

«Te Apulia genuit» (c. *Iul. imp.* 6.18) Some Notes on the Birthplace of Julian of Eclanum

In his classic study on Julian of Eclanum Albert Bruckner concluded that the place of Julian's birth and early life can only vaguely be defined as «lying somewhere in southern Italy». Any attempt at further specification, he warns, may result in guesswork¹. For more than a century this view remained unchallenged². We would like to put forward a new hypothesis here. It is less «safe» than Bruckner's, but it holds a high degree of probability and may prove more useful for a comprehensive understanding of Julian's life.

I. – WHY NOT ATELLA OR CAPUA ?

Bruckner saw his scepticism justified by contradicting evidence provided by the sources. Augustine of Hippo called Julian a native of Apulia³. Bruckner held it to be widely agreed⁴ that by doing so he did not refer to the then Campanian city of Eclanum⁵, where Julian had been bishop between 416 and

1. BRUCKNER 13-14, note 1 (especially on page 14).

2. Cf., for example, the view expressed by Alexander 441 ; on further literature, cf. LÖSSL 311.

3. AUG., c. *Iul. imp.* 6.18 (PL 45, 1542) : *te Apulia genuit*.

4. See the references in BRUCKNER 13-14, note 1. However, as Bruckner has to admit, there are notable exceptions, especially Noris 179-180 and the Maurists (XIV, 1068 [cf. PL 45, 1035] : *natus est Iulianus in Apulia*, teste Augustino c. *Iul. imp.* 6.18 ; *forsitan Eculani, seu Eclani*). What Bruckner does not mention either is that Tillemont, too, belongs to this group, despite his inclination on page 815 to favour the *atelenensis* possibility (cf. below). On page 817, referring to NORIS 114 and depending apparently on the Maurists, he rather favours Eclanum : «Il naquit dans la Pouille, peutestre dans la ville d'Éclane». Cf. also TILLEMONT 1027-1028, note 80.

5. Despite *lib. colon.* 1 (BLUME 210) listing the *ager Aeclanensis* under *prouincia Apulia* and *lib. colon.* 2 (BLUME 261) listing the *ager Eclanensis* under the *ciuitates Apuliae*. If a link could

418⁶. However, there is much less agreement about what Augustine did mean; for *Apulia* seems to render a rather vague notion⁷. Could it be a hint, Bruckner asks, at a specific place, for example, a town, the name of which can be found in some MSS of Prosper's *Chronicon* for the year 439 (442), where Julian is apparently called an Atellian⁸. Is it possible that in his anti-Pelagian chronicle Prosper deliberately suppressed the name of the site of Julian's episcopal see and inserted that of his home town instead, perhaps in order to stress that by then Julian had long ceased to be bishop of Eclanum? Two details suggest that this is not the case. Neither of them is mentioned by Bruckner. First, especially in satirical writings, *atellani* are sometimes not meant to be inhabitants of Atella, but fabulists⁹. If Prosper, too, used *atele-*

be established between *AUG., c. Iul. imp.* 6.18 and *lib. colon.*, it might help to explain Augustine's remark further. For example, it might then more reasonably be considered an error. On the basis of *lib. colon.* Augustine could have assumed Eclanum to be situated in Apulia. In that case his remark about Julian being born in Apulia might indeed refer to Eclanum. On the reliability, or rather, unreliability, of *lib. colon.* as a source of topographical information in relation to a specified period of time (here the second half of the 4th and the first half of the 5th century), cf. MOMMSEN 146-199, especially 191-192; NISSEN 26; SCHANZ 803. Another notable error is *lib. colon.* 1 (BLUME 209) listing the *ager Beneuentanus* under *prouincia Brittorum*, i. e. the province of Bruttium, while it belonged most certainly, together with its fellow southern Samnite (Hirpinian) city Eclanum, to Campania. These topographical questions can already be found discussed, though rather inconclusively, in TILLEMONT 1027 (note 80).

6. Cf. MAR. MERC. *ep. ad Symbol.* Theodor. (ACO I/V/1.15, page 23, line 23): *ex episcopo oppidi Eclanensis*. On more references cf. GARNIER 289; NORIS 178-180; TILLEMONT 1026-1027 (note 80); BRUCKNER 13, note 1; WERMELINGER 226f. and LÖSSL 310-312.

7. Though until recently scholars have been content to quote the remark without further discussion or comment. Cf. WERMELINGER 226f., note 45; ALEXANDER 441; LAMBERIGTS 5, note 5.

8. PROSP., *epit. chron.* 1336 (MGH AA IX, 477; cf. in the apparatus): *Iulianus atelenensis*. According to BRUCKNER 13-14, note 1, the suggestion was made by TILLEMONT 815 following the appendix to F. Ballerini's edition of Noris' works (IV, 880-882), and CHIFFLET 193-196. CHEVALIER 1314 held it to be safe, DAVIDS 469 probable. Probably through the strong influence of MIGNE (PL 51, 598) in the wake of those authorities, Bruckner, too, takes it quite seriously. Thereby he overlooks that already TILLEMONT 1027 (note 80) cast strong doubts upon it and does not seem to have followed Chifflet's tentative explanation. Mommsen's report on the text tradition in MGH AA IX, 362-366 and 375-376 clarifies the matter even further. There seems to be only one late ancient source suggesting *atelenensis*. It is lost. Only two manuscripts depending on it are extant (cf. below note 10). Cf. moreover MOMMSEN's hint (MGH AA IX, 366) at Chifflet preferring ms Bruxell. 5169 (saec. IX), which reads *eclanensis*. Bruckner's account is therefore misleading. There are good reasons to dismiss *atelenensis* (not *Athelanensis*, as in PL 51, 598) entirely and reject in particular Chevalier's and Davids's proposals. TILLEMONT 1027 (note 80), as already mentioned, only reports on Chifflet's assumptions and is sceptical about them on grounds that Atella was always well known as a Campanian town (cf. below, note 46). Augustine could not possibly have mistaken it as Apulian like, especially if relying on *lib. colon.*, Eclanum.

9. Cf., for example, Jerome in *ep.* 147.5 (CSEL 56, 320): *reperitum est facinus, quod nec mimus fingere nec scurra ludere nec atellanus possit effari*.

nensis to signify Julian as a writer not to be taken seriously, it is highly unlikely that the epithet would also coincidentally refer to his historical home town. In any case, it is unlikely that Prosper used the term at all¹⁰. Most probably *atelenensis* is a textual corruption of the well attested *aeclanensis* or *eclanensis*¹¹, which refers to Julian's see and, as argued here, also to his home town. Bruckner's dismissal of the *atelenensis* version on grounds that it is «too modern» appears rather odd and does not take us any further¹². The answer is much simpler. Its plausibility rests on a second detail not mentioned by Bruckner¹³. Atella can be ruled out because it is a Campanian town. It lies half way between Naples and Capua, in the heart of the *ager Campanus*, far from any place Augustine could have mistaken for one lying in *Apulia*.

For Bruckner things began to look far from clear at this point, especially since besides Eclanum and Atella he found that yet another (Campanian) city, Capua, traditionally assumed to host the episcopal see of Julian's father, Memor, was held by some to be Julian's birth place¹⁴. None of these cities was Apulian. Capua and Atella lay right in the middle of the Campanian plain, the *ager Campanus*, frequently transmogrified as *ager Capuanus*¹⁵, which led to even further complications and misunderstandings, Eclanum, however, lay in the Hirpini. This explains Bruckner's decision to abstain from any further attempt to specify what Augustine may have meant by *Apulia* as denoting Julian's birthplace. Left with the choice of either following Augustine literally or (to allow also for the Campanian options drawn from other sources) referring only generally to «southern Italy» as Julian's «fatherland», Bruckner opted for the latter¹⁶. And, as we mentioned already, even very recent studies have tended to follow him and avoid detailed discussions of topographical issues in connection with Julian's birth and early life.

10. The expression is not well attested. The original source, a Reichenau codex dated before 842, is lost, the *atelenensis*-group extant consists of two mss, Parisin. 4860 saec. X (cf. *MGH AA IX*, 363), and the much more recent August. Vind 223 saec. XV (cf. *MGH AA IX*, 365).

11. Cf. *MGH AA IX*, 477. The apparatus lists alone seven major mss.

12. Why, he asks, should the name of Atella have escaped all of Julian's contemporaries with the exception of Prosper (or some of his medieval copists) only to be rediscovered from early modern times by means of textual analysis? Cf. BRUCKNER 13-14, note 1 (especially on page 14): «Gewiss ein ansprechender Gedanke, wenn er nur nicht so modern wäre».

13. Cf. above, note 8, on Bruckner's insufficient use of TILLEMONT 1027 (note 80).

14. Cf. BARONIUS V, 415.443; VOSS 561; SCHOENEMANN 570; BRUCKNER 13-14, note 1.

15. On the sources cf. NISSEN 700.

16. BRUCKNER 13-14, note 1 (on page 14): «Die Klügsten und Vorsichtigsten, mit denen auch ich es darum halten will, haben, überhaupt keine nähere Vermutung aufgestellt, sondern sich damit begnügt, nach dem Zeugnisse Augustins (c. *Iul. imp.* 6.18 [PL 45, 1542]: *non enim te Apulia genuit, ideo Poenos uincendos existimes gente, quos non potes mente*) von seinem Vaterland Apulien, so GARNIER I, 286, CAVE 400 und WALCH 702 oder noch allgemeiner von Süditalien zu reden, so SCHROECKH 37 oder BINDEMANN III, 516; denn auch die oft angeführte Stelle aus Mercator (*lib. subnot.* 4.2 [PL 48, 128f.] = *comm. Iul.* 7 [ACO I/5/1, page 9, line 18-20]) führt uns nicht, über ein allgemeines Resultat hinaus; und zudem könnte Mercator dabei sehr wohl den Sitz seines Bistums im Auge haben».

II. – HOME AREA OR SITE OF EPISCOPAL SEE ?

Yet a more detailed analysis could help to narrow down the possibilities so to reach at a more definite conclusion. As a first step in that direction we shall address the discrepancy that on the one hand the individual cities mentioned so far are all Campanian and on the other hand Augustine calls Julian a native of Apulia. Bruckner did not dig very deep at this point, and not just in his handling of the Augustinian reference. Let us see, for example, how he treats the following statement, a hefty remark by Marius Mercator against Julian¹⁷ :

«te uerissima Amsanctinae scaturiginis conregionalis tuae taeterrimus foetor, te Auerni lacus nocentissimus halitus, te postremo Atabulus prouinciae tuae pestifer flatus inflauit».

«Most truly, the utterly horrible smell arising from lake Amsanctus, *situated in your region*, that most noxious steam from lake Avernus, at last the Atabalus, that pestilent *wind off from your province*, has carried you here».

Bruckner fails to see the significance of this remark. He thinks it is a rather odd and frustratingly vague way of referring to Julian's home area. But a closer look may reveal some interesting details.

The Amsanctus is a little lake in the Hirpini, the region, in which Eclanum is situated¹⁸. Lake Avernus, however, lies near Naples and, more conspicuously, near Cumae. Its noxious vapours of volcanic origin feature prominently in Virgil's *Aeneid*, particularly in the passage on the sinister cave, through which Aeneas is told to have entered the nether regions¹⁹. The Atabalus, finally, is a south-easterly wind, today known as Shirokko. In antiquity it was often associated with Apulia, either blowing there or coming from there, bitterly cold in winter and dry in spring and early summer, with devastating effects on soil and crops²⁰.

Without going into detail Bruckner admits that with these remarks Mercator may indeed have referred to the vicinity of Eclanum. But he quickly goes on to say that even if Mercator referred to Eclanum and its vicinity, he must have meant the site of Julian's see, not his home area. On what grounds does Bruckner make this claim ? First, he thinks he is dealing with a piece of first

17. MAR. MERC., *lib. subnot.* 4.2 (PL 48, 128f.) = *comm. Iul.* 7 (ACO I/5/1, p. 9, l. 18-21), quoted by BRUCKNER 13-14, note 1 (on page 14) ; cf. also above note 16. The translation and the italics are mine. Amsanctus (PL 48, 128f.) is altered to Amsanctus according to ACO I/5/1, page 9, line 18 ; cf. also VERG., *Aen.* 7.565 (ed. MYNORS) ; AUG., *c. Iul. imp.* 1.48 (ed. KALINKA, in : CSEL 85/1, 37f.).

18. Cf. CIL IX, page 91 ; CIC., *diu.* 1.79 ; PLIN., *hist. nat.* 2.208 ; VERG., *Aen.* 7.565.

19. Cf. VERG., *Aen.* 5.813 ; 6.126 and 201 : *inde ubi uenere ad fauces graue olentis Auernae.*

20. Cf. PLIN., *hist. nat.* 17.24.37 (232) ; GELL., *noct. Att.* 2.22 relates the term is derived from Greek ἄτη, damnum, and βάλλειν, mittere ; cf. also HORAT., *sermo* 1.5.77-81 : *incipit ex illo montis Apulia notos / ostentare mihi, quos torret Atabalus et quos / numquam erepsemus, nisi nos uicina Triuici / uilla recepisset, lacrimoso non sine funo, / uidos cum foliis ramos urente camino.*

hand information provided by Mercator. Second, on grounds of *c. Iul. imp.* 6.18 (Julian a native of Apulia), he rules out the possibility that Julian might come from the eastern part of Campania (i. e. Eclanum). Third, he does not take into account that Mercator's passage depends on Augustine's in *c. Iul. imp.* 6.18 and that Augustine's may be, at least partly, erroneous. Ironically, his conjecture leaves him with less of a plausible hypothesis than he could have otherwise got sustained. What he fails to see in particular is that Mercator's passage is a response to a remark made originally by Julian in his anti-Augustinian work *Ad Florum*, merely quoted (not commented on!) by Augustine in *c. Iul. imp.* 1.48. It is Julian who first chose the imagery from Virgil's *Aeneid* for his polemics against Augustine. Addressing Augustine and comparing his teaching with the poisonous fumes arising from lakes Amsanctus and Avernus he writes²¹ :

«hic tu, sacerdos religiosissime rhetorque doctissime, exhalas tristius et horridius aliquid quam uel Amsancti uallis uel puteus Auerni, immo scelestius quam ipsa in his locis idolorum cultura commiserat».

«Here are you, most religious priest and learned rhetorician, exhaling things even more distressing and horrible than, for that matter, the Amsanctus basin or the Avernus cave ; and, yet worse, more blasphemous than the idolatry once practised in those places».

It is Augustine's doctrine of the original sin with its abject implications that Julian is alluding to here, in particular the view that newborn children who die without being baptized, are eternally damned. Interestingly in *c. Iul. imp.* 1.48 Augustine himself abstains from taking up the imagery, preferring to give the impression of being interested in an impartial clarification of a question much too serious and difficult to be treated in the context of a personalized polemical satire using classical images. It is Mercator who picks up the Virgilian imagery and points out that the Amsanctus basin lies in Julian's home area (*conregionalis tuae*) and the Atabulus carries the horrible smell of the heresy over (from beyond) the Hirpini, blowing either in or over from «Julian's province» (*Atabulus prouinciae tuae*). His message is that not Augustine, but Julian has to take the blame of spreading a blasphemous heresy – Pelagianism. Much in contrast to the infinitely less well documented and hence largely hypothetical case of Prosper's Atella, it is quite clear that Mercator's retort is effective only if it is based on historical fact. If Julian had not in fact come from «where the Atabulus blows» or «blows from», it would have been as pointless, as, for that matter, Bruckner's over-critical distinction between Julian's home town and the site of his episcopal see. From the context and the overall tone of the remark it is quite clear : Mercator does refer to Julian's

21. IUL. FLOR., 1, quoted in AUG., *c. Iul. imp.* 1.48 (CSEL 85/1, 37f.). The allusions are to VERG., *Aen.* 7.563-565 : *est locus Italiae medio sub montibus altis, / nobilis et fama multis memoratus in oris, / Amsancti ualles ; 6.201 : olentis Auerni.*

home province, not only to where he happened to be bishop, but to where he actually came from²².

III. – GEOGRAPHIC OR ETHNIC TERMINOLOGY ?

Augustine's remark in *c. Iul. imp.* 6.18 should be put under similar scrutiny. Why did Augustine choose such a general and ambiguous term as Apulia to refer to Julian's home area ? Did he not know how to distinguish between Campania and Apulia ? Surely, he did, at least roughly. He knew, to quote some other examples, that Nola lay in Campania. In his *ep.* 26 he advises his pupil Licentius to go to Campania and meet Paulinus²³. In *Contra Secundinum* he writes that «our three books entitled *De libero arbitrio* can be found at Paulinus', God's noble servant's, place in the Campanian town of Nola²⁴». He knew equally well where to put Apulia. In *De ciuitate dei* 18.16, for example, he points out that *Mons Garganus* lies in Apulia²⁵. All these statements are correct. The last one, however, also reveals a certain problem. Augustine drew his information mostly from works of literature. There is little indication that he consulted maps or studied works of geography. His source for the latter statement is most certainly Virgil's *Aeneid* book 11²⁶. Therefore, rather than having detailed knowledge of the site, he may have just used the phrase he found in his source²⁷. He certainly found his way more easily in Cicero, Virgil and Livy than in the Caudine Forks (*furculae Caudinae*), the defile near Benevent mentioned in *De ciuitate dei* 3.17 as a place of defeat and shame for the Roman army during the Samnite War in 321 or 320 B.C²⁸. The fact that he knew the name of a place from an historical battle does not imply that he

22. Again, this type of argument is supported by what TILLEMONT 1026-1027 says in note 80 about the site of Julian's episcopal see. Julian came from Eclanum and was bishop of Eclanum. There is no reason to complicate the matter any further, as has also become clear from the textual critical evidence discussed above in connection with *Prosp. chron.* Suggestions like the one quoted by DAVIDS 469 (footnote), according to which Julian may have been first bishop of Eclanum prior to transferring to Capua, are not very helpful. As the outcome of Bruckner's inquiry (see in this article at the end of section 2) shows, they tend to end in aporias. Cf. also BRUCKNER 15, note 2.

23. AUG., *ep.* 26.5 (CSEL 34/1, 88) : *uade in Campaniam, disce Paulinum.*

24. AUG., *c. Secundinum* 11 (CSEL 25/2, 923).

25. AUG., *ciu. dei* 18.16 (CChr.SL 48, 607) : *...monte Gargano, qui est in Apulia...* On the ancient use of the term Apulia in this sense cf. already STRABO, *geogr.* books 5 and 6.

26. Cf. for example VERG., *Aen.* 11.243-247.

27. The same applies to statements elsewhere about topographical, historical and ethnological matters, like Lake Avernus, the Samnite Wars, Lucanians, Bruttians, Samnites and Etruscans. Cf. *ciu. dei* 3.17 ; 5.22 ; 18.16 and 23 (CChr.SL 47, 81-85, esp. 83 and 185f. ; 48, 607 and 613-615).

28. AUG., *ciu. dei* 3.17 (CChr.SL 47, 83) ; cf. LIV., *urb. cond.* 9.2ff. ; CIC., *offic.* 3.30.109.

had detailed knowledge of it, or, for that matter, the province in which it lay. He may have been able to locate places vaguely in provinces and regions, yet he may have been lacking geographical precision, particularly in a passing remark as in *c. Iul. imp.* 6.18. When making that remark, he may have had in mind an area like the whole of southern Italy, or, at least, its eastern part, excluding, besides the western parts of Campania, the sole and the heel of the Italian boot, Bruttium (modern Calabria) and ancient Calabria (modern Terra d'Otranto). That would have included Apulia, but also the east of Campania (respectively the western parts of Samnium and the Hirpini). If we also assume that he had recourse to «classified» or specialist sources such as itineraries or works of geography, he could have obtained this kind of information from *lib. colon.* 1 and 2 (Blume 210. 261), or a similar source, which listed Eclanum under *provincia Apuliae* or as *ciuitas Apuliae*. In that case he may have thought Eclanum was Julian's home town²⁹.

However, if, on the basis of certified geographical knowledge, he intended to be geographically precise, if he really meant that Julian was born in Apulia proper (not somewhere in the border region between Apulia and Campania) and if he was right, then all the places mentioned so far, not only Atella and Capua, but also Eclanum and its vicinity, would have to be ruled out. Yet even then «southern Italy» would be a far too general circumscription of what Augustine would have meant, namely the area east of Campania, Samnium, and the Hirpini, north of ancient Calabria, and south and south west of Mount Garganus.

Before we continue, we should consider one more possibility arising from the meaning and context of our source. What, if, for Augustine, *Apulia* had an ethnic rather than a geographic connotation? Like Mercator's remark in *comm. Iul.* 7 the passage in *c. Iul. imp.* 6.18 is a response to one of Julian's verbal attacks. In full, it reads³⁰:

«noli istum Poenum monentem uel admonentem terrena inflatus propagine spernere. 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».

«Do not, inflated as you are with pride in the superiority of your earthly pedigree, reject the Punic who exhorts or cautions you; for you must not believe, being, as you are, of Apulian origin, that the Punics will be defeated by noble descent, they, whom you are not able to defeat by the power of your mind. Flee from punishments rather than from Punics; for from Punic squabblers you won't be able to flee, not as long as you think you can take pleasure in relying upon your own moral strength».

The last remark clearly alludes to Julian's «Pelagianism», his rejection of Augustine's teaching on grace, according to which human beings on grounds of

29. One reason why he did not simply say so is given in the second half of this section. On further information concerning itineraries and geographical knowledge in late antiquity, cf. MILLER; KUBITSCHKEK.

30. AUG., *c. Iul. imp.* 6.18 (PL 45, 1542).

their original and, hence, moral sinfulness cannot sensibly rely upon their own moral strength and are eternally damned unless they rely exclusively on God's help. But who are the Punic squabblers? Augustine reveals their (or rather his) identity further on in the work when he quotes Cyprian of Carthage as the prime witness against Julian³¹. He had done so all along, since the beginning of the controversy in 418, when Julian had first called him a Punic³². The issue had thus initially been forced upon Augustine. But being a professionally trained rhetorician he had no problem with reusing the jibe whenever it suited him, as *c. Iul. imp.* 6.18 shows³³. It almost seems as if Augustine relished exploiting all the puns and double meanings that were given rise to by Julian's use of the ambiguous imagery of «Punic» in his invectives against him. What precisely are these ambiguities? Why could the term «Punic» be used for abuse and praise alike?

Several levels of meaning can be distinguished. *Poenus*, «Punic», refers to the dominant ethnic group in Carthage and its hinterland. However, it also means, in «politically incorrect» parlance³⁴, «cunning» or «crafty», as related e. g. already in Plautus' *Poenulus*³⁵. Obviously the secondary use originates from prejudice. Because Romans held Punics to be cunning or crafty, *poenus* came to assume that meaning in general, especially against the background of the stormy historical relationship between the Roman and the Punic nation. This is why, and the way in which, Julian uses the term against Augustine. Yet Augustine, for his part, finds a way of making use of it to his own advantage. By concentrating on its original, historical meaning he defuses the derogatory power of its secondary use. For example, to begin with, in a Roman context no reference to anything Punic could fail to allude to the historic Punic threat to Rome, in particular in connection with Apulia³⁶. However, as Augustine's remark suggests, the situation is now reversed – at the ecclesiastical level – with African bishops of humble descent defending catholic Roman orthodoxy against aristocratic Apulian bishops turned heretics. Another historic reference

31. On Augustine's call upon Cyprian in the Pelagian controversy in general, cf. DASSMANN.

32. Cf. AUG., *c. Iul.* 3.32 (PL 44, 719): *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.*

33. Cf. the passages quoted already and *c. Iul. imp.* 1.7 (CSEL 85/1): *magna tibi poena est disputator hic Poenus, et longe antequam nasceremini, magna poena haeresis uestrae Poenus praeparatus est Cyprianus.* 2.19; 6.6; 6.18; 6.23 (CSEL 85/1, 174; PL 45, 1511; 1542; 1557).

34. Today the use of such language would be seen as betraying a chauvinist or even a racist trait in Julian's character. PAGELS 98-150, who depicts Julian as openminded, progressive and tolerant, lacks the necessary hermeneutics of suspicion in this case.

35. PLAUT., *Poen.* 112-113: *et is omnis linguas scit, sed dissimulat sciens / se scire: Poenus plane est, quid uerbis opust?* Cf. FORCELLINI 744: *Translate ponitur pro uafro, callido, uersuto. Tales enim Poeni habiti sunt.*

36. During the Second Punic War, especially after the battle of Cannae, Apulia had defected from Rome and supported Hannibal, a move for which she was severely punished after Hannibal's ultimate defeat. Cf. also below note 46.

point is the figure of Cyprian of Carthage. Cyprian had started a dispute with the Roman bishop Stephen in 255 and 256 about the validity of sacraments bestowed by ministers who had denied their faith during persecution. He had opted in favour of rebaptism of Christians who had received sacraments from such ministers. During the Donatist schism, which broke in 311 and continued until Augustine's time and after, the Donatists, who denied the validity of the sacraments of the catholic church on similar grounds, could call upon Cyprian as a witness. In his anti-Donatist works Augustine developed the idea that sacraments worked *ex opere operato*, independent of the worthiness of ministers. He declared that rebaptism and reordination were unnecessary, or, in view of the Donatist case, even unlawful and reprehensible. Yet, despite these differences in their teachings, he, too, championed Cyprian as the great universal church teacher, who was also undoubtedly Punic, i.e. North African. How did he justify this position? *On baptism*, dating from c. 400, provides a telling example³⁷. He simply played down the fact that Cyprian and Stephen had disagreed. Had they not always stayed united in spirit?³⁸ Cyprian was, of course, the greater church teacher, yet not against, but in unity with Rome. He did not part from the truth of catholic unity, as the Donatists claimed, yet he taught a distinctly African theology, which could be used against the Pelagians. It was always primarily by reference to Cyprian that Augustine set out to prove a point by patristic argument from authority³⁹, first against the Donatists, then against Pelagius and the Pelagians, and especially against Julian⁴⁰. In the context of the Donatist controversy nobody would have recognized that as particularly «Punic». Augustine called upon Cyprian as a universal church teacher in unity with Rome, while his adversaries were North Africans like he and Cyprian himself. The leading Pelagians, however, came from outside North Africa, and it was one of them, Julian, who suddenly started to address Augustine, in a derogatory way, as «Punic».

There is also a personal level to that, as Augustine's remark in *c. Iul. imp.* 6.18 might indicate. Julian was an Apulian aristocrat close to senatorial level⁴¹. Augustine almost certainly belonged to a lower social class⁴², which,

37. Cf. especially *bapt.* 3.5f. (CSEL 51, 202).

38. More on that way of argument in *bapt.* cf. in LÖSSL 106, especially note 28.

39. Sometimes even to the expense of the Roman claim to primacy, as *retract.* 1.21.20 (CChr.SL 57, 62-63) on the now lost work *c. ep. Donati* shows. Cf. LÖSSL 50-51 (note 34); 171 (note 129).

40. On that point in extenso cf. LÖSSL 328-332. 342-345, and DASSMANN.

41. MAR. MERC., *lib. subnot.* 4.4 (PL 48, 130f.) (= *comm. Iul.* 7 [ACO I/5/1, page 9, line 27]) calls Julian's mother Juliana a *primaria femina*. In one of the most authoritative manuscript witnesses of PAUL. NOL., *carm.* 25 (CSEL 30, 238, apparatus), Parisin. 8094 (saec. X), described by HARTEL (CSEL 30, xxi), Julian's wife, Titia, is called a *clarissima femina*. Paulinus belonged to the senatorial class (cf. PLRE 1 [1971] 681-683; AUSON., *ep.* 21.56 [GREEN 223]; AMBR., *ep.* 27.3 [CSEL 82/1, 181]), as may have Titia's father, Aemilius, who was at the time bishop of Benevent. Thus the fact that Julian emerges from an high aristocratic background, higher, for example, than Augustine or even Ambrose of Milan (cf. McLynn in his first chapter), seems quite firmly established. Cf. BRUCKNER 15 and 17, who is to be followed in this question, while DAVIDS 470 and the authorities he quotes, including TILLEMONT 814-815,

as it happened, did not hamper him unduly. His training and career as a rhetor and later his authority as a bishop and teacher of the church, were exceptional. And yet, as Julian's attacks suggest when read in the light of Augustine's answer in *c. Iul. imp.* 6.18, it must have been possible to question his character via allusions to his ethnic, cultural or social background. Julian must have had sufficient reasons to believe that by addressing him as «Punic» he would be able to humiliate him and cast doubts over his reputation. In addition, the term «Punic» is linked to a number of reprehensible attributes. Thus Julian calls Augustine a «Punic Manichean»⁴³, an «Aristotle of (or for) Punics», and a «would be philosopher for (or of) Punics»⁴⁴. Again, Julian seems to understand «Punic» in two ways: First, as symptomatic of the spread of Manicheism in «Punic lands» (Augustine having been a Manichean himself); second, as equivalent to Augustine's continued and cunning attachment to Manichean positions, which he tried to pass off as orthodox Christian doctrine. Similarly, «Punic» Aristotle may have simply been a jibe against Augustine's cunning misuse of Aristotelian equivocation. «Punic» *philosophaster* may aim in the same direction, with the added tinge of doubt about Augustine's philosophical competence.

Related to these personal accusations are accusations of bad behaviour during the controversy⁴⁵. Whatever the judgement that we form of Julian's character on the basis of his prejudiced use of the word «Punic», it must be counterbalanced against the fact that it was Augustine who, on doubtful legal premises, had interfered in Italian church affairs and who fought for an

must be rejected. The expressions *primaria* and *clarissima* (cf. *TLL* 3 [1912] 1275; 10/8 [1995] 1235) define social status. They denote nobility. Juliana and Titia were aristocratic women. Moreover, their status demanded that they be properly married. As AUGUSTINE once put it in a similar case, *ciu. dei.* 22.8.388-389 (*CChr.SL* 48, 824-825): *clarissima femina est, nobiliter nata, nobiliter nupta.*

42. His father was a local magistrate. He may have been Punic, but not necessarily in an ethnic sense. It was the culture of Roman North Africa by which Augustine was influenced most deeply. On lively details, cf. BROWN (in his first chapter), and, with a host of new literature, HUSS 551-552 and note 31. Green, and, on the question concerning the distinction of Punic and Berber, Simon, are still noteworthy.

43. Cf. in this context his brief and telling remark on his stay in Carthage not long before the outbreak of the Pelagian controversy, quoted in *AUG., c. Iul. imp.* 5.26 (*PL* 45, 1537f.): *Iulianus: nam cum ante hos annos essemus Carthagini, a quodam mihi Honorato nomine necessario tuo, Manichaeo aequae, sicut epistolae uestrae indicant, ipsum propositum est.* BRUCKNER 21. On the history of religion background of this remark cf. HUSS 552-553; LIEU 151-191; on Julian charging Augustine with Manicheism cf. LÖSSL 313-408 (passim).

44. *AUG., c. Iul. imp.* 3.199 (*CSEL* 85/1, 498), quoted from *IUL. FLOR., 3: Aristoteles Poenorum.* *AUG., c. Iul. imp.* 5.11 (*PL* 45, 1440), quoted from *IUL. FLOR., 5: philosophaster Poenorum.*

45. On the historical details cf. WERMELINGER 219-238; on the «Punic character» of the North African theological tradition in which Augustine's theology can be situated cf. FREND 94-111; HUSS 552-553 (with an update on literature). But Huss thinks Frend exaggerates. On Julian's plea to call a council to decide the controversy and Augustine's contempt for the idea cf. *AUG., c. duas epp. Pel.* 4.34 (*CSEL* 60, 570).

African cause on Italian soil. It was Julian who had lost his see and left his home to live in exile for the rest of his life without even being given the right to appeal. By trying to make Augustine's teaching look like a «Punic treachery» and/or «oddity», which would have better stayed confined to Africa, he sought to neutralize, or at least diminish Augustine's influence abroad.

In comparison, Augustine's understanding of the Punic issue had long stayed confined to ancient history⁴⁶. Significantly, he did not identify with or show even a slight sympathy with it⁴⁷. Looking back in history and analyzing the present situation he did not see himself as Punic, but as Roman. Although in *De ciuitate dei* he fundamentally criticized the Roman state, he never failed to recognize its monumental omnipotence and superiority over local and regional cultures like the Punic one, despite the leading role of Carthage. It was Rome to whom the North Africa of Late Antiquity owed its importance and its connection to the universal causes of the Empire and the Christian church. It is precisely in calling upon Cyprian as a witness against Julian that Augustine stresses that. What makes Cyprian so credible as a Punic in Augustine's eyes is that he is untouched by the historically ambiguous and prejudiced meaning of the word. Cyprian is a perfect Punic in so far as he is a more than perfect Roman. His *Poenitas* is in fact a better *Romanitas*. By calling upon Cyprian against Julian, Augustine turns an alleged vice into a virtue. Julian's derogatory use of the word «Punic» could not possibly have referred to Cyprian, whose authority was universally acknowledged. Interestingly Augustine at this point distinguishes himself from Cyprian and his Punic identity: «'Punic' here does not refer to me», he writes, «but to Cyprian⁴⁸». The term of abuse and discrimination has become one of such honour that Augustine refrains from applying it to himself. He only wants to appear a lowly follower in Cyprian's footsteps, not somebody who tries to appropriate Cyprian's position or denigrate it as Julian obviously does.

Is it possible that in the last quote Augustine also indicates that he himself is not Punic? Possibly, and Julian may even confirm it. He seems to have hesitated before calling Augustine a Punic. On one occasion he describes him

46. In *ciu. dei* 1.24 ; 3.18 (*CChr.SL* 47, 18-29 and 85f.) it is mentioned in connection with M. Atilius Regulus, a hero of the First Punic War in the third century B.C., nicknamed *domitor Poenorum*. As mentioned earlier, Augustine's depiction of Julian as an arrogant Apulian could be seen in as wide a context as this. Augustine certainly knew of the Apulian (and Campanian, notably Atellan) defection from Rome during the Second Punic War. In connection with the battle of Cannae in Apulia that treacherous move had almost led to the total destruction of Rome. In return, Hannibal's loss of Atella and Campania was the beginning of his downfall. The Romans later took revenge, and Apulia and Campania and in particular Atella were treated with such severity that the effects of destruction had not been overcome even in Julian's time. On the historical details cf. HUSS, *Geschichte* 335-404, especially 335f., 341-344, 371, 377f.

47. Such sympathy would not have gone unnoticed in an age which saw an unequalled revival of Punic culture and political institutions in North Africa. Cf. HUSS 551.

48. AUG., *c. Iul.* 3.32 (*PL* 44, 719) : *non ego sed Cyprianus Poenus.*

as behaving «like a Punic orator»⁴⁹. In difference to direct attributes like *Poenus* or *Punicus* terms like *Aristoteles Poenorum* and *philosophaster Poenorum* can be understood in the *genitivus subiectivus* as well as *obiectivus*, Augustine being an «Aristotle for Punic» as well as «of Punic». At a superficial glance such distinctions may appear overly cautious, considering the importance of the ethnic element in the controversy, however, they should be treated seriously.

But in any case, in *c. Iul. imp.* 6.18 Augustine is ready to accept the role of «Punic squabbler». Yet once more he dwells on the paradox implied in the statement. It is he, the supposedly cunning, crafty, or boorish and backward North African, who tries to put straight, exhort, caution and call to order the proud and arrogant Apulian gentleman gone astray⁵⁰. Thus, in this context, *Poenus* and *Apulia* may be used as expressions meant to transcend their direct or colloquial meanings. In particular, *Apulia* may mean more than just a geographical entity. Its geographical meaning may still predominate, but it may have taken on a slight ethnic and cultural touch, which should not escape completely unnoticed when one attempts to locate Julian's place of origin.

IV. – «AECLANUM – CIUITAS APULIAE» (*LIB. COLON.* 2 [BLUME 261])

But now, what geographical entity might Augustine have had in mind when referring to Apulia as Julian's home region? It has been said from the outset that, judging from the meaning of Apulia in late antiquity – leaving aside the problematic account of the *lib. colon.*⁵¹ – and granted that Augustine's understanding of the term was correct and met the geographical standards of his times, it could not have referred to any of the cities mentioned above, or, for that matter, to the landscapes in which those cities were situated: Campania and the Hirpini. On the other hand it would not have comprised the whole of Bruckner's «southern Italy» either. If Augustine's use of the term Apulia was largely correct, it would have referred to, admittedly, a rather large and loosely defined area which excluded large parts of southern Italy. Augustine might have used the term *pars pro toto* for the *prouincia Apuliae et Calabriae*⁵² governed in his time by a *corrector Apuliae et Calabriae*⁵³. Calabria (or Greek Messapia) in this case would have been today's Salento and Terra d'Otranto. Today's Calabria, the southernmost part of Italy reaching out

49. Quote from IUL. FLOR., 1 in AUG., *c. Iul. imp.* 1.48 (CSEL 85/1, 37): *ut Poenus orator.* Italics in the translation are mine.

50. Cf. the condescending tone of *c. Iul. imp.* 6.18 (PL 45, 1742) shortly before the passage quoted above: *o fili Iuliane, noli in tua uirtute confidere.*

51. Cf. above note 5 and in the first paragraph of section 3.

52. Cf. *lib. colon.* 2 (BLUME 261), although this particular reference seems to suggest a distinction between *Apulia* and *Apulia et Calabria*. If it does, it is most certainly wrong.

53. Cf. *not. dign.*, 2.64; on the term *corrector* cf. also BARNWELL 53-70, especially 66 (literature).

towards the Street of Messina and Sicily, was in ancient times called Bruttium or *prouincia Brittiorum*⁵⁴. The area of «Apulia and Calabria» stretched from the lower part of the river Tifernus, today's Biferno, north of *Mons Garganus* in the northwest, the home of the original *Apuli*⁵⁵, an Oscan speaking nation, to Cape Leuca in the extreme south of the Italian heel. The boundary between Apulia and Calabria was from very early on held to be roughly a line drawn across the isthmus of the Messapian peninsula, from the Adriatic sea somewhere in the middle between the cities of Egnatia and Brundisium to the gulf of Tarent⁵⁶. However, this initial boundary of a greater Apulia, as described by Strabo and Mela, seems not to have endured. In Imperial times the area of the Peucetians (*Poediculi*), which, according to the old borderline across the Messapian isthmus, would have been considered to be Apulian, became gradually a part of Calabria⁵⁷. Apulia's western border with today's Basilicata, ancient Lucania, was then marked by the lower part of the river Bradano, reaching the sea in the west of Tarent. North of Lucania lay the Hirpini and Samnium, where Apulia's western border was marked by the eastern foothills of the southern Apennines. Augustine therefore could have meant by Apulia that more restricted area east and south east of the Hirpini and Samnium and north of Calabria, with Calabria reaching far into what is modern Puglia, a rather limited area, especially as compared to Bruckner's «southern Italy». It would have included the ancient cities of Teanum, Sipontum, Luceria, Arpi, Herdonia, Venusia, Canusium and Barium. Yet defined as this area may be, if Augustine did mean it to host Julian's birthplace, we would have to leave it here. For the sources do not name any specific location within this area which could be assumed to be this place.

In contrast, Eclanum and Benevent, 15 Roman miles (*milia*) north-west of Eclanum on the Via Appia⁵⁸, were situated in the area of the Hirpini, sometimes also referred to as southern Samnium, but really an area which had always been treated as independent⁵⁹. In the Augustan reforms of provincial government the Hirpini were put together with Apulia, Calabria and Lucania to the so called *regio secunda*⁶⁰, a fact that might count in favour of the possibility of Augustine having had Eclanum in mind when talking of *Apulia*⁶¹. It

54. Cf. *lib. colon.* 1 (BLUME 209).

55. Cf. STRABO, *geogr.* 6.285 : The «Apulians properly so called». Books 5 and 6 of Strabo's *Geography* are largely devoted to the area. Cf. also above note 25.

56. STRABO, *geogr.* 6.277 ; cf. also MELA, *geogr.* 2.66 : *post Barium et Gnatia ... iam in Calabria Brundisium...*

57. *Lib. colon.* 2 (BLUME 261).

58. Cf. *Itiner. Antonin.* 120 and *Tab. Peutinger.* ; MILLER ; KUBITSCHKEK ; NISSEN 817-821 ; *CIL IX*, 98-120 (on inscriptions found in Eclanum), 620f. (milestones along the roads from the times of Hadrian to Constantine).

59. On the difference between the Hirpini and the rest of Samnium cf. LIV., *urb. cond.* 22.15.

60. Cf. PLIN., *hist. nat.* 3.11.16-12.17.

61. Especially in conjunction with *lib. colon.* 1 and 2 (BLUME 210 and 261).

is possible that he may have vaguely thought of the Hirpinian city Eclanum, being part of the *regio secunda*, as belonging to the province of Apulia and Calabria⁶². But his statement is almost five hundred years later than the Augustan reforms. The system of provincial government in Italy had changed several times since. After Constantine at the latest the Hirpini had not only become part of the *regio prima*, consisting of Latium and Campania, but within that *regio* part of the province of Campania⁶³. As late as the eighth century the Venerable Bede could account for that when referring to Julian as *Iulianus de Campania*⁶⁴. Bede got his information from Prosper of Aquitaine, who in one of his notorious epigrams, designed to promote Augustinianism against Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism, alluded to the alleged «Pelagian» Julian metaphorically as a bull or stallion inflated with pride and hot temper through the consumption of Campanian grass (*Campano gramine corda tumet*)⁶⁵. In his brief exposition on the Song of Songs, Bede calls Julian *Eclanensis episcopus de Campania*⁶⁶. Obviously, for him Eclanum, Julian's see⁶⁷, lay in Campania which was also Julian's home area.

62. The *Myth. Vat.*, a late sixth / early seventh century source, vaguely suggest even Benevent as being situated in Apulia, although they do not explicitly state it. *Myth. Vat.* 2.250 (CChr.SL 91C, 280) : ...partes Apuliae ... in eodem tractu ciuitates plurimas condidit Beneuentum...

63. Cf., contrary to what is said on Eclanum and Benevent, *lib. colon.* 1 (BLUME 229-239).

64. BEDA, *hist. eccl.* 1.10. Plummer's comments in his edition of 1896 on page 21f. and his remark on Bede's dealing with Pelagianism on page lxiif. are still worth reading.

65. PROSPER, *epigr.* (PL 51, 149-151 ; cf. also PL 45, 1857-1858). Not surprisingly, Prosper's verses depend heavily on classical sources. In *Aen.* 6.49 Virgil writes about the Sybils' frenzy : *et rabie fera corda tument*. Statius, imitating Vergil, as so often, writes in *Thebaid* 3.600 about Capaneus : *longam pridem indignantia pacem corda tumens*. VALERIUS FLACCUS in *Arg.* 6.2 relates a similar image when writing about *Mars acri corde tumet*. So strong is the classical influence that it poses problems to the textual critical assessment of Prosper's epigram with one tradition reading *corda tumet* or *corda tument*, following Vergil, the other reading *corde tumet*, following Valerius Flaccus. The Campanian reference, in comparison, is clearer, although there, too, is the possibility that *Campano* represents a misspelling of *campo* like in HORAT., *ars. poet.* 162 : *gaudet equis canibusque et aprici gramine campi* (meaning the *campus Martius*), LUC. *Phars.*, 4.412 : *spoliabat gramine campum miles*, VERG., *Aen.* 3.537 : *equos in gramine uidi tondentes campum*. The motive of the inflated heart can also be found in VIRG., *Aen.* 6.407 (*tumida ex ira tum corda residunt Charontis*) and HORAT., *Sat.* 2.3.313, not to talk about the Bible and, in its footsteps, AUGUSTINE, *ciu. dei* 1.28 (CChr.SL 47, 29) : *cor inflatum*.

66. Many witnesses relate *celanensis* (cf. BRUCKNER 9, note 3), a version resulting from a dyslexic misspelling of *eclanensis*. It is suppressed in HURST's edition of 1983 (CChr.SL 119B, 167).

67. Cf. BRUCKNER 15, note 2 (literature).

CONCLUSION

The circle may thus be drawn to a close. It is certainly smaller in circumference than Bruckner had thought. If all the available evidence is taken together, it can be considered rather likely that Julian was born in Eclanum or in its immediate vicinity, which Augustine could have considered part of Apulia with some justification. And even if, in the unlikely case of Augustine's application of the term Apulia being entirely correct and Julian coming from somewhere in that south-eastern part of Italy east of Eclanum, it would still be a limited and closely defined area and certainly not the whole of Apulia and Calabria, let alone «southern Italy». Of the Campanian cities mentioned, Atella may safely be dismissed on textual grounds, while Benevent may be counted among places belonging to the immediate vicinity of Eclanum ; given that Aemilius and not Julian's father, Memor, was the bishop of Benevent, it, too, may quite safely be dismissed. The only remotely serious contender besides Eclanum is Capua, often seen as the city where Memor was bishop. But as Augustine's correspondence with Paulinus of Nola suggests, Augustine would never have mistaken Capua for a part of Apulia. He may have quite likely made the error with Eclanum. As it can be assumed that Julian was born in the town where his father was bishop and that he would have been ordained deacon in the church in which he would later become bishop, it may be concluded that Eclanum in the Hirpini was Julian's place of origin, the place which Julian, «an Apulian of noble descent», considered his home⁶⁸.

Josef LÖSSL

3/45a Crystal Palace Road

G.B. – LONDON SE22 9EX

ABSTRACT : The fact that Eclanum was Julian's episcopal see is well established. But where was his place of origin ? This article summarizes a number of suggestions made over the centuries and takes a new, comprehensive, look at the evidence. Considering textual as well as historical, geographical and ethnological aspects, it comes to the conclusion that Eclanum is not only the site of Julian's see but also his hometown.

RÉSUMÉ : Qu'Éclane soit le siège de l'évêché de Julien est un fait bien établi. Mais quelle était sa patrie d'origine ? Cet article résume un certain nombre de suggestions faites au cours des derniers siècles et jette un oeil neuf sur les sources. Prenant en considération aussi bien le domaine des textes que ceux de l'histoire, de la géographie ou de l'ethnologie, l'auteur arrive à la conclusion qu'Éclane fut non seulement le siège de l'évêché de Julien mais également son lieu de naissance.

68. Our findings coincide with the tentative assumptions of Lanzoni. Though still listing Memor under Capua (page 202), albeit in brackets, LANZONI decides that it is more likely for him being his son's, Julian's, predecessor in Aeclanum (pages 264-266) ; cf. also Aubert.

REFERENCES

- ALEXANDER J.S., art. «Julian von Aeclanum», in : *TRE* 17 (1988) 441-443.
- AUBERT R., art. «Éclane», in : *DHGE* 14 (1960) 1406-1407.
- BARNWELL P.S., *Emperor, Prefects and Kings*, London 1992.
- BARONIUS C., *Annales Ecclesiastici* I-XIX, Lucae (1588ff.) 1738-1746.
- BINDEMANN C., *Der Heilige Augustin* I-III, Leipzig 1844-1869.
- BLUME F., LACHMANN, K., RUDORFF, A., *Die Schriften der römischen Feldmesser* I, Berlin 1848, 209-262.
- BROWN P., *Augustine of Hippo*, London 1967.
- BRUCKNER A., *Julian von Eclanum* (= *TU* 15/3), Leipzig 1897.
- CHEVALIER C.U.J., *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge*, Paris 1827-1836.
- CHIFFLET P.-F., *Paulinus illustratus*, Divione 1662.
- CAVE G., *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum historia litteraria* I, Basel 1741.
- DASSMANN E., «“Tam Ambrosius quam Cyprianus” (c. *Iul. imp.* 4.112). Augustins Helfer im pelagianischen Streit», in : FS W. SCHNEEMELCHER, Stuttgart e.a. 1989, 259-268.
- DAVIDS T.W., art. «Julian of Eclana», in : *DCB* 3 (1882) 469-472.
- FORCELLINI A., *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis* III, Padua 1940.
- FREND W.H.C., *The Donatist Church*, Oxford 1952.
- GARNIER J., *Dissertationes septem, quibus integra continetur historia Pelagiana*, Paris, 1673, repr. in : *PL* 48, pp. 233, resp. 255-698.
- GREEN W.M., «Augustine's Use of Punic», in : *PSPUC* 11 (1951) 179-190.
- HUSS W., *Geschichte der Karthager* (= *HAW* III/8), München 1985.
- KUBITSCHKE W., art. «Karten», in : *PRE* 10 (1919) 2022-2149.
- LAMBERIGTS M., «Julian of Aeclanum. A Plea for a Good Creator», in : *AugL* 38 (1988) 5-24.
- LANZONI F., *Le Diocesi d'Italia dalle origine al principio del secolo VII (an. 604) I-II* (= *ST* 35), (Faenza 1927) repr. Rome 1963.
- LIEU S.N.C., *Manicheism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*, Tübingen 1992.
- LÖSSL J., *Intellectus gratiae* (= *SupplVigChr* 38), Leiden 1997.
- McLYNN N., *Ambrose of Milan*, Berkeley / Cal. 1994.
- MILLER K., *Die Peutingersche Tafel* (1916), repr. 1962.
- , *Itineraria Romana*, Stuttgart 1916.
- MOMMSEN Th., *Gesammelte Schriften* V, Berlin 1908.
- NISSEN H., *Italische Landeskunde* II/2, Leipzig 1902.
- NORIS H., *Historia Pelagiana* (Patavii 1673), *Opera omnia* I, Verona 1729.

PAGELS E., *Adam, Eve and the Serpent*, London - New York 1988.

PURCELL N., art. «geography», in : *OCD* ³1996, 632-633.

—, art. «maps», in : *OCD* ³1996, 920.

SCHANZ M., HOSIUS C., KRÜGER G., *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian* (= HAW VIII) II, München ³1907-1920.

SCHOENEMANN C.T.G., *Bibliotheca historico-litteraria Patrum Latinorum* II, Leipzig 1794.

SCHROECKH J., *Christliche Kirchengeschichte* XV, Leipzig 1790.

SIMON M., «Punique ou Berbère ?» In : *AIPh* 13 (1955) 613-629.

TILLEMONT S. LE NAIN DE, *Mémoires pour servir l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles* XIII, Paris 1702.

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Leipzig 1901ff.

VIGNIER J., *Supplementum ad Augustini opera*, Paris 1657.

VOSS J.G., *De controversiis quas Pelagius eiusque reliquiae moverunt, Opera omnia* VI, Amsterdam 1701.

WALCH Ch.W.F., *Entwurf einer vollständigen Geschichte der Ketzereien* IV, Leipzig 1768.

WERMELINGER O., *Rom und Pelagius*, Stuttgart 1975.