2. *The Eruditi are at my Side*²³⁴

Augustine invokes his authorities in order to show that his doctrine is supported by all the doctors of the Church (although he can only present the position of a few of them),²³⁵ for he is convinced that the doctrine of original sin is not his own invention but a doctrine, held by the Catholic faith from its very beginning.²³⁶ Erudition is important for Augustine: as we have seen in the presentation of the individual judges of the court, Augustine regularly mentioned that they were learned doctors. These people cannot be reckoned to the group of common ranks of workmen, soldiers, school-boys, sailors, bartenders, fishermen, cooks and butchers, youths dismissed from monasteries, men from the ordinary run of clerics, people who cannot judge doctrines through the categories of Aristotle, in sum, the sorts of people Julian was complaining about. When Julian uses qualifications such as country folk and people of the theater, he must see that he is attributing these qualifications to people like Cyprian and Ambrose and so many learned writers, companions in God's kingdom of heaven.²³⁷ Someone like Ambrose, Augustine insists, is not simply someone from the common folk whose ignorant masses Julian is looking down upon. Ambrose is a man to whom Julian in no sense is equal to in the worldly literature which Julian is so proud of: Ambrose is the person *par excellence* who meets the standards as requested by Julian.²³⁸ Moreover, with regard to the quality of his ecclesiastical writings, one should simply read the praise of Pelagius!²³⁹

²³⁴ On the basis of what will be said in this section I have great problems with the so-called "plébéisme" of Augustine; cf. SALAMITO, *Les virtuoses et la multitude*, p. 240. Constantly Augustine will appeal to these doctors of faith in order to show that his views are supported by them. When one should count the texts related to the doctors with what one will find about the common folk, it will become clear who receives most weight and authority from Augustine.

²³⁵ *Contra Iulianum* I,5, PL 44, 643.

²³⁶ *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II,25, CSEL 42, p. 278.

²³⁷ See *Contra Iulianum* II,37, PL 44, 700: "Numquid Irenaeus, et Cyprianus, et Reticius, et Olympius, et Hilarius, et Gregorius, et Basilius, et Ambrosius, et Ioannes, de plebeia faece sellulariorum, sicut Tulliane iocaris, in uestram inuidiam concitati sunt?"; *Opus imperfectum* II,14, CSEL 85,1, p. 172: "Vide sane, quemadmodum rurales et theatrales dicas Cyprianum et Ambrosium et tot eruditos in regno Dei scribas, socios eorum."

²³⁸ *Opus imperfectum* II,1, CSEL 85,1, p. 164: "Talis hic erat Ambrosius, quem iudicem si non refugis, dubitare non debes iustissime te esse damnatum (...)."

²³⁹ *Opus imperfectum* II,36, CSEL 85,1, pp. 188-189: "Ambrosius est ille, non quicumque de uulgo, cuius imperitam multitudinem non ualentem de tuis disputationibus iudicare nimis alta ceruice et proterua fronte contemnitis; Ambrosius est, inquam, cui nulla ex parte in ipsis litteris saecularibus, de quibus multum inflaris,

Because Julian requested a small group of learned people, Augustine regularly emphasizes that the judges he presents are indeed that small group of learned people requested.²⁴⁰ These people meet the standards of reason, erudition and freedom, Julian asked for:²⁴¹ this board of doctors from Africa, Gaul, Italy, Greece²⁴² defends the catholic truth, and meets the standards asked for by Julian, for they are "bishops of the Church" and "men of sound minds".²⁴³ They form the neutral and objective court of learned people that Julian wanted.²⁴⁴ Living before the outbreak of the controversy, possessing a sound doctrine, they can judge the question under discussion without any party politics.²⁴⁵ Julian could never find a synod of such high quality or better judges than these men.²⁴⁶ Augustine will not neglect to mention that John Chrysostom and Basil, who were qualified by Julian himself as learned, belong to his court.²⁴⁷

They are learned representatives of what is also held by their colleagues and the *whole* Church of Christ²⁴⁸ from its very beginning:

aequaris; in ecclesiasticis uero quis ille sit, audi uel lege Pelagium doctorem tuum (...). See also *Opus imperfectum* II,8, CSEL 85,1, p. 168.

²⁴⁰ See *Contra Iulianum* I,31, PL 44, 662: "Sed ecce, quo te introduxi, conuentus sanctorum istorum non est multitudo popularis: non solum filii, sed et patres Ecclesiae sunt."; II,36, PL 44, 699: "Verum quia te delectat, non numerare multitudinem, sed appendere paucitatem; exceptis iudicibus Palaestinis, qui haeresim uestram in absoluto Pelagio damnauerunt, quem timore compressum Pelagiana ipsa dogmata damnare coegerunt, decem episcopos iam defunctos et unum presbyterum tibi huius causae opposui iudices, qui de illa cum hic uiuerent iudicauerunt. Si uestra consideretur paucitas, multi sunt: si multitudo catholicorum episcoporum, perpauci sunt."

²⁴¹ *Contra Iulianum* II,37, PL 44, 700: "Isti episcopi sunt, docti, graues, sancti, ueritatis acerrimi defensores aduersus garrulas uanitates, in quorum ratione, eruditione, libertate, quae tria bona iudici tribuisti, non potes inuenire quod spernas."

²⁴² *Opus imperfectum* II,33, CSEL 85,1, p. 186.

²⁴³ *Opus imperfectum* IV,119, CSEL 85,2, p. 133: "Quos antistites ecclesiarum cum uiros sani capitis dicas; (...) quae illi notissima consensione didicerunt atque docuerunt (...)."

²⁴⁴ *Contra Iulianum* II,34, PL 44, 698: "(...) ad hanc tamen causam tales erant (...): nullas nobiscum uel uobiscum amicitias attenderunt, uel inimicitias exercuerunt; neque nobis neque uobis irati sunt, neque nos neque uos miserati sunt (...). Nec nos nec uos eis noti fuimus, et eorum pro nobis latas contra uos sententias recitamus." See also WEBER, *Some Literary Aspects of the Debate between Julian of Eclanum and Augustine*, p. 294.

²⁴⁵ *Contra Iulianum* III,42, PL 44, 723: "In qua uellem quidem egregios iudices non repudiare, quos tibi meis superioribus libris sana doctrina eruditos, sine ullo studio partium de hac causa sententias protulisse monstraui."

²⁴⁶ Cf. also *Opus imperfectum* II,37, CSEL 85,1, p. 189.

²⁴⁷ *Contra Iulianum* I,33, PL 44, 663: "Postremo sanctus episcopus Ioannes (...) quam tu sicut sanctum eruditumque laudasti (...)."; I,35, PL 44, 666: "(...) et episcopis Basilio et Joanne, quos tu quoque in sanctis eruditis ueridica attestazione posuisti (...)."

²⁴⁸ *Contra Iulianum* VI,11, PL 44, 828-829.

the Church's belief in original sin and the need of baptism for all, including babies, belongs to the very ancient, authoritative Catholic faith, is based upon Scripture, and very well known through the celebrations of the Church.²⁴⁹ The defense of this very venerable faith of the Church belongs to the essence of the Catholic resistance against the Pelagians.²⁵⁰

These authorities did not live at the same time, but at different periods of time and in distant places, still holding the same, orthodox doctrine. They are gathered from the East and from the West, and their writings are still available.²⁵¹ They include men from the rising of the sun to its setting, some from the past, others nearer to our era, some already have passed away, others are still living.²⁵²

These men *taught what they had learned in the Church*:

"They drank as milk and ate as food; they have served its milk and its food to little ones and to adults and have most clearly and bravely defended it against its enemies, including you who were not born then, though they are now showing you for what you are."²⁵³

In other words, these men were both children of the Church and fathers of the Church. They were nourished by the Church's truth, defended it, and are still continuing to defend it, through their books, against people like Julian. "It was through the efforts of these men that

²⁴⁹ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* III,26, CSEL 60, p. 519: "Sed hoc dico tam manifestum esse secundum scripturas sanctas originale peccatum atque hoc dimitti lauacro regenerationis in paruulis tanta fidei catholicae antiquitate atque auctoritate firmatum, tam clara ecclesiae celebritate notissimum (...)"

²⁵⁰ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,29, CSEL 60, p. 559: "(...) catholicis, qui eis pro antiquissima et firmissima ecclesiae fide resistent (...)" ; cf. also *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I,1, CSEL 42, pp. 211-212; II,15, CSEL 42, p. 268; *Opus imperfectum* III,61, CSEL 85,1, p. 400.

²⁵¹ *Contra Iulianum* II,37, PL 44, 700: "Si episcopalis synodus ex toto orbe congregaretur, mirum si tales possent illic facile tot sedere. Quia nec isti uno tempore fuerunt: sed fideles et multis excellentiores paucos dispensatores suos Deus per diuersas aetates temporum, locorumque distantias, sicut ei placet atque expedire iudicat, ipse dispensat. Hos itaque de aliis atque aliis temporibus atque regionibus ab oriente et occidente congregatos uides, non in locum quo nauigare cogantur homines, sed in librum qui nauigare possit ad homines."

²⁵² *Contra Iulianum* I,20, PL 44, 654: "(...) a solis ortu usque ad occasum tot ac tantos catholicae fidei doctores et defensores, antiquos et nostrae aetati contiguos, dormientes et manentes (...)" ; cf. also *Opus imperfectum* IV,7, CSEL 85,2, p. 12.

²⁵³ *Contra Iulianum* II, 37, PL 44, 700: "(...) quam in lacte suxerunt, quam in cibo sumpserunt, cuius lac et cibum paruulis magnisque ministraverunt, quam contra inimicos etiam uos tunc nondum natos, unde nunc reuelamini, apertissime ac fortissime defenderunt." For the translation, see R.J. TESKE, *Answer to the Pelagians, II: Marriage and Desire, Answer to the Two Letters of the Pelagians, Answer to Julian* (The Works of Saint Augustine, I/24), New York, 1998, p. 335 (abbreviated as WSA I/24).

the Church, after the death of the apostles, was still able to grow, for these men planted, watered, built, shepherded and nourished the Church, which has taken fright at the profane words of your novelty (...).²⁵⁴

Between these men there is a great consensus,²⁵⁵ a consensus that cannot be called a "conspiratio perditorum".²⁵⁶ As Catholic co-disciples and co-doctors, they believed that through one person sin came into the world and passed to all.²⁵⁷ Their consensus with regard to original sin is very important for Augustine.²⁵⁸ Augustine stresses that they were in agreement with each other, Scripture, and the Catholic faith.²⁵⁹ Therefore, Augustine will never accept that Julian might try to separate one of Augustine's doctors from the rest of the group. In defense of his case, Julian had appealed to John Chrysostom,²⁶⁰ and, incorrectly, to Basil.²⁶¹ With regard to the essentials of the faith, it is to be excluded that John, Julian's authority, held an opinion different to that of his colleagues like the Roman Innocent, the Carthaginian Cyprian, the Cappadocian Basil, the Nazianzean Gregory, or the Milanese Ambrose.²⁶² The one who dares to question the truth of 1 Cor. 15,21-22, is destroying what we believe in *Christum*, i.e., that Christ is the savior of children, that he is the sole savior, and that, without his flesh and blood, one cannot have life. According to Augustine, "Hoc sensit, hoc credidit, hoc didicit, hoc docuit et Joannes". Therefore, Augustine accuses Julian of transforming John's words into his own doctrine.²⁶³ Augustine admits that these doctors

²⁵⁴ *Contra Iulianum* II,37, PL 44, 700: "Talibus post apostolos sancta ecclesia plantatoribus, rigatoribus, aedificatoribus, pastoribus, nutritoribus creuit. Ideo profanas uoces uestrae nouitatis expauit (...)". The translation is taken from WSA I/24, p. 335.

²⁵⁵ *Contra Iulianum* I,30, PL 44, 661; III,32, PL 44, 719; *Opus imperfectum* IV,119, CSEL 85,1, p. 133.

²⁵⁶ *Contra Iulianum* I,34, PL 44, 665; cf. also VI,69, PL 44, 865: "(...) sanctorum et eruditorum Ecclesiae catholicae partum pius fidelisque consensus (...)". For Julian's complaint, see *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 313, CCSL 88, p. 394.

²⁵⁷ *Opus imperfectum* I,126, CSEL 85,1, p. 139: "Sic quippe intellexit (Ambrosius) cum ceteris condiscipulis et condoctoribus suis sine ulla dubitatione catholicis (...)".

²⁵⁸ See, e.g., *Contra Iulianum* III,32, PL 44, 719; *Opus imperfectum* I,52, CSEL 85,1, p. 48.

²⁵⁹ *Opus imperfectum* IV,112, CSEL 85,2, p. 120.

²⁶⁰ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 308, CCSL 88, p. 392; frg. 311-312, CCSL 88, pp. 393-394.

²⁶¹ *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 309-310, CCSL 88, pp. 392-393.

²⁶² *Contra Iulianum* I,22, PL 44, 655; see REBILLARD, *Augustin et ses autorités*, pp. 260-261.

²⁶³ *Contra Iulianum* I,22, PL 44, 655.

and defenders of the Catholic rule of faith can differ, without harming the integrity of the faith. Augustine is willing to accept that the *regulae catholicae defensores* can have different opinions about problems that do not belong to the essence of faith. He quite frankly admits that one doctor can be better and more faithful to the truth than another, but he will never accept that a person such as Chrysostom would ever deny that salvation without Christ was possible, for this has to do with the foundations of faith. If there are differences, they are to be situated on another level than the one that has to do with the foundations of faith.²⁶⁴

What these men learned and taught can in no way be described as stupid or impious, as was suggested by Julian with regard to Augustine's doctrine. Reversing Julian's critique, Augustine claims that through the mercy of the Lord who governs his Church mercifully, the Catholic faith has been so vigilant that neither the stupid, impious doctrine of the Pelagians nor that of the Manicheans was received.²⁶⁵ Those who did so are saintly and educated men, Catholics, as is proved by their fame in the whole Church.²⁶⁶ Reacting against Julian's complaints about coercion, Augustine replies that one cannot claim that people like Cyprian and Ambrose – *beatissimis et in fide catholica excellentissimis viris* – were forced to sign-off for they overthrew the heresy already before its existence with such a clarity that one can hardly find a clearer answer to these heretics. Augustine therefore is not convinced that a synod as requested by Julian is needed: it is quite rare to find heresies which needed a

²⁶⁴ *Contra Iulianum* I,22, PL 44, 655: "Alia sunt, in quibus inter se aliquando etiam doctissimi atque optimi regulae catholicae defensores, salua fidei compage non consonant, et alius alio de una re melius aliquid dicit et uerius. Hoc autem unde nunc agimus, ad ipsa fidei pertinet fundamenta." Skilful debater as he was, Julian, *Ad Florum* IV,112, CSEL 85,2, p. 119 referred to Augustine's *De natura et gratia* 71ff. in order to show that when Pelagius appealed to Ambrose and Cyprian, Augustine had replied that he was not bound by the authority of these people. Augustine even had suggested that their eventually incorrect views were wiped out by progress toward the better life. Julian accused Augustine of staining the reputation of these men by associating them to his own case, although their positions could easily be explained through clear and benevolent argumentation. It should be said that Augustine's reply is not really convincing: I do not see why Julian through his statements might have refuted Pelagius' and his own heresy; see *Opus imperfectum* IV,112, CSEL 85,2, p. 119. In the text, Julian referred to, Augustine implicitly accepts the authority of the people Pelagius appealed to, but rejects Pelagius' arguments; see REBILLARD, *Augustin et ses autorités*, pp. 253-257.

²⁶⁵ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,33, CSEL 60, p. 569.

²⁶⁶ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,33, CSEL 60, p. 569: "Ecce sancti et docti uiri, fama totius ecclesiae contestante catholici (...)."

synod in order to be condemned.²⁶⁷ Augustine does not see any reason why the Christian governors should doubt the ancient Catholic faith and give space and time to the Pelagians for an examination of it. They would be better off coercing the Pelagians!²⁶⁸

Augustine even goes a step further. He accuses Julian of either not knowing the thoughts and the statements of these Catholic teachers, or if he did, it becomes clear that he tried to deceive those not familiar with these teachers.²⁶⁹

Like his predecessors such as Ambrose, Augustine, with his modest ability, tries to build up peoples by exhortation, entreatment, and correction, but, like Ambrose and all his great companions, he holds and states the same opinion about original sin.²⁷⁰ It is to men like Irenaeus, Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrose, Basil, and John Chrysostom that Augustine wants to cling in the communion of faith, which he wants to defend against the idle words and calumnies of Julian: "Look to these catholic eyes and open your eyes!", Augustine cries out.²⁷¹ Ironically, he asks Julian whether he dares to say that, when people hear the Pelagians, they will set afire for virtue, but when they hear these great and good men, they will be broken by despair and refuse to long for perfection?²⁷² You, Augustine continues, honor the saints of God, the patriarchs, the prophets, apostles through the praise of nature, while these *lumina Ecclesiae* dishonor them by their blame of nature, for they claim that one must fight against the innate evil of concupiscence in order to maintain the good of chastity?²⁷³ By God's grace, through conflict, this evil must be overcome and thereafter,

²⁶⁷ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,34, CSEL 60, pp. 569-570.

²⁶⁸ *Opus imperfectum* I,10, CSEL 85,1, p. 11: "Absit a christianis potestatibus terrenae rei publicae, ut de antiqua catholica fide dubitent et ob hoc oppugnatoribus eius locum et tempus examinis praebeant ac non potius in ea certi atque fundati talibus quales uos estis inimicis eius disciplinam coercionis imponant."; cf. also II,103, CSEL 85,1, p. 235, where Augustine stated that once a heresy was condemned by bishops, the Christian civil power should coerce it, not examining it again.

²⁶⁹ *Contra Iulianum* I,29, PL 44, 661.

²⁷⁰ *Opus imperfectum* IV,119, CSEL 85,2, p. 133: "Et nos pro modulo nostro populos aedificamus hortando obsecrando arguendo, quod fecit Ambrosius; et tamen de originali peccato hoc sentimus et dicimus, quod sensit et dixit Ambrosius, nec solus, sed cum aliis magnis consortibus suis."; IV,122, CSEL 85,2, p. 141: "Illud scilicet originale peccatum, quod uos negatis cum Pelagio, nos uero cum Ambrosio confitemur."

²⁷¹ *Opus imperfectum* IV,73, CSEL 85,2, p. 76; cf. also IV,97, CSEL 85,2, p. 102.

²⁷² *Contra Iulianum* II,30, PL 44, 693.

²⁷³ *Contra Iulianum* II,30, PL 44, 693; cf. also II,70, PL 44, 866.

through the last rebirth healed.²⁷⁴ "Is the light called darkness", Augustine asks, "and the darkness light to the point that Pelagius, Caelestius, and Julian can see, while Hilary, Gregory, and Ambrose are blind?"²⁷⁵ It will be evident that Julian must, or, at least, should deny this. Therefore, he must take into account the views of these men.²⁷⁶ Because of the already mentioned request of Julian for few wise men, Augustine only mentions three persons here: Hilary, Gregory, and Ambrose. Indeed, Julian had suggested that if Augustine were forced to appear for judges, he would not know what to do or where to flee, since Augustine could not find anything with which to meet Julian's arguments. If Julian wants to weigh, he should weigh the views of these few men: "I do not want there be so many that it is a bother for you to count them, but they are not lightweight so that many disdain to weigh them".²⁷⁷ In the presence of Hilary, Gregory, and Ambrose, Julian cannot say that Augustine is too weak to object to Julian. These few men, authorities in the matter, are sufficient to answer to Julian's accusations. Therefore, Augustine flees from the Pelagian darkness to the bright, Catholic lights of Hilary, Gregory, and Ambrose.²⁷⁸

If Julian concedes that what Augustine presented from the writings of Ambrose, Cyprian, or other Catholics against Julian is true, he must recognize original sin.²⁷⁹ If he refuses to return to the true faith, he will be confronted with these standards of truth. Augustine appears to be surprised that Julian does not seem to be aware that the critique formulated against Augustine and his view on original sin, is also a critique against these many and great doctors of the Church, who lived excellent lives, defended the faith against the heresies of their times, and passed away before the coming of the Pelagian resistance to the doctrine of original sin:²⁸⁰ slandering Augustine means slandering these men.²⁸¹ Julian is accused of attacking these lights of the city of God, people he would better follow instead of attacking,²⁸² for they could recognize that God was the creator of

²⁷⁴ *Contra Iulianum* II,30, PL 44, 693-694.

²⁷⁵ *Contra Iulianum* II,35, PL 44, 698.

²⁷⁶ *Contra Iulianum* II,35, PL 44, 698-699.

²⁷⁷ *Contra Iulianum* II,35, PL 44, 699. The translation is taken from WSA I/24, p. 333.

²⁷⁸ *Contra Iulianum* II,35, PL 44, 698-699.

²⁷⁹ *Opus imperfectum* IV,113, CSEL 85,2, p. 122.

²⁸⁰ *Contra Iulianum* I,11, PL 44, 646; II,30, PL 44, 694.

²⁸¹ *Opus imperfectum* IV,73, CSEL 85,2, pp. 75-76.

²⁸² *Contra Iulianum* I,11, PL 44, 647.

all what exists, they honored marriage, they proclaimed that in baptism, through Christ, all sins are forgiven, they believed in a just God, in human beings' capacity for virtue and perfection through God's grace, without therefore denying the doctrine of original sin.²⁸³ Proclaiming the doctrine of original sin did not hinder these men in their attempts to live a chaste life, overcoming vice, to fight as exemplary soldiers of Christ, overcoming the works of the devil, not trusting in their own virtues.²⁸⁴ Therefore, Augustine is convinced that Julian will never be able to live a better life than these men,²⁸⁵ from whom he is deviating, by denying that Christ is also the redeemer of little children.²⁸⁶ He invites Julian to be open to the teaching of these men in order to return to the truth.²⁸⁷ Augustine hopes that Julian will be healed by the statements and the authority of these holy men.²⁸⁸

3. *Augustine's Faith is that of the Multitude, for it is Christian and Catholic*

Augustine accepts that his faith is also a *dogma popolare*, because he and the faithful are the Church of he who is called Jesus, for he saves his people from their sins. To this Church belong not only people like Ambrose and Cyprian, but also Julian's father: they all did not create such people but found them.²⁸⁹ However, it should be clear that Augustine cannot accept that depreciative language is used in order to ridicule the faith of the common people and their leaders, the bishops: they all taught what they had learned! Julian should realize that the multitude of Christians despises the new heresy,²⁹⁰ for it cannot give a sufficient answer to the suffering of babies: only the doctrine of original sin and its acceptance can offer a valid

²⁸³ *Contra Iulianum* II,19, PL 44, 686 (on the basis of texts of Ambrose); II,32, PL 44, 695; *Opus imperfectum* IV,117, CSEL 85,2, p. 129.

²⁸⁴ *Contra Iulianum* II,24, PL 44, 690.

²⁸⁵ *Opus imperfectum* I,70, CSEL 85,1, p. 79.

²⁸⁶ *Opus imperfectum* I,118, CSEL 85,1, p. 135.

²⁸⁷ *Contra Iulianum* II,14, PL 44, 684; II,15, PL 44, 684.

²⁸⁸ *Contra Iulianum* II,37, PL 44, 700-701.

²⁸⁹ *Opus imperfectum* II,2, CSEL 85,1, p. 165. One should not to much focus on the expression *dogma popolare* as popular: Augustine considers this faith of the people to be the faith of the Church, its leaders and its believers. Faith is universal and is found by the faithful, not created by them. See the pertinent remarks of REBILLARD, *Dogma popolare*, pp. 185-186.

²⁹⁰ *Contra Iulianum* II,36, PL 44, 699: "(...) sed nec ego te ullius multitudinis numerositate perturbo; quamvis propitio Deo, de hac fide, cui contradicitis, catholica sanum sapiat etiam multitudo; in qua usquequaque plurimi, ubi possunt, quomodo possunt, sicut diuinitus adiuuantur, uana uestra argumenta confutant."

answer.²⁹¹ Furthermore, when Julian complains that Augustine is stirring up the common people against him, because Augustine had said that these new heretics denied that for babies rebirth through baptism was needed for the redemption from the power of the devil, Augustine wonders whether this is not a sign that this Catholic faith is so popular and firmly implanted in society that even ordinary people notice it.²⁹² Augustine is convinced that Julian, while detesting the common folk – this countless multitude of believers²⁹³ –, does not realize that he will accomplish nothing with these people, for all, rich and poor, high and low, learned and unlearned, men and women²⁹⁴ are firmly grounded in the truth and the antiquity of the Catholic faith,²⁹⁵ knowing why mothers all over the world run to the Church in order to get their babies baptized.²⁹⁶ What the “learned” debater Julian did not see with all his “knowledge”, is crystal clear to the common people!²⁹⁷

In reaction to Julian's complaint that Augustine could only raise the murmuring of the people as an argument against Julian, Augustine also stresses that this murmuring rests upon the authority of so many doctors,²⁹⁸ thus linking the doctors' authority and the faith of the common people.²⁹⁹ Further, Augustine can claim that if Julian would have

²⁹¹ *Contra Iulianum* V,4, PL 44, 784.

²⁹² *Contra Iulianum* VI,22, PL 44, 835.

²⁹³ *Opus imperfectum* VI,3, CSEL 85,2, p. 294.

²⁹⁴ *Contra Iulianum* I,31, PL 44, 662: “Diuites et pauperes, excelsi atque infimi, docti et indocti, mares et feminae nouerunt quid cuique aetati in baptismo remittatur.”

²⁹⁵ *Contra Iulianum* VI,34, PL 44, 841: “Sed nimirum tua disputata considerans, nihil te talibus argumentis apud populum in catholicae fidei ueritate et antiquitate fundatum agere potuisse uel posse sensisti.”; cf. also VI,36, PL 44, 842.

²⁹⁶ *Contra Iulianum* I,31, PL 44, 662: “Vnde etiam matres quotidie toto orbe terrarum non ad Christum tantum, id est, ad unctum; sed ad Christum Iesum, id est, etiam saluatorem cum paruulis currunt.” Texts such as the one quoted here make clear that Augustine, when speaking of the faith of the multitude, stresses the universality of their faith, not so much, as suggested by Salamito, the popular character of the faith; SALAMITO, pp. 211-212; pp. 226-232. See the pertinent critique of REBILLARD, *Dogma Populare*, pp. 181-182. On the use of liturgical rites as an argument in the Pelagian controversy, see J.-A. VINEL, *L'argument liturgique opposé par Saint Augustin aux Pélagiens*, in *Questions liturgiques* 68 (1987) 209-241, pp. 215-224.

²⁹⁷ *Contra Iulianum* I,36, PL 44, 699; VI,22, PL 44, 835-836: “Necesse quippe fuerat, quidquid in paruulis suis ageret, quod attinet ad mysteria christiana, omnes nosse Christianos. (...) Antequam essem natus huic mundo, et antequam essem renatus Deo, multa catholica lumina uestras futuras tenebras redarguendo praeuenerunt (...)”; *Opus imperfectum* III,104, CSEL 85,1, p. 424: “O stulti haeretici noui.”

²⁹⁸ *Contra Iulianum* VI,69, PL 44, 865.

²⁹⁹ *Contra Iulianum* I,31, PL 44, 662: “Sed ecce, quo te introduxi, conuentus sanctorum istorum non est multitudo popularis: non solum filii, sed et patres ecclesiae sunt.”

come to the essence of the matter under discussion, it would have been clear not only to the learned but also to the ordinary Christian faithful that Julian is a new heretic.³⁰⁰ Augustine is in no way impressed by Julian's boasting of small numbers and maintaining that Augustine's doctrine only pleases the majority,³⁰¹ especially when this majority is Catholic and disapproves the Pelagian heresy.³⁰²

Using an argument *ad hominem*, Augustine reminds Julian not to forget that it is these common folk that he himself has found in the Church.³⁰³

In passing it should be said that also Augustine himself, in *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum*, a work known to Julian, had suggested that the Pelagians, these new heretics, even after an explicit condemnation, still tried to tempt by their writings the hearts of the less cautious or less educated.³⁰⁴ By interjecting the din of other questions, they hid their unbelief for human beings who are more simple or slower or less learned in the Sacred Scriptures.³⁰⁵ They terrify the weak and those less well trained in Sacred Scripture than they should be in confrontation with the Pelagians.³⁰⁶ Also in *Contra Iulianum*, Augustine insists that protection of the faithful, especially of the weaker ones, is needed for those terrified by Julian's arguments and the less well trained in Sacred Scripture should they be confronted by Julian.³⁰⁷ In other words, Augustine himself warns his readers to be careful with these misleaders of simple people.³⁰⁸

In passing and without further developing this, one should remind that the fact that only a few people are really intelligent and studious enough to require knowledge about the human and divine, while there is a great multitude of slow and lazy ones, for Augustine is a proof that our nature is indeed vitiated because of Adam's fall.³⁰⁹

³⁰⁰ *Opus imperfectum* III,183, CSEL 85,1, p. 482.

³⁰¹ *Opus imperfectum* II,3, CSEL 85,1, p. 166.

³⁰² *Opus imperfectum* II,4, CSEL 85,1, p. 166.

³⁰³ *Opus imperfectum* II,2, CSEL 85,1, p. 165.

³⁰⁴ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* I,2, CSEL 60, p. 424: "Noui quippe heretici, inimici gratiae Dei, quae datur pusillis et magnis per Iesum Christum dominum nostrum, etsi iam cauendi euidentius apertiore inprobatione monstrantur, non tamen quiescunt scriptis suis minus cautorum uel minus eruditorum corda temptare."

³⁰⁵ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* III,24, CSEL 60, p. 516: "(...) inmittunt aliarum nebulas quaestionum, in quibus eorum apud homines simpliciores siue tardiores siue sanctis litteris minus eruditos impietas delitiscat."

³⁰⁶ *Contra Iulianum* II,1, PL 44, 672.

³⁰⁷ *Contra Iulianum* II,2, PL 44, 672.

³⁰⁸ When Julian is ridiculizing the common folk, Augustine not always reacts; see, e.g. *Contra Iulianum* V,2-3, PL 44, 783.

³⁰⁹ See, e.g., *Opus imperfectum* V,1, CSEL 85,2, p. 166: "Nempe tanta raritas ingeniosorum et studiosorum, per quae duo ad humanarum diuinarumque rerum

4. Neither a Manichean nor a Punic Faith

Julian quite often accused Augustine of still being an *African Manichean*. He feared that the Catholic Church might be ravished by Manichean robbers from Africa, and he insisted with Turbantius that one should pray to God in order that He might save his Church.³¹⁰ According to Julian, Augustine's positions were not in line with the faith rooted in antiquity and handed down to the present time (cf. *supra*).

Time and again, Augustine refutes the accusation that his faith might be Manichean. He reminds Julian that such accusations are typical of heretics: the same procedure had been followed by Jovinian at the time.³¹¹ It is no surprise that the new heretics give new names to Catholics (Augustine thinks here of the term *traducianus*). That already happened in the past.³¹²

If this faith, as Julian suggested, is a *dogma popolare*, it can never be Manichean, for their madness, like that of the Pelagians, is only present in a few and it does not attract many.³¹³ Julian must be aware that if the doctrine of original sin is a Manichean idea,³¹⁴ this is the doctrine that has been confessed and professed by the great men, who had learned this doctrine in Christ's Church at the time of their first formation and, once being bishop, continued to teach it in the Church of Christ. Julian should be aware that he is attacking many, great defenders and doctors of the Catholic Church!³¹⁵ With regard to

scientiam peruenitur, et tanta multitudo tardorum et desidiosorum, satis indicat in quam partem suo tanquam pondere feratur ipsa natura, quam negatis esse uitiatam."

³¹⁰ See, e.g., *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 51, CCL 88, p. 352.

³¹¹ *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II,38, CSEL 42, p. 292: "Nec ego id dico, quod isti hoc sentiant; uerumtamen per Iouinianum catholicis Manicheos obicientem non esse hoc nouum noui haeretici recognoscant."; *Contra Iulianum* I,4, PL 44, 643; see REBILLARD, *Augustin et ses autorités*, p. 258.

³¹² *Opus imperfectum* I,6, CSEL 85,1, p. 9.

³¹³ *Opus imperfectum* VI,2-3, CSEL 85,2, pp. 293-294; see also II,2-3, CSEL 85,1, pp. 165-166, with regard to the small number of the Manicheans. This topos is well known in the Christian controversy literature; see OPELT, *Die Polemik in der christlichen lateinischen Literatur von Tertullian bis Augustin*, pp. 230-231.

³¹⁴ Within the discussion about the *dogma popolare*, it is interesting to see that also Augustine complains about the fact that Julian is disgracing Augustine's name among the "imperiti"; cf. *Contra Iulianum* II,1, PL 44, 671.

³¹⁵ *Contra Iulianum* I,12, PL 44, 648: "Sed qua confidentia id dicere audebis, homo qui dicis Manichaeum esse sensum, confiteri ex Adam trahere nascentes originale peccatum; quod isti confessi atque professi sunt quod in Christi Ecclesia suorum rudimentorum tempore didicerunt, quod Christi Ecclesiam suorum honorum tempore docuerunt (...)" ; II,1, PL 44, 671: "(...) quot et quantis uiris, Ecclesiae sanctis clarisque doctoribus, Manichaeorum crimen impingas (...)" ; *Opus imperfectum* I,2, CSEL 85,1, p. 2: "Post commemorationem quippe doctorum catholicorum quos

the councils of the wicked, Augustine asks Julian whether the latter dares to call the agreement of so many Catholics, teachers of the Church, standing in the ancient Catholic truth before him, a council of the wicked?³¹⁶ The faith of somebody like Ambrose is true, sound, rooted in antiquity, handed down to us and for all these reasons, Augustine adds, it is also my faith.³¹⁷ Accusing Augustine of Manicheism is also accusing his predecessors of Manicheism³¹⁸ or Traducianism.³¹⁹ Julian should know that all his slander not only hurls Augustine but also Augustine's predecessors and by doing so gives proof that he belongs with the new heretics.³²⁰ Augustine continues: "I did not spit it out upon Italy. (...) Rather, I received the bath of rebirth from this bishop of Italy who preached and taught this faith."³²¹

Manicheos facis – mihi sub hoc crimine obiciendo, quod illi in catholica ecclesia didicerunt atque docuerunt – (...)" IV,113, CSEL 85,2, p. 113-114: "cur ergo me dicis, quod illum esse non dicis, cum hoc ille tanto ante dixerit, quod ego nunc dico, atque in hac sententia propter quam Manichaeum me dicis, mihi et illi sit causa communis? (...) cur in una eademque sententia, quam dicit ille, dico ego, non est Manicheus ille, sed ego?" IV,120, CSEL 85,2, p. 134: "Prorsus si illum non dicis, nec me debes dicere; si autem me dicendum putas, et illum cogeris dicere, et illos omnes magnos ecclesiae claros que doctores, qui de peccato originali, propter quod me Manichaeum dicis, ea dicunt sine ulla obscuritate uel ambiguitate quae dico, ut in primo et secundo sex librorum meorum, quos contra quatuor tuos edidi, satis euidenter ostendi."; cf. also I,135, CSEL 85,1, p. 151; IV,119, CSEL 85,1, p. 133; IV,120, CSEL 85,1, p. 135.

³¹⁶ *Opus imperfectum* I,59, CSEL 85,1, p. 56.

³¹⁷ *Opus imperfectum* I,59, CSEL 85,1, p. 57: "Ecce non est eorum, sed est Ambrosii; quia vera est, quia sana est, quia ut dixi antiquitus tradita atque fundata est, haec et mea est." Cf. also I,109, CSEL 85,1, p. 129: "(...) Ambrosius utique, non ut Manicheus, quo nomine tales qualis ille fidei fuerat criminari, sed ut catholicus intellexit Apostolum (...)"; I,115, CSEL 85,1, p. 133: "Hoc non dixit haereticus immundus Manicheus, sed catholicus sanctus Ambrosius."; cf. also I,52, CSEL 85,1, p. 47; IV,118, CSEL 85,2, p. 130: "Originale peccatum cum Ambrosio confitemur (...)". IV,50, CSEL 85,1, p. 56: "Nec Apollinarista nec Manicheus fuit, sed haereticorum catholicus expugnator Ambrosius (...)". Sometimes, Augustine quotes a text from one of his giants and rhetorically asks: is this man a Manichean?; see, e.g., *Opus imperfectum* I,123, CSEL 85,1, p. 137.

³¹⁸ *Opus imperfectum* VI,33, CSEL 85,2, pp. 428-429; cf. also *Contra Iulianum* I,11, PL 44, 647; *Opus imperfectum* II,9, CSEL 85,1, p. 169.

³¹⁹ *Opus imperfectum* I,6, CSEL 85,1, p. 9.

³²⁰ *Opus imperfectum* I,9, CSEL 85,1, p. 10; with regard to Cyprian and Ambrose, see already *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,24, CSEL 60, pp. 548-549; IV,32, CSEL 60, p. 569; cf. also *Contra Iulianum* II,4, PL 44, 674; II,11, PL 44, 681 (with regard to Ambrose); II,37, PL 44, 701; *Opus imperfectum* I,9, CSEL 85,1, p. 10; IV,109, CSEL 85,2, p. 117.

³²¹ *Opus imperfectum* I,59, CSEL 85,1, p. 57: "Non ego hanc in Italiam, quod uos gemere dicitis, eructavi, sed potius ab isto episcopo Italiae hanc praedicante et docente lauacrum regenerationis accepi."

If I am a disciple of Mani, then Ambrose is also one; but he is not",³²² for he held anti-Manichean positions.³²³ If I, Augustine, am in line with Ambrose, why do you accuse me of Manicheism?³²⁴ With his accusations, Julian makes of these many great men false defenders and doctors of the Catholic faith.³²⁵ Some of them had never heard of Manicheism!³²⁶ It is monstrous and crazy to suggest that the Manichean error had already deceived Cyprian long before the name of Mani had even been heard in Roman territory.³²⁷ But these men were, instead, standing in the oldest tradition of the Church.³²⁸ Augustine himself does not need the help of Mani or Faustus, for his position is not only supported by the prophets and the apostles but also by his predecessors in the Church, very sound in faith, very sharp in mind, very rich in learning, and renowned in reputation.³²⁹ Augustine stresses that he

³²² *Opus imperfectum* I,66, CSEL 85,1, p. 65: "Si enim ego hinc sum discipulus Manichei, hoc est et ille; non est autem hoc ille (...)"; IV,88, CSEL 85,2, p. 91: "Vbi cernis esse consequens, ut si ego propter hanc sententiam sum Manichaeus, sit et Ambrosius; quia uero ille non est, neminem faciat uel ostendat ista sententia Manichaeum."; cf. also I,48, CSEL 85,1, pp. 39-40; II,2, CSEL 85,1, p. 165; II,9, CSEL 85,1, p. 169; II,21, CSEL 85,1, p. 176; II,31, CSEL 85,1, p. 185; II,164, p. 285; II,207, CSEL 85,1, p. 318: "Doctores catholici, non Manichei deceptores (...)"; II,208, CSEL 85,1, p. 319; IV,75, CSEL 85,2, p. 77; IV,113, CSEL 85,2, p. 113; IV,118, CSEL 85,2, p. 130; IV,122, CSEL 85,2, p. 141.

³²³ *Contra Iulianum* I,44, PL 44, 671; *Opus imperfectum* IV,109, pp. 116-117.

³²⁴ *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II,15, CSEL 42, pp. 267: "Si ergo illum Manicheum dicere non audetis, nos, cum in eadem causa eadem sententia fidem catholicam defendamus, cur dicitis Manicheos?"; see also *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,33, CSEL 60, p. 569: "Vnde apparet istos doctores catholicos longe a Manicheorum sensibus alienos. Et tamen asserunt originale peccatum (...)"; *Opus imperfectum* IV,109, CSEL 85,2, p. 117: "Quod ergo credit Ambrosius, hoc et ego; quod autem Manicheus, nec ille nec ego. Quid est quod tu niteris me separare ab Ambrosio et coniungere Manicheo? (...) cur non ambos a Manicheis dignaris abiungere?"; cf. also IV,108, CSEL 85,2, p. 116. See also DASSMANN, "Tam Ambrosius quam Cyprianus", p. 362.

³²⁵ *Contra Iulianum* I,36, PL 44, 666.

³²⁶ *Contra Iulianum* III,32, PL 44,719. In *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II,51, CSEL 42, p. 308, Augustine explicitly refers here to Cyprian: "(...) numquid et gloriosissimae coronae Cyprianus dicitur ab aliquo non solum fuisse, sed vel esse potuisse Manicheus, cum prius iste sit passus, quam illa in orbe Romano pestis adparuit?"

³²⁷ *Contra Iulianum* III,31, PL 44, 718.

³²⁸ *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II,51, CSEL 42, p. 308.

³²⁹ *Opus imperfectum* IV,72, CSEL 85,2, pp. 74-75; cf. also *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II,51, CSEL 42, pp. 307-308 (with regard to Ambrose and Cyprian); *Opus imperfectum* I,6, CSEL 85,1, p. 9; IV,108, CSEL 85,1, p. 116. It is interesting to see that Julian's argumentation was very much in the same line. He also claimed that he was in line with Scripture, prophets, evangelists, apostles and catholic thinkers known for their "catholica sanitas", in his case John Chrysostom, Basil, and Theodore of Mopsuestia; see *Ad Florum* III,111, CSEL 85,1, p. 432.

stays in a continuous line:³³⁰ before Augustine, there was Ambrose who was not a Manichee, before Ambrose there were Hilary and Gregory, who were certainly no Manichees, before them there were Cyprian and many others, who, again, were no Manichees.³³¹ Not without exaggeration he can speak of "meus est Cyprianus, meus est Hilarius, meus est Ambrosius, meus est Gregorius, meus est Basilius, meus est Iohannes Constantinopolitanus; hi omnes et alii socii eorum eadem sentientes, quos commemorare longum est, mei sunt".³³²

Using several times, like Julian, the metaphor of a fight, Augustine states that Ambrose's Catholic faith will defeat in the name and the power of Christ both the Manicheans and the Pelagians,³³³ and I with him.³³⁴ Therefore, both Mani and Julian, confronted with Scripture (John) and tradition (Ambrose), would be better off silent.³³⁵ It would be better for Julian to learn from Ambrose where the evil of carnal concupiscence is coming, in order not to help the Manichees, as he is doing now,³³⁶ while slandering the Catholics.³³⁷ The Catholic bishops, indeed, are able to give an adequate answer to the question where evil is coming from, an answer that Julian cannot give.³³⁸

In a passage, full of irony, Augustine wonders whether Ambrose, if he were still alive in those days, might come to realize that he was

³³⁰ For the latter, to whom Gregory will be opposed, see *Opus imperfectum* I,69, CSEL 85,1, p. 76.

³³¹ *Opus imperfectum* I,117, CSEL 85,1, p. 134: "Ante me erat Ambrosius, qui non erat Manicheus, ante ipsum Hilarius, Gregorius, ante hos Cyprianus et ceteri, quos commemorare longum est, qui non erant Manichei."; cf. also I,9, CSEL 85,1, p. 10.

³³² See *Opus imperfectum* I,52, CSEL 85,1, pp. 47-48.

³³³ *Opus imperfectum* III,178, CSEL 85,1, p. 480; cf. also III,181, CSEL 85,1, p. 481; III,187, CSEL 85,1, p. 490: "(...) quoniam catholica fide in Christi nomine atque uirtute utrosque uincit Ambrosius."; II,213, CSEL 85,1, p. 504: "Non esse Ambrosium Manicheum, qui fidei catholicae inuictissimus et Manicheos prostravit et uos (...)"; IV,112, CSEL 85,2, p. 120; see also V,5, CSEL 85,2, p. 173; V,41, CSEL 85,2, p. 243: "tuus destructor"; V,43, CSEL 85,2, pp. 246-247; VI,8, CSEL 85,1, p. 305: "Quo telo inuitabili et insuperabili ueritatis, et Manicheus obtruncatur, et tu."; VI,37, CSEL 85,2, p. 445; cf. already *Contra Iulianum* II,5, PL 44, 675.

³³⁴ *Opus imperfectum* VI,14, CSEL 85,2, pp. 334-335.

³³⁵ *Opus imperfectum* IV,23, CSEL 85,1, p. 25.

³³⁶ *Opus imperfectum* IV,28, CSEL 85,2, p. 28; IV,42, CSEL 85,2, p. 43; IV,50, CSEL 85,2, p. 56; IV,64, CSEL 85,2, p. 69; IV,70, CSEL 85,2, p. 74; V,20, CSEL 85,2, p. 202; VI,6, CSEL 85,2, p. 299; VI,8, CSEL 85,2, p. 304; VI,14, CSEL 85,1, p. 331ff. See also A. TRAPÈ, *Un celebre testo di Sant'Agostino sull' "Ignoranza e la difficoltà"* (*Retract. I,9,6*) e l' "*Opus imperfectum Contra Iulianum*", in *Augustinus Magister* II, Paris, 1954, pp. 795-803.

³³⁷ *Opus imperfectum* IV,56, CSEL 85,2, p. 62.

³³⁸ *Opus imperfectum* VI,14, CSEL 85,2, pp. 330-331.

a Manichee, while listening to Pelagius and hearing that the struggle between flesh and spirit was not, as he had taught, the result of Adam's transgression, something he would no longer dare to say "sub uobis magistris".³³⁹ Obeying Julian, he would have forbidden the rites of exhortation and exsufflation and would have been expelled from the Catholic Church, together with Julian.³⁴⁰ Evidently, this would never happen: if Ambrose were still alive, he would react even more vehemently and authoritatively than Augustine "pro catholica fide et pro Dei gratia uel aequitate".³⁴¹

Since Julian called Augustine a Punic debater, Augustine not only will refer to Cyprian – he is the real Punic debater, not me, Augustine reacts³⁴² –, but also to the other doctors. Only one of the holy men comes from Africa, the others from elsewhere: if the Manicheans would have defiled the Church through these holy bishops of God and renowned doctors, which Church gave birth to Julian?³⁴³ How can Julian accuse these men, who are on so many things in consensus with each other, of Manicheism?³⁴⁴ Stop to accuse us of Manicheism in order not to injure the venerable martyr Cyprian,³⁴⁵ who, together with his colleagues at the time, *prouisione diuina* through a conciliar decision already condemned the Pelagians who would come years later.³⁴⁶ Long before the Manichean pestilence came to Africa, Cyprian already confessed the doctrine of original sin,³⁴⁷ teaching what he had learned in the African Church.

However, instead of constantly accusing Augustine of Manicheism, he should better join Augustine in following Ambrose,³⁴⁸ for he, with his colleagues, is standing, like Augustine, in the Catholic

³³⁹ *Opus imperfectum* IV,114, CSEL 85,2, pp. 123-124; similar procedure but now adapted to Julian in IV,120, CSEL 85,2, p. 135.

³⁴⁰ *Opus imperfectum* IV,120, CSEL 85,2, p. 135.

³⁴¹ *Opus imperfectum* IV,114, CSEL 85,2, pp. 124-125.

³⁴² *Contra Iulianum* III,32, PL 44, 719.

³⁴³ *Contra Iulianum* III,32, PL 44, 719.

³⁴⁴ *Opus imperfectum* I,55, CSEL 85,1, p. 52: "Numquid Manicheus fuit iste Reticus?"

³⁴⁵ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,21, CSEL 60, p. 544; cf. also IV,32, CSEL 60, p. 569.

³⁴⁶ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,23, CSEL 60, p. 546; with regard to Augustine's respect for conciliar decisions, see H.-J. SIEBEN, *Die Konzilsidee der Alte Kirche*, Paderborn, 1979, pp. 68-102.

³⁴⁷ *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* IV,24, CSEL 60, p. 549: "(...) antequam terras nostras uel tenuissimus odor Manicheae pestilentiae tetigisset (...)".

³⁴⁸ *Opus imperfectum* V,30, CSEL 85,1, p. 229: "Desine ergo mihi magistrum apponere Manicheum, sed mecum potius sequere Ambrosium (...)".

truth.³⁴⁹ Augustine cannot understand that Pelagius and Caelestius might have such a great influence on Julian that he dares to label these judges and defenders of the Catholic faith Manichees. Because of his denial of the doctrine of original sin, he is a stronger and mightier enemy of Christ's cross and God's grace than of people like Ambrose.³⁵⁰ In any case, even if Julian might dare to call one of these men Manichees, he certainly will not dare to give this name to Christ.³⁵¹

Just as Julian showed his Italian "nationalistic" feelings, Augustine does not fear to show that he is proud of his African background and his African predecessor Cyprian. When Julian suggested that the Catholic Church was ravished by the Manichean pirates from Africa,³⁵² Augustine reverses the accusation. He first stresses that Catholics react against Manichees, Donatists, and other heretics or enemies of the Christian and Catholic name in Africa.³⁵³ He describes the Pelagian heresy as a *transmarina pestilentia*, a robbery against which he puts Cyprian, through whom he wants to defend the Catholic faith against the vain and profane novelty of the Pelagian error.³⁵⁴ Indeed, it is Julian himself who spoke against the most ancient Catholic faith.³⁵⁵ Using military vocabulary (like Julian), he claims that Julian constructs new machines and prepares new attacks against the walls of the most ancient truth. I am not, as you say, the Punic debater, but Cyprian who will punish you for your impious doctrine.³⁵⁶

³⁴⁹ *Contra Iulianum* II,5, PL 44, 675: "(...) cum hoc dicere me uideas, quod ille dixit (...)"; *Opus imperfectum* IV,122, CSEL 85,2, p. 143: "Ego tamen in hac causa, in qua tibi de originali peccato multum uideor detestandus, et Manicheo potius coaequandus, cum Ambrosio sum, uelis nolis, quem Iovinianus Manicheum dicebat (...)"; see also VI,41, CSEL 85,2, p. 464 (with regard to the carnal concupiscence as result of the fall of the first man).

³⁵⁰ *Opus imperfectum* II,56, CSEL 85,1, p. 395.

³⁵¹ Cf. *Contra Iulianum* I,13, PL 44, 648 (with regard to Innocent).

³⁵² *Ad Turbantium*, frg. 51, CCSL 88, p. 352.

³⁵³ *Contra Iulianum* III,31, PL 44, 718.

³⁵⁴ *Contra Iulianum* III,31, PL 44, 718: "Contra uos autem, quia nobis estis pestilentia transmarina, Christo saluatore uincenda, ideo ne latrocinamur ex Africa, quia unum martyrem hinc opponimus Cyprianum, per quem probemus antiquam nos defendere fidem catholicam, contra uestri erroris uanam profanamque nouitatem?" On the use of the term pestilence as a polemical motive, see OPELT, *Die Polemik in der christlichen lateinischen Literatur*, p. 158.

³⁵⁵ *Contra Iulianum* III,31, PL 44, 718-719: "(...) contra antiquissimam catholicam fidem (...)".

³⁵⁶ *Contra Iulianum* III,32, PL 719: "Sed quantumlibet tergiuerseris, o haeresis Pelagiana, quae contra muros antiquissimae ueritatis nouas construis machinas, nouas moliris insidias: Poenus disputator, quod me contumeliose tuus defensor appellat; Poenus, inquam, disputator, non ego, sed Cyprianus Poenus, te hoc uulnere poenus immolat, et poenam scelerato ex dogmate sumit."; cf. also *Opus imperfectum* I,7,

Augustine does not believe that, as suggested by Julian, his faith is to be compared to a small Numidian shield (*caetra Numidica*). It is a genuinely complete shield of truth! With this shield, the Punic³⁵⁷ Cyprian, an outstanding soldier of Christ, was already armed against the Pelagians. When Julian ironically called Augustine the most notable debater who, by the steps of his Punic dialectics, had destroyed judgment, Augustine will refer to Cyprian, a Punic person in whom Julian will not dare to mock Punic dialectics.³⁵⁸ Julian should realize that, while barking against the Punic bishop and martyr Cyprian, he is attacking the most solidly grounded faith of the Church for which this martyr shed his blood.³⁵⁹ Quite evidently, Julian's hinting at the Punic wars did not escape Augustine, but he was not really impressed by it. Because Julian was born in Apulia, he might think that he surpasses the Punic people, but he will never surpass them by his mind. Julian should better flee the punishments (*poena*) than the Punic (*Poenus*) people. Indeed, he will never escape the Punic opponents as long as he trusts in his own virtue, for the Punic Cyprian claimed that we must boast over nothing for nothing is ours.³⁶⁰

V. Conclusion

The complaints and accusations as formulated by Julian were serious ones: Augustine's doctrine was foolish, an innovation, supported by the common folk, inspired by Manicheism, missing any rational plausibility. It was an African doctrine, introduced by force in Italy and ruining the Church in the West. The promoter of this doctrine, Augustine, had misused the common folk to stir up a revolt against the intellectuals such as Julian and his companions.

Augustine, in his reply, gives priority to Scripture, but immediately adds that the doctors he appeals to are faithful to it and develop

CSEL 85,1, p. 9; VI,23, CSEL 85,2, p. 378. See also DASSMANN, "*Tam Ambrosius quam Cyprianus*", p. 160.

³⁵⁷ Augustine clearly distinguishes between his own Numidian background and the Punic Cyprian: "(...) non quidem Numida, sed tamen Poenus ille Cyprianus (...)"; *Opus imperfectum* VI,6, CSEL 85,2, p. 299.

³⁵⁸ *Opus imperfectum* I,72, CSEL 85,1, p. 85.

³⁵⁹ *Opus imperfectum* I,106, CSEL 85,1, p. 125.

³⁶⁰ *Opus imperfectum* VI,18, CSEL 85,2, p. 353: "Non enim quia te Apulia genuit, ideo Poenos uincendos existimes gente, quos non potes mente. Poenas potius fuge, non Poenos: nam disputatores Poenos non potes fugere, quamdiu te delectat in tua uirtute confidere; et beatus enim Cyprianus Poenus fuit, qui dixit, in nullo gloriandum, quando nostrum nihil sit."

their ideas in line with Scripture. The faith of these Fathers can be qualified as historically continuous and geographically unanimous. Augustine clearly motivates his choice of the judges: some function as guarantees of the historical continuity (Ireneus, Reticius, Olympius), many are familiar with heresies (Irenaeus, Cyprian, Reticius, Olympius, Hilary, Ambrose, Gregory, Basil, the bishops of Diospolis, Jerome), or are recognized as great authorities by Pelagius and Julian (Cyprian, Ambrose, Hilary, Basil, John Chrysostom). What binds them all is their unanimity with regard to the essentials of the faith. Although Augustine is proud on his African origin, and gives a considerable place to Cyprian because of the antiquity of his faith, for personal and strategic reasons he mostly invokes the Italian Ambrose, the compatriot of Julian, but spiritual father of Augustine. Quite a number of the judges of the court do not really function in Augustine's argumentation. One might think here of Ireneus and Olympius. But even the bishops of Diospolis, who set free Pelagius, receive less and less attention from Augustine. Others receive an introductory praise that is disproportionate with the factual use Augustine makes of them. This is clearly the case for Innocent and Jerome. With regard to Jerome, one can even think of a kind of distance from the side of Augustine. By inserting Basil and Chrysostom in his list of judges, Augustine clearly wants to prove that they stay at his side and that Julian uncorrectly appealed to them in defense of his own case. With regard to that Eastern tradition, it should be repeated that Augustine mainly is dependent on translations.

Although Augustine is of the opinion that Julian, with his desire for a court, consisting of a few, learned people, is looking for the wrong judges, he himself makes great efforts in order to show that his own court of judges, these few doctors, meet the standards as requested by Julian. In doing so, he pays much attention to prove the antiquity of the faith, its historical continuity, and its geographical universality: this sound faith is spread all over the world and held by the whole Church. Furthermore, Augustine endlessly repeats that his *eruditi* learned men taught what they had learned: they were children of the Church who became Fathers and contributed to the growth of the Church. Augustine emphasizes the great consensus between these Fathers, because they were inspired by and in agreement with Scripture and the Catholic faith. Therefore, they can share Julian's position with regard to the goodness of creation, marriage, God's justice, and still hold the doctrine of original sin. For all these reasons, their doctrine cannot be evaluated as stupid, impious. The accusation that it was introduced through force is meaningless.

Augustine stresses that Julian does, willingly or unwillingly, not know his dossier and that his condemnation is, from all angles, justified.

Julian's depreciation of the multitude is used by Augustine against Julian's pretensions: it is a proof of the strength of the doctrine, and the weakness of Julian's pretensions about his own intellectual capacities. Augustine takes care to stress the link between the multitude and their bishops. Moreover, the multitude rejects the Pelagians because their doctrine is not able to give the right answers. Finally, if some of the common folk are weak and unfamiliar with Scripture, it is precisely for that reason that one should warn against the deceiver Julian! However, it should be said that Augustine's view of the multitude is not univocal.

At length, Augustine answers the accusation of still being an African Manichean. If this was so, one could not explain the success of the Catholic faith with the multitude. If this was the case, one should already qualify doctors, living long before Manicheism entered Africa, as Manichean. One might think here especially of Cyprian, who died as a martyr for his orthodox faith. Augustine repeats regularly that he has found this faith in Italy and that he is dependent upon doctors from all over the world. His weapons are Scripture and tradition. On the contrary, Julian, by his critique of the doctrine of original sin, is the real helper of the Manicheans.

Augustine also turns Julian's complaints about the African pestilence against the Pelagians: their heresy is a transmarine pestilence, but the Africans are well armed against these pretentious Italian invaders and attackers of the ancient faith.

In sum, Augustine uses all kinds of arguments in order to make clear that he and not Julian is the son, promoter and protector of the ancient, strongly-rooted, Christian, Catholic, orthodox truth.

M. LAMBERIGTS