2018 - 64/1

REVUE D'ÉTUDES AUGUSTINIENNES ET PATRISTIQUES

Revue soutenue par l'Institut des Sciences Humaines et Sociales du CNRS

SOMMAIRE

Edwina MURPHY, Sin no more: Healing, wholeness, and the absent adulteress in Cyprian's use of John.....	1-15
Emanuele CASTELLI, Sulpicio Severo contro Girolamo. Per una nuova interpretazione della lettera prefatoria e del primo capitolo della <i>Vita Martini</i>	17-35
Mariagnese GIUSTO, L'interpretazione patristica della pericope evangelica della donna curva (Lc 13, 11- 17).....	37-71
Matthieu PIGNOT, Setting rules for becoming Christian: Augustine's polemical treatise <i>De fide et operibus</i> in context.....	73-114
Enrico MORO, A proposito delle tre ipotesi sull'origine delle anime nel libro X del <i>De Genesi ad litteram</i> (X, 1, 1 – 5, 8).....	115-137
Anne DE SAXCÉ, La rosée dans l'exégèse augustinienne.....	139-164
Giulio MALAVASI & Anthony DUPONT, Marius Mercator and the Augustinian Concept of Carnal Concupiscence.....	165-180
François DOLBEAU, Un épitomé inconnu des <i>Confessions</i> d'Augustin.....	181-187
Comptes rendus bibliographiques.....	189-213

COMITÉ DE DIRECTION

Isabelle BOCHET, Catherine BROC-SCHMETZER, François DOLBEAU, Vincent ZARINI

CONSEIL SCIENTIFIQUE

Irena BACKUS (Genève), Jean-Denis BERGER, Laetitia CICCOLINI, Gilbert DAHAN, Volker DRECOLL (Tübingen), Martine DULAËY, Allan D. FITZGERALD (Rome), Sylvie LABARRE, Alain LE BOULLUEC, Michel-Yves PERRIN, Pierre PETITMENGIN, Mickaël RIBREAU, Hervé SAVON, Brian STOCK (Toronto), Sophie VAN DER MEEREN

Administrateur : Jean-Denis BERGER

Les manuscrits doivent être envoyés à Jean-Denis BERGER,
à l'Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 95, rue de Sèvres, 75006 PARIS.

DIFFUSION EXCLUSIVE

BREPOLS PUBLISHERS
Begijnhof 67. B-2300 TURNHOUT (Belgique)
téléphone : 00 32 14 44 80 20
télécopie : 00 32 14 42 89 19
e-mail : info@brepols.net
www.brepols.net

Abonnement à la revue imprimée + numérique : 115 € TTC

Abonnement à la revue imprimée : 100 € TTC

Fascicules séparés : 65 € TTC

Pour s'abonner à la Revue d'études augustinienes et patristiques (quelle que soit la formule choisie), écrire à : periodicals@brepols.net.

Comptes bancaires
Crédit du Nord, Centre Aff. Roubaix
RIB : 30076 02919 61068404200 14
ING France-Lille
RIB : 30438 00008 3389403 6002 40

Marius Mercator and the Augustinian Concept of Carnal Concupiscence

It is commonly held and widely known that Marius Mercator played a background role in the Pelagian controversy and its reception in later church history¹. He exchanged letters with Augustine of Hippo on the issue of Pelagian ideas². He was also acquainted with Jerome, another foe of the so-called Pelagians, who mentioned Mercator in one of his letters³. Though not negligible, his impact in the Pelagian controversy was minimal compared to that of Augustine. Mercator seemed to be aware of his limited literary contribution to the defence of orthodoxy against the so-called Pelagian heresy and of his indebtedness to Augustine's theology in this regard⁴. As far as we can reconstruct, Mercator's anti-Pelagian literary works comprise two phases. During the first period, around 418 in Rome, Mercator composed some anti-Pelagian works which are not preserved. We know of these anti-Pelagian works thanks to Augustine's response to Mercator, in which Augustine clarifies some doctrinal doubts to Mercator⁵. The second period is situated in or around Constantinople, when Mercator wrote the following two anti-Pelagian pamphlets: the *Commonitorium super nomine Caelestii* written at

1. We would like to cordially thank Timo Nisula and Mickaël Ribreau for their insightful comments on the first version of this article.

The most comprehensive studies on Marius Mercator are: S. PRETE, *Mario Mercatore. Polemista antipelagiano*, Torino, 1958 and C. KONOPPA, *Die Werke des Marius Mercator: Übersetzung und Kommentierung seiner Schriften*, Frankfurt am Main, 2004. See also: W.C. BARK, "The Doctrinal Interests of Marius Mercator", *Church History*, 12, 1943, pp. 210-216, and A. LEPKA, "L'originalité des répliques de Marius Mercator à Julien d'Éclane", *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 27, 1931, pp. 572-579.

2. AUGUSTINUS, *Epist.* 193, ed. by A. Goldbacher, Leipzig, 1911, CSEL 57, pp. 167-175.

3. HIERONYMUS, *Epist.* 154, 3, ed. by I. Hilberg, Wien – Leipzig, 1918, CSEL 56, p. 368.

4. See MARIUS MERCATOR, *Commonitorium lectori adversum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani* 3-4, ed. by E. Schwartz, Berlin – Leipzig, 1925-1927, ACO I, V/1, pp. 6-7.

5. For a hypothesis on Mercator's enemies, see: G. MALAVASI, "Marius Mercator's Enemies in Augustine's Letter 193", in *Studia Patristica*, 74, Leuven, 2016, pp. 361-370.

the latest in 429 and addressed to the Emperor Theodosius II and to the Church of Constantinople, and the *Commonitorium lectori adversum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani* composed after the death of Augustine (430) for the presbyter Pientius, otherwise unknown⁶. Mercator accuses the Pelagians in general, and Julian of Aeclanum in particular, of denying the fact that death is a penal consequence of original sin (thereby portraying death as a natural phenomenon) and of withholding baptism from infants. Since, according to the Pelagians, babies are born without (original) sin, they do not need baptism to be liberated from (original) sin⁷.

The objective of this brief paper is to evaluate, through a specific case study, Mercator's degree of loyalty to and understanding of Augustine's anti-Pelagian theology. In particular, we will investigate how Mercator processed Augustine's theology of *concupiscentia carnis*: carnal concupiscence. We have good reasons to focus our research question on the Augustinian notion of carnal concupiscence. The fact that the debate about the nature and impact of carnal concupiscence was a crucial issue in the Pelagian controversy—especially in the heated polemics between Augustine and Julian of Aeclanum—does not need to be further argued⁸.

6. Modern translations of Mercator's works can be found in Italian, *Mario Mercatore. Memoriali antipelagiani*, S. Prete (ed.), Siena, 1960, and in German, C. KONOPPA, *Die Werke des Marius Mercator: Übersetzung und Kommentierung seiner Schriften*, Frankfurt am Main, 2004, see pp. 83-179 for a commentary on Mercator's *Commonitorium lectori adversum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani*. On the literary genre of Mercator's works, see: S. PRETE, *Il commonitorium nella letteratura cristiana antica*, Bologna, 1962, and R. LIZZI TESTA, "Un'epistola speciale: il commonitorium", in *Forme letterarie nella produzione latina di IV-VI secolo. Con uno sguardo a Bisanzio*, Rome, 2003, pp. 53-90. For the dating of Mercator's works, see the entry "Marius Mercator" in *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire. Vol. II: Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313-604)*, ed. by C. Pietri – L. Pietri, Rome, 2000, pp. 1499-1504, esp. p. 1500.

7. E.M. MORALES – R. DODARO, "Marius Mercator", in *Augustinus-Lexikon*, ed. by C. Mayer, vol. 3, Basel, 2004-2010, pp. 1179-1181. Theodore of Mopsuestia also discussed this matter in a work against the "defenders of original sin", see: G. MALAVASI, "The Involvement of Theodore of Mopsuestia in the Pelagian Controversy: A Study of Theodore's Treatise Against Those who Say that Men sin by Nature and not by Will", *Augustiniana*, 64, 2014, pp. 227-260, esp. pp. 245-246, and N. KAVVADAS, "An Eastern View. Theodore of Mopsuestia's Against the Defenders of Original Sin", in *The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius*, ed. by A.Y. Hwang – B.J. Matz – A. Casiday, Washington, D.C., 2014, pp. 271-293, esp. pp. 283-292.

8. On Augustine and carnal concupiscence, see: G. BONNER, "Concupiscentia", in *Augustinus-Lexikon*, ed. by C. Mayer, vol. 1, Basel, 1986-1994, pp. 1113-1122, and T. NISULA, *Augustine and the Functions of Concupiscence*, Leiden – Boston, 2012. See also M. LAMBERIGTS, "A Critical Evaluation of Critiques of Augustine's View of Sexuality", in *Augustine and His Critics. Essays in Honour of Gerald Bonner*, ed. by R. Dodaro – G. Lawless, London, 2000, pp. 176-197.

For an elaborate and systematic analysis of Augustine's ideas about *concupiscentia*, and especially the (infralapsarian) libidinisation of sexual acts, see the recent: M. FOUCAULT, *Histoire de la*

Furthermore, Mercator explicitly addressed this issue in his own works, though admittedly only in a limited number of passages⁹. Mercator's later and limited consideration of carnal concupiscence can be explained by the fact that he preferred to devote his attention to another, related, theological issue, namely the link between death and original sin. The latter emphasis prompted Serafino Prete to state that Mercator's writings could be summarized with the title *De mortalitate*¹⁰. We opted to concentrate on the concept of carnal concupiscence, less frequently discussed by Mercator, because it could potentially indicate Mercator's acquaintance with and dependence on Augustine's anti-Pelagian doctrine. As such, the study of *concupiscentia carnis* in Mercator functions as a litmus test. Once we have established the (probable) link between Mercator and Augustine for this topic which Mercator infrequently reflected upon, future research can move towards topics which Mercator (and Augustine) discussed at length in an attempt to evaluate Mercator's knowledge and use of the writings of the bishop of Hippo.

Central in our analysis is a passage of Mercator's *Commonitorium lectori adversum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani*, dedicated to the topic of concupiscence. At this juncture, Mercator quotes concise passages from Julian's writings, and subsequently rebukes them. This *modus operandi* is very similar, though not identical, to Augustine's approach in his *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum*. In this unfinished work, Augustine offers a complete copy of Julian's *Ad Florum* (apart from the last two books that are lost), countered by the bishop of Hippo section by section. Mercator does not offer us Julian's works comprehensively, but cites only some scattered fragments, specifically selected in order to be refuted by him.

sexualité IV: Les aveux de la chair, Paris, 2018, pp. 283-361. (The latter will probably not remain without discussion, esp. Foucault's situating of the juridification of sexual acts in Augustine's thinking. Moreover, as noticed by Jérôme LAGOUANÈRE [*Le Monde des Livres* 09/02/2018, p. 2], is—despite Foucault's appreciation for Augustine's positive attitude towards marriage as a “middle way”—Augustine's theory about sexuality more “optimistic” than depicted by Foucault, and Foucault, in this perspective, does not distinguish the sexual act—as such not a sin, because possible in paradise before the fall—and [sinful] *libido/concupiscentia* escaping the human will, that arose as punishment of the fall.)

9. References to carnal concupiscence and related words can be found in: MARIUS MERCATOR, *Commonitorium lectori adversum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani* 8, ACO I, V/1, pp. 9-10; and 14, ACO I, V/1, p. 22. Both passages will be analysed in the present article. There are also other occurrences of carnal concupiscence/lust in sermons of Nestorius translated by Mercator, taken from the PL 48 edition, see: NESTORIUS, *Sermo primus. Tractatus in Adam in ecclesia publice habitus* 6, PL 48, c. 192 B; 7, PL 48, c. 193 A; NESTORIUS, *Sermo II. Item ejusdem tractatus alius ad populum in Adam* 3, PL 48, c. 198 A; NESTORIUS, *Altero versio sermonum iii et iv in uno redactorum* 5, PL 48, c. 206 B-C; 10, PL 48, c. 208 B; 16, PL 48, c. 211 B.

10. S. PRETE, *Mario Mercatore. Polemista antipelagiano*, Torino, 1958, p. 50.

According to Julian, Augustine's claim that original sin is generationally transmitted through intercourse (*tradux peccati*) implies a fundamental condemnation of marriage¹¹. Julian, on the contrary, regarded marriage as a divine institution, and offered a careful exegesis of the creation account in Gn. 1-3 from this perspective, notably in his *Ad Turbantium* and *Ad Florum*. Since physical procreation holds a central place in God's intention with human marriage, sexual intercourse and the instrument of concupiscence that leads to sexual intercourse are likewise established by God. In short, Julian's view accommodates *concupiscentia* as a natural quality (*naturalis*)¹², given by God¹³, which is always under human control¹⁴. One of Julian's fragments that is countered by Mercator in this specific context of marriage/sexuality is also dealt with in Augustine's *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* II, 59. In this passage, Julian briefly commented on Gn. 2, 24: "That is why a man leaves his father and mother and is united to his wife, and they become one flesh." Julian stressed that this Genesis verse does not say that a man and a woman will become "one human being," but only states that they will be united in "one flesh". According to Julian, this insight has important implications. It means that God instituted this union before the fall, and that He thus likewise instituted the pleasure of intercourse accompanying this union. Consequently, the sexual desire that led to sexual union is also approved and instituted by God. Otherwise put, *uoluptas* and *libido* belong to the human nature from the very beginning and therefore are not to be rejected or condemned as sinful¹⁵.

11. IULIANUS AECLANENSIS, *Epistula ad Valerium*, frag. 2, ed. by L. de Coninck – M.J. D'Hondt, Turnhout, 1977, CCL 88, p. 335.

12. For instance IULIANUS AECLANENSIS, *Ad Turbantium*, frag. 63, CCL 88, p. 356; frag. 130, CCL 88, p. 368.

13. For instance IULIANUS AECLANENSIS, *Ad Turbantium*, frag. 41, CCL 88, p. 350; frag. 45, CCL 88, p. 351.

14. For instance IULIANUS AECLANENSIS, *Ad Turbantium*, frag. 116, CCL 88, p. 366; frag. 233, CCL 88, p. 383. For further references and an indepth analysis, see the very substantial and profound dissertation of Mathijs Lamberigts, which we consulted for the specific Julian references in our article: M. LAMBERIGTS, *De polemiek tussen Julianus van Aeclanum en Augustinus van Hippo. Deel 1: Julianus van Aeclanum. Volume 1: Tekst, Volume 2: Voetnoten. Deel 2: Augustinus van Hippo. Volume 1: Tekst, Volume 2: Voetnoten* (unpublished doctoral dissertation Theology, K.U. Leuven), Leuven, 1988, Deel 1: vol. 1, pp. 200-251, vol. 2, pp. 160-197. See also: F. REFOULÉ, "Julien d'Éclane, théologien et philosophe", *Recherches de science religieuse*, 54, 1964, pp. 42-84; M. RIBREAU, "Augustin héréslogue dans le *Contra Iulianum*", *Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques*, 55, 2009, pp. 189-213.

15. MARIUS MERCATOR, *Commonitorium lectori adversum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani* 8, ACO I, V/1, p. 9: "Non enim dictum est erunt duo homines in uno homine, sed erunt duo in carne una, quo unionis nomine uoluptas illa coeuntium et libido, quae sensim adiciens membra consternat ac, sicut ille prudens intellexit, unam carnem gestit efficere, a deo instituta et corporibus docetur inserta." On Julian's concept of concupiscence, see: M. LAMBERIGTS, "The Philosophical and Theological Background of Julian of Aeclanum's Concept of Concupiscence", in *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike: Texte,*

We will observe Mercator's reaction to Julian's position, quoted below *in extenso*. The three sentences marked in bold will be discussed extensively in the remainder of this article.

"Eleganter, scurra, loqueris more tuo et more quo theatrum Arbitri Valerique detristi. Constat in illis prosatoribus generis humani fuisse libidinem insitam eorum naturae, [2.] quam quidem **diuinae scripturae non, ut tu uis, libidinem solent sed carnis concupiscentiam nominare**, de qua illud inperent: *Crescite et multiplicamini, et replete terram* (Gn. 1, 28) et illud: *Adhaerebit uxori suae, et erunt duo in carne una* (Gn. 2, 23). Sed si mandatum diuinum seruassent, non eis fuerat immodesta stimulatix, infesta et inopportuna inritatrix, cum non quaeritur opus eius, qualis nunc est, trahens ui sua et magna uasa plerumque de castitatis arce deiciens. [1.] **Ergo si talis non est, sicut nec est, qualis naturaliter subolis tantum causa diuinitus fuerat data, uitata est**; quo uitio suo cum generat, quod nascitur ex uitio, uitiatum est [3.] et **iure medico et redintegratore indiget Christo.**"

(Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium lectori aduersum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani* 8, ACO I, V/1, p. 10)

In this very brief passage, Mercator completely dismissed Julian's interpretation of carnal concupiscence, supporting instead a position that comes very close to that of Augustine. We have indicated three particular statements in this passage that invite closer scrutiny in order to determine the degree to which Mercator's response to Julian concerning carnal concupiscence could be considered "Augustinian"¹⁶.

[1.] The first passage addresses the question about whether our present, post-lapsarian, concupiscence differs from that of Adam and Eve at the moment of creation prior to the fall, and, if so, in what way it differs: "Si talis non est, sicut nec est, qualis naturaliter [...] fuerat data, uitata est." The theological kernel within this question is the supposed presence or absence of concupiscence in Adam and Eve from creation onwards. This question was frequently answered by Augustine, especially in his vehement debate with Julian. For Julian, the answer was clear: concupiscence is an integral part of creation, hence it belongs to human nature, and its current form is identical to the prelapsarian form enjoyed by Adam and Eve. For Augustine, the answer is much more complicated, and he refuses to formulate a simple, straightforward, definitive solution¹⁷. We can assume that Augustine's

Personen, Institutionen. Akten der Tagung vom 22.-25. Februar 2006 am Zentrum für Antike und Moderne der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, ed. by T. Fuhrer, Stuttgart, 2008, pp. 245-260, and P. BROWN, "Sexuality and Society in the Fifth Century A.D.: Augustine and Julian of Eclanum", in *Tria Corda: Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano*, ed. by E. Gabba, Como, 1983, pp. 49-70.

16. This passage is also briefly commented upon in C. KONOPPA, *Die Werke des Marius Mercator: Übersetzung und Kommentierung seiner Schriften*, Frankfurt am Main, 2004, pp. 128-130.

17. Concerning Augustine's and Julian's different approach of Adam and Eve, see: M. LAMBERIGTS, "Julien d'Éclane et Augustine d'Hippone: deux conceptions d'Adam", *Augustiniana*, 40, 1990, pp. 373-410.

enigmatic position on the question of concupiscence influenced Mercator as he composed the above passage.

In his rebuttal of Julian's thesis that human death is natural because Adam was created mortal, Augustine particularly stressed the discontinuity between Adam's situation before the fall and our postlapsarian human condition. While for Julian it was clear that Adam was created with concupiscence, Augustine found it hard to accept this idea of natural concupiscence, since he linked mankind's mortality—a punishment of *peccatum originale*—with *concupiscentia carnis*. Augustine addressed the topic of prelapsarian concupiscence, for example, in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II, 35, 59. He clearly asserted that in Eden, before the fall, carnal concupiscence never influenced the human will, but was always obedient to the (rational) choices of the first human couple. The present situation, however, is radically different. Damaged by the disobedience of the first human beings, concupiscence is now vitiated and arouses disordered disobedience¹⁸. In this passage,

18. AUGUSTINUS, *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II, 35, 59, ed. by C.F. Urba and I. Zycha, Wien, 1902, CSEL 42, p. 318: "Hinc si forte erubuerit et dixerit tantam pacem felicitatis illius tantumque ordinem in his rebus esse potuisse, ut numquam carnis concupiscentia uoluntatem illorum hominum praeueniret, sed, cum ipsi uellent, tunc illa consurgeret, tunc autem uellent, quando ad seminandos filios opus esset, ita ut nullus seminis esset inritus iactus, nullus fieret concubitus, quem non sequeretur conceptus et partus ad nutum seruiente carne, ad nutum seruiente libidine: hoc si dicit, saltem consideret nunc in hominibus non esse quod dicit. Et si non uult concedere uitium esse libidinem, dicat saltem per illorum hominum inoboedientiam etiam ipsam uitiatam esse carnis concupiscentiam, ut illa, quae oboedienter et ordinate moueretur, nunc inoboedienter inordinate moueatur."

According to Augustine, *concupiscentia carnis* existed in an innocent form before the fall. It was at that time in harmony with the human will (*De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II, 59; *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum* I, 68; *Contra duas epistulas pelagianorum* I, 34-35). That form of *concupiscentia carnis* thus was good. As punishment for the first sin, God weakened human will, however, impeding it to control sexual lust anymore. If Adam and Eve did not fall, mankind would still possess the original innocent and good *concupiscentia*. Infralapsarian *concupiscentia* however indicates our inclination to sin – the urge to place our own will above God's. The latter desire escapes our own self-control (*De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I, 7). Cf. A. SOLIGNAC, "La condition de l'homme pécheur d'après saint Augustin", *Nouvelle revue théologique*, 78, 1956, pp. 359-387; W. TIANYUE, "Did Augustine lose the philosophical battle in the debate with Julian of Eclanum on *concupiscentia carnis* and *voluntas*?", *Augustiniana*, 57, 2007, pp. 7-30; K. TREGO, "L'âme et la volonté chez saint Augustin", in *Saint Augustin*, ed. by M. Caron, Paris, 2009, pp. 261-306. For Augustine's notion of *concupiscentia*, how it is situated within his theory of sin, and how this notion developed in his debate with the so-called (semi-)pelagians, in particular Pelagius, and Julian, see the extensive notes in the *Bibliothèque augustinienne*: M. MOREAU – Chr. INGREMEAU – B. DELAROCHE (introd., trad., notes), *Premières réactions antipélagiens I. Salaire et pardon des péchés. De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, Paris, 2013, BA 20/A, pp. 431-446; 448-450; P. DESCOTES (introd., trad., notes), *Premières réactions antipélagiens II. La grâce de la nouvelle alliance. De gratia testamenti novi*, Paris, 2016, BA 20/B, pp. 513-520; J. DE LA TULLAYE –

Augustine appears to have accepted the idea that the concupiscence of the flesh was present in Adam and Eve from the very beginning, but their concupiscence was different from the form we experience after the fall. Summarily, obedient concupiscence was damaged by original sin and transformed into a vitiated and disobedient concupiscence.

Later on, Augustine's interpretation becomes more sophisticated. In order to answer Julian's view on concupiscence, Augustine devised a fourfold scheme of hypotheses explaining the presence of concupiscence in our first forefathers. *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* presents these four hypotheses. First, Adam and Eve enjoyed intercourse every time *libido* aroused them to do so. Second, when the latter occurred, they successfully fought against *libido*. Third, *libido* was completely obedient to the human will. Fourth, there was no *libido* in the first human beings. Augustine rapidly dismissed the first two hypotheses because they clearly contradict the Eden account as narrated in the book of Genesis. As to the other two options, Augustine seems to have been open to both. At the same time, he was well aware of the fact that the fourth option, the complete absence of concupiscence, was not an acceptable interpretation according to the so-called Pelagians. Hence, Augustine and his adversaries could form a consensus about hypothesis 3, the presence of an obedient concupiscence¹⁹. This fourfold scheme recurs, sometimes only partially, in his later anti-Pelagian oeuvres, in writings

G. DE PLINVAL (introd., trad., notes), *La crise pélagienne 1. Epistula ad Hilarium Syracusanum, De perfectione iustitiae hominis, De natura et gratia, De gestis Pelagii*, Paris, 1994, BA 21, pp. 593-594; 604-607; J. PLAGNIEUX – F.-J. THONNARD (intr., trad., notes), *La crise pélagienne 2. De gratia Christi et de peccato originali libri II, De natura et origine animae libri IV*, Paris, 1975, BA 22, pp. 735-739; 744-747; 815-817; F.-J. THONNARD – E. BLEUZEN – A.C. DE VEER, (introd., trad., notes), *La crise pélagienne 3. Premières polémiques contre Julien. De nuptiis et concupiscentia, Contra duas Epistulas Pelagianorum*, Paris, 1974, BA 23, pp. 688-696; 702-708; 743-748; J. CHÉNÉ – J. PINTARD (intr., trad., notes), *Aux Moines d'Adrumète et de Provence. De gratia et libero arbitrio, De correptione et gratia, De praedestinatione sanctorum, De dono perseverantiae*, Paris, 1962, BA 24, pp. 778-779; 783-784.

19. AUGUSTINUS, *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* I, 17, 34-35, ed. by C.F. Urba and I. Zycha, Wien – Leipzig, 1912, CSEL 60, pp. 450-452: "Unum de his quattuor rebus eligite. Procul dubio enim aut quotienscumque libuisset, totiens concubuissent; aut frenarent libidinem, quando concubitus necessarius non fuisset; aut tunc ad nutum uoluntatis libido consurgeret, quando esse concubitum necessarium casta prudentia praesensisset; aut nulla ibi omnino existente libidine ut cetera membra quaeque ad opera sua sic ad opus proprium etiam genitalia iussis uolentium sine ulla difficultate seruissent. [...] Ad hoc enim, quod agimus, sufficit nobis, quia nunc talis in hominibus non est, qualem in illius felicitatis loco esse potuisset conceditis. [...] uerum uos non pro religiosa ratione, sed pro animosa contentione nec pro humano pudore, sed pro uestro furore, ne uel ipsa concupiscentia carnis uitata credatur et ex ea trahi originale peccatum, talem prorsus, qualis nunc est, in paradisum conamini disputando reuocare."

such as *Contra Iulianum*²⁰, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum*²¹, and *Ep. 6*²². As rightly noted by Mathijs Lamberigts²³, Augustine accepted both the third and the fourth hypotheses, either the utter absence of concupiscence before the fall or the presence of a different (obedient) concupiscence, but he probably preferred to consider concupiscence as a consequence of the fall and hence absent at the moment of creation²⁴.

Returning to Mercator's first statement now, it becomes clear that he had a profound grasp of Augustine's objections to Julian's position on carnal concupiscence. Mercator perfectly understood where Augustine situated the "error" in Julian's argument, i.e. the assumption of a continuity between the concupiscence originally experienced by Adam and our postlapsarian lustful desires. At the same time, however, Mercator steered away from the complexity of Augustine's position. While Augustine remained open to two possibilities (namely, the presence of a different kind of concupiscence or the absence of any concupiscence), Mercator simply stated that our concupiscence is *vitiata* and is consequently different from that of Adam before the fall. Mercator opted for the third hypothesis of Augustine, thereby reducing the nuances of Augustine's position on carnal concupiscence.

[2.] The second assertion indicated in bold in the text accuses Julian of having made the wrong lexical choices. The Bible, according to Mercator, does not contain the word *libido*, used by Julian, but prefers the word *concupiscentia*. This statement is difficult to interpret and understand for two reasons. First, Julian did

20. AUGUSTINUS, *Contra Iulianum* IV, 5, 35, PL 44, cc. 756-757; IV, 13, 62, PL 44, c. 768; IV, 14, 65, PL 44, cc. 769-770; IV, 16, 69-70, PL 44, cc. 772-773; V, 5, 22, PL 44, c. 797; V, 7, 29, PL 44, cc. 802-803.

21. AUGUSTINUS, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* I, 70, ed. by M. Zelzer, Wien, 1974, CSEL 85/1, pp. 78-80; II, 42, CSEL 85/1, p. 193; II, 122, CSEL 85/1, pp. 252-253; III, 177, CSEL 85/1, pp. 476-478; IV, 19, CSEL 85/2, p. 19; V, 8, CSEL 85/2, p. 176; V, 16, CSEL 85/2, pp. 194-196; V, 20, CSEL 85/2, pp. 200-202; VI, 14, CSEL 85/2, pp. 324-336; VI, 22, CSEL 85/2, pp. 367-373.

22. AUGUSTINUS, *Epist. 6**, 6-7, ed. by J. Divjak, Wien, 1981, CSEL 88, pp. 35-38. See also: M-F. BERROUARD, "Les lettres 6* et 19* de saint Augustin. Leur date et les renseignements qu'elles apportent sur l'évolution de la crise 'pélagienne'", *Revue des études augustiniennes*, 27, 1981, pp. 264-277, esp. pp. 269-275, and Y.-M. DUVAL, "Notes complémentaires. Introduction à la lettre 6*", in *Œuvres de saint Augustin: Lettres 1*-29**, Paris, 1987, BA 46/B, pp. 444-456, esp. pp. 450-451.

23. M. LAMBERIGTS, "Julien d'Éclane et Augustine d'Hippone: deux conceptions d'Adam", *Augustiniana*, 40, 1990, pp. 373-410, esp. p. 389: "Augustin préfère nettement la quatrième hypothèse bien qu'il puisse aussi accepter la troisième."

24. AUGUSTINUS, *Contra Iulianum* IV, 14, 69, PL 44, cc. 772-773: "Remanet igitur, ut aut nulla ibi fuerit carnalis concupiscentia, sed ille fuerit uiuendi modus, ut omnia necessaria congruis membrorum officiis sine ullius motu libidinis implerentur (non enim quia terra non libidine, sed uoluntate motis agriculturalum manibus seminatur, ideo suos pariendo non concipit fetus): aut, ne nimium uideamur offendere homines, qui uoluptatem corporis quomodocumque defendunt, ita ibi credatur carnalium sensuum fuisse libidinem, ut omni modo rationali subdita uoluntati."

not exclusively use the term *libido* to describe sexual appetite, but he also used the terms *concupiscentia* and *uoluptas*²⁵. A clear attestation is found in a passage of his *Ad Florum* quoted by Augustine: “I already argued in defence of concupiscence (*concupiscentia*) or the pleasure of the flesh (*uoluptas carnis*), which is also called sexual desire (*libido*)²⁶.” Julian did not really distinguish the terms *uoluptas*, *concupiscentia* and *libido*, and considered all three as describing a good gift created by God, provided that humanity does not abuse the gift. Julian certainly accepted that bad or sinful applications of *uoluptas*, *concupiscentia* and *libido* unfortunately exist. Second, as stressed by Timo Nisula, Augustine also referred to *libido*, as he “uses the three standard nouns for evil desire [*libido*, *concupiscentia* and *cupiditas*] flexibly, with no static, fixed and detailed differences in the meaning. In many instances, all three of the nouns could be used interchangeably and strict limitations are rare; however, in some instances, Augustine clearly preferred one noun to the others²⁷.” Furthermore, there are instances in which Augustine used *libido* and *concupiscentia* as synonyms, for instance: “now when you mention concupiscence of the flesh (*concupiscentia carnis*) and passion (*libido*), lest you be said to be embarrassed at the name of your darling, you are more afraid to be embarrassed, and you are not afraid to be in error²⁸.” Therefore, Mercator’s lexical rejection of *libido* seems to be unsubstantiated on the basis of Julian’s and Augustine’s lexical choices, whose works Mercator claimed to have read²⁹.

25. M. LAMBERIGTS, “The Philosophical and Theological Background of Julian of Aeclanum’s Concept of Concupiscence”, in *Die christlich-philosophischen Diskurse der Spätantike: Texte, Personen, Institutionen. Akten der Tagung vom 22.-25. Februar 2006 am Zentrum für Antike und Moderne der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg*, ed. by T. Fuhrer, Stuttgart, 2008, pp. 245-260, esp. p. 251 n. 45.

26. AUGUSTINUS, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* III, 167, CSEL 85/1, p. 470 (English translation in *Answer to the Pelagians, III: Unfinished Work in Answer to Julian*, R.J. Teske [ed.], New York, 1999, WSA I/25, p. 361): “Et quamuis iam pro concupiscentia uel uoluptate carnis, quae etiam libido dicitur.”

27. T. NISULA, *Augustine and the Functions of Concupiscence*, Leiden – Boston, 2012, pp. 15-58, quotation at p. 58. For more insight on Augustine’s technical use of the term *concupiscentia (carnis)* and the distinction he specified between *concupiscentia/libido/cupiditas* on the one hand and *uoluptas* on the other, see also: G. BONNER, “Concupiscentia”, in *Augustinus-Lexikon*, ed. by C. Mayer, vol. 1, Basel, 1986-1994, pp. 1113-1122, esp. pp. 1113-1116.

28. AUGUSTINUS, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* IV, 33, CSEL 85/2, pp. 32-33 (English translation in *Answer to the Pelagians, III*, R. J. Teske [ed.], p. 413): “Et nunc quando iam concupiscentiam carnis et libidinem nominas, ne de tuae susceptae nomine erubescere dicaris, plus erubescere times, et errore non times.”

29. MARIUS MERCATOR, *Commonitorium lectori aduersum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani* 4, ACO I, V/1, p. 7: “Utriusque opus cum in nostras manus uenisset.” It is not clear whether Mercator read both the treatise(s) of Augustine and of Julian separately, or if he simply read in Augustine’s treatise(s) also those of Julian, quoted by Augustine himself. See C. KONOPPA, *Die Werke des Marius Mercator*, pp. 112-113, who, though cautiously, leans towards the first option. Similarly S. PRETE, *Mario Mercatore. Polemista antipelagiano*, p. 54.

However, at least at one juncture, in *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* I, 11, 24, Augustine indicated a significant difference between *concupiscentia* and *libido*. Augustine commented on Rom. 7, and within the Pelagian controversy, opinions differed regarding who exactly uttered this passage. Augustine leaned towards considering the converted Apostle Paul as the *ego* of the verse, while Julian believed that Paul was speaking archetypally of the Hebrew people³⁰. In *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum*, Augustine added that Paul did not speak here on behalf of himself alone, but also on behalf of Christians who, much like the apostles, live under the dispensation of grace but are not yet freed from the concupiscence of the flesh³¹. In this same passage, Augustine also vigorously denies Julian's alleged assertion that the apostles had always been polluted by unbridled passion (*inmoderata libido*)³². Therefore, in this paragraph, Augustine seems to have introduced a difference between *concupiscentia* and *libido*³³. This difference is not, however, the distinction that Mercator made. In fact, Augustine is referring to the apostles, while Mercator is considering the state of Adam and Eve before and after the fall. If anything, this passage from *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* can only partially explain Mercator's rejection of *libido*. In *Contra Iulianum*, we can find a second passage that bears some resemblances with Mercator's statement, although it is certainly not completely identical.

30. See especially M. VERSCHOREN, "'I Do the Evil that I Do not Will': Augustine and Julian on Romans 7: 5-25 during the Second Pelagian Controversy (418-430)", *Augustiniana*, 54, 2004, pp. 223-242. On Augustine's exegesis and his evolution, see: M-F. BERROUARD, "L'exégèse augustinienne de Rom., 7, 7-25 entre 396 et 418, avec des remarques sur les deux premières périodes de la crise pélagienne", *Recherches augustinienes*, 16, 1981, pp. 101-196; F. VAN FLETEREN, "Augustine's Evolving Exegesis of Romans 7:22-23 in its Pauline Context", *Augustinian Studies*, 32, 2001, pp. 89-114; R. DODARO, "Ego miser homo. Augustine, the Pelagian Controversy and the Paul of Romans 7:7-25", *Augustinianum*, 44, 2004, pp. 135-144, and T.F. MARTIN, *Rhetoric and Exegesis in Augustine's Interpretation of Romans 7:24-25a*, Lampeter, 2001.

31. AUGUSTINUS, *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* I, 11, 24, CSEL 60, p. 444: "His atque huiusmodi in ista scripturae apostolicae circumstantia diligenter consideratis recte intellegitur apostolus non quidem se solum in sua persona, uerum alios etiam sub gratia constitutos significasse."

32. AUGUSTINUS, *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum* I, 11, 24, CSEL 60, pp. 444-445: "Absit ut dicamus, sicut iste calumniatur, semper inmoderata libidine fuisse pollutos, sed dicimus a consensione prauarum libidinum liberos, de concupiscentia tamen carnis, quam moderando frenabant, tanta humilitate et pietate gemuisse, ut optarent eam non habere potius quam domare."

33. This passage is pointedly commented in T. NISULA, *Augustine and the Functions of Concupiscentia*, Leiden – Boston, 2012, p. 40: "Augustine actually seems to distinguish between the 'raw and immoderate lusts' and a 'basic fleshly desire'. The Apostles surely were free of the first kind of desires, but, according to Augustine, it seems that they were in some way susceptible to *concupiscentia carnis*. It could be concluded that the 'wicked lusts' (*prauae libidines*) have an overt, exclusively sexual colouring, while 'fleshly concupiscence' (*concupiscentia carnis*) represents the basis of all sensual desires."

“Appellas etiam *calorem genitalem*, quia pudet appellare *libidinem*, sive, sicut eam **diuinus sermo** appellare consuevit, **carnis concupiscentiam**.”
(Augustinus, *Contra Iulianum* IV, 2, 8, PL 44, cc. 739-740)

“**Diuinae scripturae** non, ut tu uis, *libidinem* solent sed **carnis concupiscentiam** nominare.”
(Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium lectori adversum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani* 8, ACO I, V/1, p. 10)

In these two passages, Augustine and Mercator both criticized Julian for the terminology he chose to describe sexual appetites: instead of using the biblical concept “concupiscence of the flesh” (*carnis concupiscentia*), Julian opted for another word. On this point, however, Augustine and Mercator diverged: Augustine attacked Julian for using “genital heat” in a positive way, or at least not in a negative way³⁴, while Mercator critiqued Julian for mistakenly using the word *libido*. This comes as a surprise since Augustine stated in the passage under consideration that Julian felt himself embarrassed to use the word *libido*, even though Julian had used this word during the controversy seemingly without any hesitation. Additionally, Mercator’s strong reaction against Julian’s use of the term *libido* could, perhaps, be inspired by Augustine. Augustine’s allegation in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II, 12-14³⁵ stated that Julian only spoke of *libido*, and did not dare to speak of *concupiscentia carnis*, to which Julian simply answered that he never remained silent about the latter³⁶.

We do not have sufficient evidence to absolutely establish the reasons which motivated Mercator’s specific charge against Julian. However, we can observe with certainty that, when considered from an Augustinian point of view, Mercator was wrong to complain about Julian’s preference for the word *libido* instead of *concupiscentia carnis*. The case for this observation is made even more robust by the fact that Mercator started writing his *Commonitorium* after the dust of the debate between Augustine and Julian had settled. The works of Augustine and Julian were available to Mercator at the moment he wrote this anti-Pelagian treatise. Admittedly, he could have been vaguely – but nevertheless incorrectly – inspired by the Augustinian distinction formulated in *Contra Iulianum* IV, 2, 8.

[3.] The third and last statement highlighted in Mercator’s reaction against Julian concerns the role of Christ in healing humans from their diseased concupiscence. According to Mercator, every human being needs the help of Christ as a physician: *iure medico et redintegratore indiget Christo*. In this short passage, Mercator connects the role of Christ as a physician to carnal concupiscence as a disease.

34. Other passages in which Augustine attacks Julian for not using carnal concupiscence, are, for example: AUGUSTINUS, *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II, 7, 17, CSEL 42, p. 269; II, 35, 59, CSEL 42, pp. 316-317.

35. CSEL 42, pp. 264-266. Directed against IULIANUS AECLANENSIS, *Ad Turbantium*, frag. 28, CCL 88, p. 347.

36. AUGUSTINUS, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* IV, 9, CSEL 85/2, pp. 13-14.

Similarly, Augustine, inspired by the Bible (mainly Mt. 9, 12-13; Lk. 5, 31-32; Mk. 2, 17), considered Christ to be the divine physician. He frequently wrote³⁷ and preached³⁸ about Christ as *medicus*. He fully integrated his *medicus*-Christology in his anti-Pelagian doctrine of original sin and carnal concupiscence. He interpreted the biblical statement that Christ came as a physician, and that physicians only come to the sick, as proof that the whole of humanity (infants included) are sick because of original sin and in need of Christ's grace as medicine. Humans are incapable of healing themselves because they are sick. Only Christ as *medicus* can bring about true healing because Christ is not infected with original sin: He is sinless, being the only one born without concupiscence (cf. *infra*). Specifically, when arguing for infant baptism—a position rejected by Julian—Augustine uses the *medicus* imagery against the former bishop of Aeclanum. According to Julian, because the act of procreation as such is good and not sinful, and since both male semen and the desire that leads to intercourse are created by God, children who are born as a result of marital sexual union cannot be born with sin. God is also the creator of infants. Hence, infants are born in a state of innocence, and thus certainly do not need baptism as a means to erase original sin³⁹. Alluding to Mt. 9, 12, Augustine succinctly indicated what is, according to him, the main difference between him and the so-called Pelagians: “Pelagiani et Caelestiani dicunt naturam humanam a bono Deo conditam bonam, sed ita esse in nascentibus paruulis sanam, ut Christi non habeant necessariam in illa aetate medicinam⁴⁰.”

According to Augustine's representation of the Pelagian position, since humanity is created good by God, infants are not sick and do not need a physician. Therefore, Pelagians deny these newborns their redemption, a position which Julian represented *par excellence*⁴¹. *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum* follows the same reasoning: “In homine nato et natura est, quam non negas bonum, de quo laudamus creatorem Deum, et uitium, quod non negas malum, si uel pressus confiteris necessarium paruulis medicum Christum, quoniam *non est necessarius*

37. R. ARBESMANN, “The Concept of ‘Christus medicus’ in Saint Augustine”, *Traditio*, 10, 1954, pp. 1-28. T.F. MARTIN, “Paul the Patient. ‘Christus Medicus’ and the ‘Stimulus Carnis’ (2 Cor. 12, 7): A Consideration of Augustine’s Medicinal Christology”, *Augustinian Studies*, 32/2, 2001, pp. 219-256.

38. P.C.J. EIJKENBOOM, *Het Christus-Medicus-Motief in de preken van Sint Augustinus*, Assen, 1960. A. DUPONT, *Gratia in Augustine’s Sermones ad Populum during the Pelagian Controversy. Do Different Contexts Furnish Different Insights?*, Leiden – Boston, 2013, see esp. chapter III on infant baptism (pp. 203-296), and specifically Augustine’s exegesis of Mt. 9, 12-13 (pp. 258-273).

39. For an in depth overview of the available sources, see again M. LAMBERIGTS, *De polemiek tussen Julianus van Aeclanum en Augustinus van Hippo*, Leuven, 1988.

40. AUGUSTINUS, *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II, 9, CSEL 42, pp. 260-261.

41. AUGUSTINUS, *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II, 56, CSEL 42, pp. 314-315: “Huic ergo paruulorum saluti inimicus est, qui eorum sic adserit innocentiam, ut sauciat et uulneratis neget necessariam medicinam.”

sanis medicus [Mt. 9, 12] eundem de se ipso dixisse negare non potes Christum⁴².” Augustine thus elaborately reproaches Julian for not recognizing Christ as the physician whom the whole of humanity is in need of⁴³, and Mercator succinctly affirms this “Augustinian” belief in Christ as the divine doctor.

Another fragment from *Commonitorium lectori adversum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani* indicates that Mercator fully accepted another Christological ramification of Augustine’s theology of carnal concupiscence, i.e. concerning Christ’s virginal birth. Augustine and Mercator agreed that Christ was created without male semen, born from the Virgin Mary, and untainted by carnal concupiscence⁴⁴. It is exactly this theological position that Mercator takes in his claim “quia non ita natus est ut ceteri omnes homines de uoluptate carnali, sed noua in eo generatio ex immaculata ante partum et post partum virgine sine libidine adfuit⁴⁵.” According to both Augustine and Mercator, the absence of carnal concupiscence was a unique feature found only in Christ. On this matter, Julian of Aelclanum strongly disagreed. For Julian, it was obvious that, since Christ was fully and truly human, he shared in *concupiscentia* with humanity. Furthermore, Christ, as creator, never condemned *concupiscentia* because it is a part of his creation⁴⁶. The reason that Christ was born of a virgin was not to exclude him from original sin (the existence of which Julian denied), nor because Christ did not want to share our *concupiscentia carnis*, but to be a sign to bring the Jews and all the unfaithful to belief⁴⁷. The fact that Christ was without sin was not a result of the unique circumstances of his birth. He was born without sin as all humans are. Rather, it is because Christ chose to not sin that he offers us a supreme ethical example⁴⁸. On the other hand, according to Augustine, Christ was truly human

42. AUGUSTINUS, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* III, 153, CSEL 85/1, p. 457.

43. AUGUSTINUS, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* VI, 20, CSEL 85/2, p. 359: “Cum ergo non saluos uenire saluandos uetatis ad medicum, diabolica in eis exercet pestis potentius principatum.”

44. On this issue, see: J. MCWILLIAM DEWART, “The Christology of the Pelagian Controversy”, in *Studia Patristica*, 17/3, Oxford, 1982, pp. 1221-1244, esp. pp. 1233-1241; E.A. CLARK, “Generation, Degeneration, Regeneration: Original Sin and the Conception of Jesus in the Polemic between Augustine and Julian of Eclanum”, in *Generation and Degeneration: Tropes of Reproduction in Literature and History from Antiquity through Early Modern Europe*, ed. by V. Finucci – K. Brownlee, Durham, 2001, pp. 17-41, esp. pp. 35-40; M. LAMBERIGTS, “Competing Christologies: Julian and Augustine on Jesus Christ”, *Augustinian Studies*, 36, 2005, pp. 159-194, esp. pp. 169-174, and D. KEECH, *The Anti-Pelagian Christology of Augustine of Hippo, 396-430*, Oxford, 2012, pp. 142-189.

45. MARIUS MERCATOR, *Commonitorium lectori adversum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani* 14, ACO I, V/1, p. 22.

46. AUGUSTINUS, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* IV, 59-61, CSEL 85/2, pp. 66-67.

47. AUGUSTINUS, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* I, 141, CSEL 85/1, p. 158.

48. AUGUSTINUS, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* I, 141, CSEL 85/1, p. 156; IV, 87, CSEL 85/2, pp. 88-90.

precisely because he did not possess original sin, just like Adam before the fall, and was consequently unaffected by *concupiscentia carnis*. (Christ was conceived by the Holy Spirit, and born from a virgin, hence without male semen and sexual lust—the double transmitter of original sin, according to Augustine⁴⁹.)

Before concluding this research note, it can also be useful to reflect on two expressions used by Mercator to define carnal concupiscence, next to the three main phrases analysed above. First, Mercator describes concupiscence as a power that can throw man down from the fortress of chastity (*de castitatis arce deiciens*). This image is also used by Julian⁵⁰ and Augustine⁵¹. Second, Mercator defines concupiscence as *immodesta stimulatix, infesta et inportuna inritatrix*. The nouns used by Mercator (*stimulatix* and *inritatrix*), though clearly mirroring the Augustinian idea of carnal concupiscence, do not appear at all in Augustine's corpus⁵². This lexical observation might suggest that, although Mercator was rather conservative in keeping Augustine's concept of concupiscence, some of his lexical choices illustrate a minimal, but not trifling, autonomy and independence.

In conclusion, the detailed analysis undertaken in this research has convincingly proven that the kernel of Mercator's critique of Julian's concept of carnal concupiscence is truly Augustinian. Our analysis has confirmed what Mercator himself has claimed in his own writing, namely that he is modestly repeating (*nostram palearem fistulam*) what his master and father (*tanti patris et magistri tubam*) has already said⁵³. However, only a careful textual analysis made it possible to reach such a conclusion. Furthermore, this study has shown that, if Mercator's core position on carnal concupiscence is loyal to Augustine, several aspects of his reply to Julian of Aeclanum nonetheless betray a partial reduction and a non-negligible misunderstanding of important nuances of Augustine's concept of carnal concupiscence. We may conclude that Mercator was a faithful disciple (but only a disciple) of Augustine on the issue of carnal concupiscence:

49. Augustine argues that Christ's flesh is no *caro peccati*, but *similitudo carnis peccati*, after Rom. 8, 3. Cf. G. PARTOENS – A. DUPONT, "Sed de quo peccato? Augustine's exegesis of Rom. 8:3c in *sermo* 152,9-11", *Vigiliae Christianae*, 66, 2012, pp. 190-212.

50. AUGUSTINUS, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* IV, 53, CSEL 85/2, p. 58.

51. AUGUSTINUS, *De continentia*, CSEL 41, p. 182.

52. A word search through the database of the CAG (*Corpus Augustinianum Gissense*) did not result in any hit for any of these two words.

53. MARIUS MERCATOR, *Commonitorium lectori adversum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani* 4, ACO I, V/1, p. 7. Concerning the passage analysed in this article, the same conclusion is reached also by C. KONOPPA, *Die Werke des Marius Mercator*, p. 129: "Marius geht hier nicht weiter als Augustinus, er fast lediglich zusammen, was dieser bereits gegen Julian gesagt hatte?"

his poor theological training, about which we can only speculate⁵⁴, probably prevented him from grasping all the facets of the complex Augustinian theology of carnal concupiscence. Nonetheless, Mercator remains one of the first readers and interpreters of Augustine after his death, contributing to the spread of the teaching of his master in late antique Christianity, not without a soft touch of innovation or simplification.

As stated at the beginning of this article, our research focusses on a limited aspect of Mercator's indebtedness towards Augustine: one specific aspect (carnal concupiscence) has been investigated as a litmus test. Therefore, the conclusions reached in this research need to be confirmed, mitigated or countered by further research on the whole corpus of Mercator. What we leave to the scholarly community, apart from the specific conclusions on carnal concupiscence, is the persuasion that a classical textual analysis of Mercator's treatises will still offer valuable contributions to a better understanding of his role in the Pelagian controversy and in the reception of Augustine's theology.

Giulio MALAVASI (Porto Mantovano) & Anthony DUPONT (Leuven)

54. However, Augustine, at the time he wrote letter 193 to Mercator (ca. 418), was very positive on Mercator's theological "improvements": "Ego itaque te, fili dilectissime, scribentem mihi uel ad me considerata tua scripta mittentem absit ut neglegenter accipiam uel superba uanitate contemnam, praesertim cum mihi de te gaudium tanto maius sit, quanto magis inopinatum inproisumque prouenit: fateor enim, tantum te profecisse nesciebam" (AUGUSTINUS, *Epist.* 193, 1, 2, CSEL 57, p. 168).

ABSTRACT: Marius Mercator was one of the less well-known theologians in the fifth century who reacted against the Pelagians. As such he wrote against the principal protagonists of the Pelagian movement: Pelagius, Caelestius, and Julian of Aeclanum. Because it was one of the most debated issues of the Pelagian controversy, the Augustinian concept of carnal concupiscence easily serves as a valuable litmus test for the sake of evaluating Marius Mercator's loyalty to and understanding of Augustine's own anti-Pelagian doctrine. A meticulous textual analysis of passages in which Mercator discusses carnal concupiscence shows that while he had a good knowledge of Augustine's doctrine, at the same time, he often simplified and reduced the complexity of Augustine's position.

RÉSUMÉ: Au ^ve siècle, Marius Mercator est l'un des théologiens les moins connus parmi ceux qui ont réagi contre les Pélagiens. Comme tel, il a écrit contre les principaux protagonistes du mouvement pélagien: Pélage, Célestius et Julien d'Éclane. Parce que cela constitue l'une des questions les plus débattues dans la controverse pélagienne, le concept augustinien de concupiscence charnelle peut facilement servir de test décisif afin d'évaluer la loyauté de Marius Mercator à l'égard de la doctrine antipélagienne d'Augustin et sa compréhension de celle-ci. Une analyse textuelle méticuleuse des passages dans lesquels Mercator traite de la concupiscence charnelle montre que, même s'il a une bonne connaissance de la doctrine d'Augustin, parallèlement, il simplifie et atténue souvent la complexité de la position de s. Augustin.

INSTITUT D'ÉTUDES AUGUSTINIENNES COLLECTION DES ÉTUDES AUGUSTINIENNES

Ausone en 2015 : bilan et nouvelles perspectives. Textes réunis et édités par Étienne WOLFF, EAA 204, 52 € (ISBN : 978-2-85121-294-8)

Ce volume *Ausone en 2015 : bilan et nouvelles perspectives* contient les communications prononcées au colloque international qui s'est tenu, sous le même intitulé, à l'Université de Paris Nanterre les 8 et 9 octobre 2015. Elles émanent toutes de spécialistes reconnus du sujet et sont présentées ici selon un ordre thématique.

Si Ausone a longtemps souffert d'une image défavorable, un renversement s'est à juste titre opéré et on reconnaît désormais en lui un auteur majeur du IV^e siècle.

Ces dernières années, une abondance de publications a renouvelé l'approche de son œuvre. Cette situation invitait à dresser un bilan des études ausoniennes tout en ouvrant à des perspectives nouvelles. C'est à quoi a tendu ce colloque, où de nombreux aspects de la vie et de la production d'Ausone ont été abordés.

Cet ouvrage offre donc une synthèse sur Ausone, mais il propose aussi des interprétations, des pistes, des idées nouvelles. À ce double titre, il nourrira la réflexion des spécialistes de l'Antiquité tardive, quel que soit leur domaine.

Chr. Veyrard-Cosme, *La Vita beati Alcuini (IX^e s.). Les inflexions d'un discours de sainteté. Introduction, édition et traduction annotée du texte d'après Reims, BM 1395 (K 784)*, 2017, 374 p., EAMA 54, 52 € (ISBN : 978-2-85121-287-0)

Le clerc anglo-saxon Alcuin d'York (730 ?-804), conseiller de Charlemagne et figure majeure de la Renaissance carolingienne, fut, une vingtaine d'années après sa mort, le héros d'un texte hagiographique, la *Vita beati Alcuini*, qui vit en lui un saint homme. De cette *Vita*, portée par une très riche intertextualité biblique, le présent ouvrage propose, pour la première fois, une édition fondée sur le texte transmis dans son intégralité par le manuscrit Reims, BM 1395 (K 784), ainsi qu'une première traduction, amplement annotée. Texte latin et traduction française sont précédés d'une riche étude textuelle thématique, en cinq parties respectivement intitulées : « Deux manuscrits pour une *Vie* : le texte dans son contexte codicologique » ; « Pour une nouvelle approche de la *Vita Alcuini* » ; « Une *Vie* aux multiples enjeux » ; « La mise en œuvre de la figure sainte » ; « La place de l'hagiographe ». L'ouvrage entend montrer, à tous ceux qu'intéresse l'univers du Haut Moyen Âge, l'importance des enjeux historiques, culturels, littéraires et spirituels de cette *Vita* méconnue d'un homme connu.

Retrouver l'Institut d'études augustiniennes sur le site <http://www.etudes-augustiniennes.paris-sorbonne.fr>

Diffusion exclusive : Brepols Publisher <http://www.brepols.net>

PUBLICATIONS DE L'INSTITUT
D'ÉTUDES AUGUSTINIENNES

COLLECTION DES ÉTUDES AUGUSTINIENNES

Série Antiquité

- 200— *Littérature, politique et religion en Afrique vandale*. Textes réunis et édités par É. Wolff, 2015.
201— « *Studium in libris* ». *Mélanges en l'honneur de Jean-Louis Charlet*. Textes édités par G. Herbert de la Portbarré-Viard et A. Stoehr-Monjou, 2016.
202— **B. Goldlust**, *Corippe, Johannide, livre 4. Introduction, édition critique, traduction et commentaire*, 2017.
204— *Ausone en 2015 : bilan et nouvelles perspectives*. Textes réunis et édités par É. Wolff, 2018.

Série Moyen Âge et Temps Modernes

- 52— **C. Giraud**, *Spiritualité et histoire des textes entre Moyen Âge et époque moderne. Genèse et fortune d'un corpus pseudépigraphique de méditations*, 2016.
53— *Transmission et réception des Pères grecs dans l'Occident, de l'Antiquité tardive à la Renaissance. Entre philologie, herméneutique et théologie*. Actes du colloque international organisé du 26 au 28 novembre 2014 à l'Université de Strasbourg, édités par E. Prinzivalli, F. Vinel et M. Cutino, avec la collaboration de I. Perée, 2016.
54— **Chr. Veyrard-Cosme**, *La Vita beati Alcuini (IX^e s.). Les inflexions d'un discours de sainteté. Introduction, édition et traduction annotée du texte d'après Reims, BM 1395 (K 784)*, 2017.

BIBLIOTHÈQUE AUGUSTINIENNE

- Œuvres de saint Augustin**, vol. 67/A. *Les Commentaires des Psaumes, CXVIII. Sermons 1-14*. Sous la direction de M. Dulaey, avec P. Descotes, L. Jansem (†) et M. Ribreau, 2016, 438 p.
Œuvres de saint Augustin, vol. 20/B. *La grâce de la Nouvelle Alliance*. Texte établi, traduit et commenté par P. Descotes, 2016, 570 p.
Œuvres de saint Augustin, vol. 67/B. *Les Commentaires des Psaumes, CXVIII. Sermons 15-32*. Sous la direction de M. Dulaey, avec P. Descotes, L. Jansem (†) et M. Ribreau, 2017, 382 p.
Œuvres de saint Augustin, vol. 59/A. *Les Commentaires des Psaumes, XXXVII-XLIV*. Sous la direction de M. Dulaey, avec I. Bochet, P. Descotes et P.-M. Hombert, 2017, 736 p.
Œuvres de saint Augustin, vol. 18/A. *Contre Fauste le manichéen, Livres I-XII*. Sous la direction de M. Dulaey, avec I. Bochet, J.-D. Dubois, A. Massie, P. Mattei, M.-Y. Perrin et G. Wurst, 2018, 512 p.

NOUVELLE BIBLIOTHÈQUE AUGUSTINIENNE

- Saint Augustin**, vol. 6, *La vie communautaire*. Traduction annotée des *Sermons* 355-356 par G. Madec, 1996, 63 p.
Saint Augustin, vol. 7, *La première catéchèse*. Introduction et traduction de G. Madec, 2001, 127 p.
Saint Augustin, vol. 8, *Sermons sur la chute de Rome*. Introduction, traduction et notes de J.-C. Fredouille, 2004, 148 p.

PÉRIODIQUES

- Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques* (1955 →) : 2 fasc. par an.
Recherches augustiniennes et patristiques (1958 →) : tome 37, 2013.

ISBN : 978-2-85121-297-9

ISSN : 1768-9260

Abonnement à la revue imprimée + numérique : 115 €

Abonnement à la revue imprimée : 100 €

Fascicules séparés : 65 €