

Who was Arnobius the Younger? Dissimulation, Deception and Disguise by a Fifth-Century Opponent of Augustine

by N. W. JAMES
St Albans

E-mail: stalbans2015@gmail.com

Twentieth-century scholars believed that Arnobius the Younger was an African monk living in Rome. This is untenable. There is now considerable doubt over the authorship of several works ascribed to him by Germain Morin: the Expositiunculae has been proved to date from the early medieval period, but the author of the anti-predestinarian Commentarii in Psalmos, one 'Arnobius', is also responsible for writing the mid fifth-century Praedestinatus, an attack on Augustine's predestinarian theology and its champion, Prosper of Aquitaine. The content of these works and related evidence point to Julian of Eclanum as the true author.

Much attention has been given over the last half century to the war of attrition waged against Augustine's distinctive doctrines of original sin and predestination by Julian of Eclanum, notably in studies by Peter Brown and Josef Lössl.¹ That controversy can be seen at

CCSL = Corpus Christianorum Series Latina; CSEL = Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum; PL = *Patrologia Latina*

This article is a revised version of a study presented to Henry Mayr-Harting, Emeritus Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, on the occasion of his eightieth birthday.

¹ Important and insightful studies of this subject are provided by P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: new edition with an epilogue*, London 2000, 383–99, and *Religion and society in the age of St Augustine*, London 1972, 183–226, and J. Lössl, 'Julian von Aclanum: Studien zu seinem Leben, seinen Werk, seinen Lehre und ihrer Überlieferung' (Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* lx, 2001). M. Lamberigts has also ranged widely over Julian's career in contributions listed comprehensively on the Catholic University of Leuven's website at <<https://www.kuleuven.be/wieiswie/en/person/00018631>>, accessed 6 July 2017. O. Wermelinger analyses the development of the conflict but does not

its deepest level as a struggle between an older and a newer understanding of man's place in the Christian scheme of salvation in which Augustine challenged an earlier, more conservative, view of the freedom of the human will and man's ability to respond to God's grace. It is not surprising therefore, that the oscillation of Pope Zosimus, first overturning the condemnation of Pelagius and then endorsing it, led to Julian's rebellion, backed by eighteen other Italian bishops. They refused to accept what they saw as a coup by the African Churches supported by the imperial court. Nor is it surprising that even those who accepted Rome's ruling continued to show sympathy for those conservative Italian Christians who contested Augustine's darker view of man. Among such sympathisers were Paulinus of Nola² and others who spoke up for the returning exiles of Julian's party in the Rome of Leo I,³ against whom the author of the *Epistola ad Demetriadem* wrote during the same pontificate.⁴

The continuing attempt to limit the influence of Augustine's teachings on these issues after his death in 430 by opponents from within Italy has attracted less attention.⁵ Instead, research has focussed on the Gallic monastic opponents of predestination, led initially by Cassian, and their anti-predestinarian but unimpeachably orthodox critique of extreme Augustinian teaching in this field which the popes of the fifth century from Celestine onwards resolutely refused to condemn. Only in the sixth century did Caesarius of Arles, with papal backing, overrule the alternative

explore the final stages of the struggle after the death of Celestine I: *Rom und Pelagius: die theologische Position der römischen Bischöfe im pelagianischen Streit in den Jahren 411–432*, Stuttgart 1975.

² For Paulinus' deathbed reconciliation of members of Julian's party see Uranius, *De obitu sancti Paulini*, PL xlv.1041–2.

³ Photius, *Bibliotheca* 1.54, ed. R. Henry, Paris 1959, 44.

⁴ *Epistula ad Demetriadem de vera humilitate*, ed. M. K. C. Krabbe, Washington, DC 1965. Recent scholarship has generally failed to make the connection between the attack on *superbia* and *elatio* in this letter of spiritual advice to Demetrias and the danger from returning Italian exiles whom Prosper considered to be Pelagians. *Elatio* was linked to *superbia*, the characteristic sin with which the Pelagians were supposedly tarred: *Epistula*, cap. 10, pp. 168–74. This is in spite of the clear identification of the letter of spiritual advice as a counterblast to Pelagian tenets by P. Ballerini and H. Ballerini, *Sancti Leoni magni romani pontificis opera omnia*, Paris 1865, PL lv.425–6. An exception is R. Villegas Marín, 'En polémica con Julián de Eclanum: por una nueva lectura del *Syllabus de gratia* de Próspero de Aquitania', *Augustinianum* xlii (2003), 81–124, esp. pp. 90, 100. The text of the *Epistula* needs to be read against a situation in which some were speaking up for Pelagian tenets in the Rome of Leo I (Photius, *Bibliotheca* 1.54) whose correspondence with Septimus of Altinum about the reception of the exiled followers of Julian provides the wider context during the early 440s. Photius identifies Prosper as a key figure in countering the threat.

⁵ This is noted by F. X. Gumerlock, 'Arnobius the Younger against the "predestined one": was Prosper of Aquitaine the predestinarian opponent of Arnobius the Younger?', *Augustinian Studies* xlv (2013), 249–63.

understanding of grace and free will which the monks of southern Gaul held in opposition to that of Augustine.⁶

The anti-predestinarian opposition kept up by Julian's party and the mysterious figure known as Arnobius the Younger, all apparently operating in Italy after Julian's abortive attempt at restoration to his see and reconciliation with the Roman Church in 439, has often been neglected. Part of the reason for the lack of progress lies in the disagreements over which works can be attributed to these figures. There is now a body of material which can be assigned to Julian of Eclanum's authorship with some certainty.⁷ But Dom Germain Morin constructed a whole *corpus* of material which he attributed to Arnobius, the named author of the *Commentarii in Psalmos*. Morin believed that it included the *Praedestinatus*, *Liber ad Gregoriam*, *Conflictus Arnobii Catholici cum Serapione* and *Expositiunculae in Evangelium*.⁸ The case was based essentially on grounds of style and linguistic analysis, out of which he constructed a biography of a supposed single author. Arnobius was portrayed as an exiled African monk living in the Rome of Leo I.⁹ The *Corpus Christianorum* has published these works under his name, but the matter remains far from settled.¹⁰ One work was certainly written by someone else. Lukas Dorfbauer has recently demolished the case that the compiler of the *Expositiunculae* is identifiable with the writer of the *Commentarii* by demonstrating that the former work cannot date from much before the seventh century.¹¹ More radically, he has also questioned whether any of the other works that Morin assigned to the Arnobius mentioned in the *Commentarii* emanate from the same pen.¹²

While there is undoubtedly scope for debate around the *Conflictus* and the *Liber ad Gregoriam*,¹³ Dorfbauer is unjustifiably sceptical about the

⁶ See W. E. Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles: the making of a community in late antique Gaul*, Cambridge 1994, and R. W. Mathisen, "'For specialists only": the reception of Augustine and his theology in fifth-century Gaul', *Collectanea Augustiniana* ii (1993), 29–41.

⁷ *Expositio libri Iob: tractatus prophetarum Osee, Joel at Amos: operum deperditorum fragmenta (Iulianus Aeclanensis)* and *Expositio in Psalmos Iulianus Aeclanensis interprete (Theodorus Mopsuestenus)*, ed. L. de Coninck, CCSL lxxxviii, lxxxviiiA, Turnhout 1977.

⁸ *Commentarii in Psalmos*, ed. K.-D. Daur, CCSL xxv, Turnhout 1990; *Conflictus, Liber ad Gregoriam* and *Expositiunculae in Evangelium*, ed. K.-D. Daur in *Arnobii Iunioris opera minora*, CCSL xxvA, Turnhout 1992; *Praedestinatus in Arnobii Iunioris Praedestinatus qui dicitur*, ed. F. Gori, CCSL xxvB, Turnhout 2000.

⁹ G. Morin, 'Arnoobe le Jeune', *Études, textes, découvertes*, i, Paris 1913, 309–439, and 'L'Origine africaine d'Arnoobe le Jeune', *Revue des sciences religieuses* xvi (1936), 177–84.

¹⁰ See, for example, the doubts expressed in K. Cooper, *The fall of the Roman household*, Cambridge 2007, 220.

¹¹ L. J. Dorfbauer, 'Neues zu den Expositiunculae in Evangelium Iohannis evangelistae Matthaei et Lucae (CPL 240) und ihrem vermeintlichen Autor "Arnobius Iunior"', *Revue bénédictine* cxxiv (2014), 65–102, 261–97. ¹² *Ibid.* 261–97, esp. pp. 265ff.

¹³ It is notable however, that the *Conflictus Arnobii Catholici cum Serapione*, which seeks to position the author as a champion of Catholic orthodoxy against Eutyches in the era of the Council of Chalcedon (451), uses the same method of argumentation as the

Praedestinatus. In particular, he fails to consider the fact that, aside from echoes of style and language, Francis Gumerlock has argued that the *Commentarii* and the *Praedestinatus* mount a sustained attack on an individual named as the ‘predestined one’, and that this individual is none other than the leading champion of Augustine’s thorough-going predestinarian views, Prosper of Aquitaine himself. Gumerlock has pinpointed Prosper as the target of attack in the *Praedestinatus* on the basis of distinctive characteristics exhibited by the Aquitanian theologian.¹⁴ Prosper, in turn, replies to the specific attacks on predestination in the *Commentarii*, and the accusations against him of heresy, in his *Expositio psalorum*.¹⁵ Crucially, the writer of both the *Commentarii* and *Praedestinatus* portrays himself in each of these works as under attack from a single adversary who accuses him of holding Pelagian tenets.¹⁶ These unorthodox doctrines he angrily proceeds to anathematise, namely that man can be without sin, if he wants to be, even without God’s assistance, and that death did not come through Adam and life through Christ.¹⁷ It is stretching credibility to suggest that the highly personalised terms of this debate, involving an insulting reference to a ‘predestined one’ which is not found anywhere else, and featuring exchanges between individual leaders from the pro and anti-predestinarian camps respectively,¹⁸ addressing each other in the second person singular, can have involved two separate authors of the *Commentarii* and *Praedestinatus* ranged against Prosper. The *Commentarii* itself refers to another work by the same author, an *alienum opus*, and to an *aliud propositum*, and has clear links with the *Praedestinatus*, as the critical apparatus to the editions of Daur and Gori demonstrate.¹⁹ The framework and characteristics of the debate are the same in both texts. The two works are marked by reference to heated exchanges which were absent from the more measured controversy between Prosper and the monks of southern Gaul. Furthermore, the author of the *Praedestinatus* refers to the fact that only two or three little men with blind hearts follow the extreme formulation of the doctrine of predestination, which appears to be a reference to Prosper, his associate

Praedestinatus. For the construction of Serapion’s dialogue to provide material solely for refutation, as in *Praedestinatus* II, see D. Lambert, ‘Augustine and the Predestinatus: heresy, authority and reception’, *Millennium yearbook on the culture and history of the First Millennium CE*, v (2008), 149–62, esp. pp. 155.

¹⁴ Gumerlock, ‘Arnobius the Younger’, 249–63.

¹⁵ *Expositio psalorum a centesimo usque ad centesimum quinquagesimum*, ed. P. Callens and M. Gastaldo, CCSL lxxviiiA. 1–211, Turnhout 1972.

¹⁶ Gumerlock, ‘Arnobius the Younger’, 252, 254.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 252–3.

¹⁸ As established *ibid.* 261.

¹⁹ *Commentarii in Psalmos*, CCSL xxv.137 (91), line 27 ‘moras alieni opera’; 210 (126), line 8 ‘sed alio proposito res agitur’.

Hilary and possibly the Rufinus who wrote to Augustine.²⁰ While works should not be brought unnecessarily under the umbrella of individual authors without good cause, neither should they be separated unjustifiably when there are such strong common bonds.

Francis Gumerlock makes a very convincing case that the profile of Arnobius' opponent in these two works fits Prosper's own. The unnamed adversary believes that predestination is an essential element of the catholic faith, he is characterised as trying to project an irenic attitude, he displays a propensity to argue by reference to ecclesiastical authority rather than relying solely on theological arguments and he makes a distinction between general and special grace.²¹ That distinction was Prosper's particular contribution to the debate over grace and free will.²² But the identification of this opponent raises another question: who was Arnobius himself? Until recently, scholars have tended to accept the contention of Morin, who first sought to chart the extent of Arnobius' literary *corpus*, that the figure in question was an exiled African monk who had fled from the Vandal invasion and subsequently lived in Rome from the 430s until the era of the Council of Ephesus in 451. The older hypothesis of Hans von Schubert, suggesting that part at least of the anonymous work *Praedestinatus* should be ascribed to Julian, has essentially been abandoned,²³ although Michael McHugh noted that the *Praedestinatus* might still have emanated from Julian's circle.²⁴ Gumerlock's work in fact provides important new clues to the figure currently labelled Arnobius the Younger, defined here as the author of the *Commentarii* and *Praedestinatus*, and that a closer reading of these two works and an understanding of his relationship with Prosper offer a good chance of establishing his identity.

In the first place, it can be shown that Morin's hypothesis of an African origin for Arnobius is built on shaky foundations. Indeed, Morin initially believed that the author of these works was a Gallic or Illyrian figure.²⁵ Later he built an elaborate case, depending entirely on internal evidence from these attributed texts, that Arnobius was an African monk who later

²⁰ Gumerlock cites Prosper and Hilary: 'Arnobius the Younger', 254. n. 21. Rufinus is the only other named supporter of the doctrine whom we know of, although he is not heard of after Augustine's death in 430.

²¹ *Ibid.* 257 (predestination essential to the faith and irenic attitude), 258 (use of authority rather than theological argument), 259 (general and special grace).

²² On Prosper's development of the concept of special grace see P. de Letter, *St Prosper of Aquitaine: the call of all the nations*, Westminster, MD–London 1952, 15–19.

²³ H. von Schubert, *Der sogenannte Praedestinatus: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pelagianismus*, Leipzig 1903, 95–114.

²⁴ M. P. McHugh, 'Arnobius the Younger', in A. D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Augustine through the ages: an encyclopedia*, Grand Rapids–Cambridge 1999, 62–3.

²⁵ Morin, 'L'Origine africaine', 177–84. He retracts his earlier view (1902) that Arnobius was of Gallic or Illyrian origin.

lived in Rome based on the fact that Arnobius is a name not found outside Africa; that the individuals to whom the *Commentarii in Psalmos* is dedicated, Laurentius and Rusticus, are two bishops from Mauretania Caesariensis who appeared at African councils during the first third of the fifth century; that he refers to himself as a *nonnus* or aged monk and to other brethren; and that he shows a knowledge of the African Bible and liturgy, but also of the liturgy of the Roman Church and the *passiones* of fifth-century Roman and neighbouring saints.²⁶

Lukas Dorfbauer has already shown that Morin's view of Arnobius as the author of contemporary *passiones* is no longer sustainable and has questioned the tenability of his other biographical suppositions.²⁷ More fundamentally, Morin assumes that the supposedly personal information in these works is accurate and not fictional. But even if the other doubtful works which he attributed to Arnobius are accepted as authentic, and interpreted literally, the identification of the writer as an African monk is flawed. In the *Conflictus*, the author adopts the *persona* of a defender of the Roman (apostolic) see and its Christological teaching during the era of the Council of Chalcedon (451) in the course of public debates against an Egyptian opponent, Serapion, who championed Alexandrian theology against the doctrinal position adopted at the council, itself based on Leo I's Tome. But no such debates, nor the appointment of a champion of papal doctrine, could have taken place in Rome itself without express papal sanction, and any policy of allowing open and free discussion of condemned teachings before nominated judges does not tally with Leo's vigorous attempt to counter and suppress the 'Eutychian' views put forward in his city by Egyptian merchants, as is revealed by a sermon delivered in their quarter.²⁸ The debate is a contrived and imaginary set-piece aimed at the intellectual discomfiture of Rome's theological opponents. As such it can provide no reliable biographical information about the author or his precise place of residence. The *Liber ad Gregoriam*, for its part, privileges marriage in a way that no fifth-century ascetic in the post-Augustinian era could easily have done. By then, the nuptial union between Christians had come to be considered as no more than a second best way of life. The work is a pronounced vindication of the need for the wife's endurance within the married life of Christians and the evils which may result if the addressee seeks to avoid conjugal relations with her husband. It hardly represents a contemporary monastic, as opposed to a pastoral, perspective. Morin's picture of Arnobius, built from these self-contradictory materials, begins to implode.

²⁶ Idem, 'Études', and 'L'Origine africaine'.

²⁷ Dorfbauer, 'Neues zu den *Expositiunculae*', 264–5.

²⁸ *Conflictus Arnobii catholici cum Serapione* 1.1 and 1.18, lines 1191–2, CCSL xxvA. 43, 86; Leo, Tractatus 96, in *Sancti Leonis magni tractatus septem et nonaginta*, ed. A. Chavasse, CCSL, cxxxviiiA, Turnhout 1973, 593–5.

In addition to such inconsistencies, there is absolutely no trace of a historical figure named Arnobius in any of the literature or biographical works of the fifth century; in particular he does not appear in Gennadius' *De viris illustribus*. Nor is there any note of his works in the later review by Photius of the contents of his library. This should put us on guard. The editors of the *Prosopographie chrétienne* have already cast doubt on the African origins of Bishops Rusticus and Laurentius,²⁹ but it is no more certain that they were Italian bishops as opposed to fictional figures. If we are to pinpoint the identity of Arnobius, the writer of the two core works which seem to come from his pen, we need to attend to the circumstances of his clash with Prosper of Aquitaine, which Gumerlock has ably explored, and to determine when this clash might have taken place.

In the *Commentarii in Psalmos* and *Praedestinatus*, the author crosses swords with Prosper of Aquitaine, the chief champion of Augustine's most extreme predestinarian views after 430, until Prosper moderated his position at the end of his life.³⁰ There seems to have been some sort of personal duel between them in which the so-called Arnobius appears as a leader and spokesman for an anti-predestinarian party, disputing the validity of Augustine's views through exegesis of the Psalms and key Pauline texts. Chief among these was Romans viii.32, which emphasised that Christ died to save all men.³¹ Arnobius appears in the context of a formal debate between pro- and anti-predestinarian parties. In this debate, Prosper was challenged over his interpretation of St Paul's teaching that 'Those whom he predestined, those he called.' The Aquitanian theologian argued that the proposition referred only to God's elect, whereas his opponent pointed out that a subsequent verse made it clear that Christ was given up for all, not just those predestined for salvation. The writer accuses his predestinarian opponent, namely Prosper, of closing the book (presumably his Bible or *catena* of biblical texts) and shouting that 'God does not call all to his grace; he does not call all', thereby stunning and troubling his opponents by going beyond what any of the predestinarian 'heretics' had ever said before.³²

Gumerlock suggests that the altercation happened in 431. He places the conference at the point when Prosper appeared in Rome before Celestine I to seek papal endorsement of Augustine's predestinarian teaching against

²⁹ C. Pietri and L. Pietri, *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, II/2: *Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne* (313–604), 1237, 1952, entries for Laurentius 9bis and Rusticus; A. Mandouze, *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire: prosopographie de l'Afrique chrétienne*, 628, 630 (Laurentius I and Laurentius IV), 1013, 1016 (Rusticus 5, 13).

³⁰ On Prosper's later change in attitude see de Letter, *St Prosper*, introduction at pp. 3–20, esp. pp. 9–19.

³¹ *Arnobii Iunioris Praedestinatus qui dicitur* 3, 8, CCSL, xxvB. 76–7.

³² *Praedestinatus* III.8, pp. 76–7. Arnobius' arguments are outlined in Gumerlock: 'Arnobius the Younger', 252–4, 261–2.

the criticisms circulating within monastic circles in Marseilles.³³ But this does not seem to be a likely scenario. The first-hand account of the episode given in Celestine's subsequent letter to the Gallic bishops, *Apostolici verba*, praising Augustine as a pillar of orthodoxy, but refusing to endorse his more advanced views, omits any mention of a debate between different groups in Rome. It simply refers to the presence of Prosper and his ally Hilary in bringing an appeal against the criticism of Augustine by Cassian and the monks of southern Gaul.³⁴ Arnobius' exchanges with his opponent do not fit easily into this controversy. Prosper had not articulated his doctrine of special grace in any of his works from the early 430s against Cassian's followers. It is alluded to briefly in the *Praetertorium*, generally dated to the late 430s or early 440s, and perhaps directed at Julian and his followers in 439 if a recent study is correct.³⁵ The doctrine is fully worked out only in his *De vocatione* which dates from the pontificate of Leo I.³⁶

The *Praedestinatus* is securely placed by Gori between 432 and 449: after the death of Celestine but before the Eutychian controversy.³⁷ Within this window there is no direct surviving evidence of a conference anywhere at which the issues of predestination and special grace might have been discussed. The pursuit of this line of enquiry leads to a dead end. The indication of a personal duel between Prosper and an anti-predestinarian opponent is more promising. Here, the great Louis Duchesne, who a century ago pointed to the likelihood that the *Praedestinatus* was connected in some way with the last desperate initiative by Julian of Eclanum to seek reconciliation with Rome and restoration to his see in 439, offers a way forward.³⁸ Prosper's *Chronicle* entry for that year includes a bitter entry about Julian, lambasting him for his bragging and deceit as part of this attempt: 'iactantissimus Pelagiani erroris adsertor' and 'multimoda arte fallendi' are the phrases used of him.³⁹ Prosper broke with his usual

³³ Gumerlock, 'Arnobius the Younger', 262.

³⁴ Celestine, *ep.* xxi, *PL* 1.528–30.

³⁵ R. Villegas Marín, 'En polémica con Julián', *Augustinianum* xliii (2003), 81–124.

³⁶ See the discussion by R. J. Teske and D. Weber in *De vocatione omnium gentium*, CSEL xcvi. 9–44, Vienna 2009, and A. Hwang, 'Prosper of Aquitaine and the fall of Rome', *Studia Patristica*, lxi, Leuven 2013, 277–81. Hwang sees the *De vocatione* as written in response to the sacking of Rome by the Vandals in 455. On the concept of special grace as Prosper's distinctive contribution see Gumerlock, 'Arnobius the Younger', 259–60.

³⁷ *Praedestinatus*, CCSL, xxvB, prolegomena, p. xiii.

³⁸ L. Duchesne, *The early history of the Christian Church*, London 1924, iii. 199. B. J. Kidd also suggested that the *Praedestinatus* was written by a hidden Pelagian disappointed with the papal ruling against Julian in 439: *A history of the Church to AD 461*, Oxford 1922, iii. 156.

³⁹ 'Hac tempestate Iulianus Eclanensis, iactantissimus Pelagiani erroris adsertor, quem dudum amissi episcopatus intemperans cupido exagitabat, multimoda arte fallendi correctionis spem praeferens, molitus est in communione ecclesiae inreperere.'

calm tone in the remainder of his *Chronicle* to launch this vituperative attack on Julian. There is real personal animus here which mirrors that found in the references to Prosper in the *Praedestinatus* and *Commentarii*.⁴⁰ If a personal clash in 431 is ruled out, the raging attack on Julian's attempt at restoration in Prosper's chronicle entry for 439 seems to reflect the general, if not all the specific circumstances described in book III of the *Praedestinatus*.

Where, though, is the evidence of a situation where others were present along with Prosper's chief adversary in a personal confrontation as described in *Praedestinatus* III.8? While there is no definite proof that many of the Italian exiles of 419 returned *en masse* along with Julian, it is a fair deduction. It is known that Leo I spent the early years of his pontificate during the 440s conducting mopping-up operations against them throughout Italy.⁴¹ Consequently, it is likely that the attempted restoration of their leader did provide the occasion for their return in strength. Nothing is heard about them previously during most of the pontificate of Xystus III after their expulsion from Constantinople in 430. The pursuit of disguised Pelagians, as Leo describes them, shortly afterwards, is clearly attested by the *De promissionibus* attributed to Quodvultdeus,⁴² by Photius⁴³ and in Leo's own correspondence (*epp.* i, ii).⁴⁴ The demand for a full consideration of the doctrines of Julian and his associates by a properly convened synod of bishops had been a common objective since

sed his insidiis Xystus papa [diaconi Leonis hortatu] vigilanter occurrens nullum aditum pestiferis conatibus patere permisit et ita omnes catholicos de reiectione fallacis bestiae gaudere fecit, quasi tunc primum superbissimam haeresim apostolicus gladius detruncavisset': *Monumenta Germaniae historica, auctores antiquissimi, chronica minora*, ed. T. Mommsen, Berlin 1892, ix/2, 477. The best manuscripts omit the reference to Leo's intervention but this might represent a later re-editing by Prosper.

⁴⁰ 'audite, calumniosi quid conuertitis caput ad calumnias, et Pelagii nobis dogma obicitis?': *Praedestinatus* III.29.9; III.30, CCSL xxvB. 113, 116; 'age et non calumniose': *Commentarii in Psalmos*, Psalm cxlvi, CCSL xxv.250.

⁴¹ N. W. James, 'Who were the Pelagians found in Venetia during the 440s?', *Studia Patristica*, xxii, Leuven 1989, 271–6. Villegas Marín casts doubt on the evidence of Quodvultdeus and Photius for the pursuit of Julian's followers by Leo I as pope in the 440s, instead claiming that this campaign occurred in 439 while Leo was arch-deacon, but they include circumstantial detail which is convincing and which is not derived from Prosper's *Chronicon*: 'En polémica con Julián', 111–15.

⁴² 'In Italiam quoque, nobis apud Campaniam substitutis, dum venerabilis et apostolico honore nominandus papa Leo Manichaeos conuertet et conteret Pelagianos et maxime Iulianum ambientem, quidam Florus nomine spiritu seductionis adreptus ... haud procul a Neapolitana ciuitate in subuersionem animarum ... a praefatae prouinciae liminibus pulsus est': *De promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei, dimidium temporis* 6, 12, CCSL lx.198, lines 81–91. Pietri and Pietri favour the identification of this Florus with the bishop allied to Julian: *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*, II/2: *Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313–604)*, 851, 1543–4.

⁴³ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, i.54, edited by R. Henry as *Bibliothèque*, Paris 1959, 44.

⁴⁴ *PL* liv.593–8.

418–19. It is entirely plausible that a conference was held in 439 to debate their views before a council of the Roman Church, especially under a pope, Xystus, who had once been corrected after showing sympathy for Pelagius.⁴⁵ Certainly, after 439, with the former bishop of Eclanum rebuffed again by Rome, there could have been no such open debate with their opponents in the West as described in the *Praedestinatus*. If Prosper engaged in debate with a single adversary in this context, but an adversary surrounded by a group of supporters, in an atmosphere of bitter recrimination, then we once again have to consider the intriguing possibility that Arnobius and Julian were one.

A dating of the *Commentarii in Psalmos* and the *Praedestinatus* to a period beginning in 439 fits in with other evidence surrounding the controversy between Prosper and the so-called Arnobius to which these texts bear witness. Gumerlock has established that the two works were part of a series of literary productions prompted by the debate over predestination. Prosper replied to the *In Psalmos* of Arnobius with his own *Expositio in Psalmos*. He commented only on Psalms c–cl as that was the section of the Psalter where the latter had expressed his objectionable theology of grace most clearly in expounding Psalms cviii, cxvii, cxxvi and cxlvi.⁴⁶ But one work which seems to form an integral part of the polemical contest between the two opponents has been neglected. This is the text of the *Hypomnesticon*, critically edited by J. E. Chisholm and attributed by him after exhaustive study to Prosper.⁴⁷ Other scholars have proved reluctant to accept this attribution, although without cogent reasons.⁴⁸ On more detailed examination, it becomes clear that this text is closely related to the three works cited above on the Psalms and the ‘predestined one’ or *Praedestinatus*. The form of address used is direct and polemical, ‘audi’ and ‘ausculte’.⁴⁹ Both authors speak in the first person and slip into the second person, and indeed, the second person singular in addressing a

⁴⁵ Augustine, *ep.* cxciv, in *S. Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi epistulae*, ed. A. Goldbacher, Leipzig 1911, CSEL lvii.176–214.

⁴⁶ A. Y. Hwang, *Intrepid lover of perfect grace: the life and thought of Prosper of Aquitaine*, Washington, DC 2009, 202.

⁴⁷ *The pseudo-augustinian Hypomnesticon against the Pelagians and Celestians*, ed. J. E. Chisholm, Fribourg 1967, 1980.

⁴⁸ See the summary in Hwang, *Intrepid lover of perfect grace*, 22–5. The objections given there to Chisholm’s case are insubstantial. They include a lack of endorsement from Georges de Plinval, who taught him at Fribourg, and other arguments relating to the authorship of the *De vocatione omnium gentium* where Chisholm’s contention that this work is by Prosper has since been vindicated. Chisholm’s error was to assume that the monastic opponents of predestination in Gaul were a principal target, whereas it was in fact the Italian opponents of predestination who were the adversaries.

⁴⁹ ‘Ausculta ... Audi igitur’: *Pseudo-augustinian Hypomnesticon* II, responsio IV, p. 154, lines 19, 26.

particular opponent.⁵⁰ *Hypomnesticon* demonstrates a clash with an undefined adversary over the nature of grace and the issue of whether predestination is orthodox or heterodox but also encompasses an attack on Julian's belief in the goodness of *concupiscentia* within marriage.

The *Hypomnesticon* was produced in two stages, beginning with *responsiones* I–V, to which *responsio* VI was hastily added later. This is abundantly clear from the failure to update the preface giving the number of separate sections within the work, which speaks of only five propositions which are considered. *Responsio* IV is an attack on Julian of Eclanum's teaching on *concupiscentia*, but *responsio* VI, which is transmitted independently in some manuscripts, is a vigorous defence of predestination.⁵¹ It looks, therefore, as though the work was originally produced as a riposte to Julian and his followers, after tracing their errors back to Pelagius and Celestius, but that the last section represents an attempt to rebut the specific attacks of the so-called Arnobius in the *Praedestinatus*. In particular, the author of *Hypomnesticon* reiterates what the opponent of Arnobius is reported to have said in book III of *Praedestinatus*. He bluntly states that not all men are to be saved and that the 'omnes' of 1 Timothy ii.4 are not all men as such, but only the body of the elect to whom God wishes to grant salvation.⁵² If we accept that the clash between Arnobius and his opponents referred to in the *Commentarii* and the *Praedestinatus* probably occurred in 439, and lay in the recent past, then the *Hypomnesticon* and *Expositio super Psalmos* seem to be part of Prosper's response in the period shortly after. This is important, because it is likely that such a prolonged exchange takes us into the pontificate of Leo I, whose election occurred in August 440. Under Leo, Photius states that Prosper wrote *libelli* (pamphlets) against the Pelagians.⁵³ The *Hypomnesticon* seems to fit this description exactly: it attacks teachings in works attributed to Arnobius and other doctrines of Julian which were deemed by the author to be Pelagian. The vehement denial by Arnobius of any unorthodox beliefs and his condemnation of Pelagius was a response to Prosper's attacks as encapsulated in these two polemical works by his Aquitanian opponent.⁵⁴ It is apparent that the

⁵⁰ *Hypomnesticon*, second person/vocative singular: *responsio* IV. 1: 'quaeris a me' (p. 154, line 17), and 'Quapropter interrogo, responde' (p. 154, line 21); *responsio* IV. 2: 'Quod si credere non vis, quaero ut dicas' (p. 155, line 42); *responsio* IV. 3: 'Sed respondeas forsitan' (p. 155, line 49); *responsio* IV. 8: 'haeretice' (p. 168, line 386); *responsio* IV. 6: 'Gratia est, haeretice' (p. 164, line 291).

⁵¹ For this analysis of the text see *ibid.* I. 18–23, 108 n. 5.

⁵² Chisholm noted the use of the argument in *responsio* VI. 8, but not the parallel with the *Praedestinatus*. *Pseudo-augustinian Hypomnesticon* I. 37. He favoured an earlier date, around 435, for the composition of the *Hypomnesticon*.

⁵³ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, I. 54, p. 44.

⁵⁴ Gumerlock, 'Arnobius the Younger', 253.

Hypomnesticon forms part of the series of works provoked by a direct encounter with the author of the *Praedestinatus*.

Whatever the actual circumstances of the clash between Prosper and the figure of Arnobius, certain features are clear. Our mysterious polemicist appears as a spokesman and leading figure among an anti-predestinarian group seeking to drive a wedge between the supposedly ‘true’ teaching of Augustine and that of the extreme predestinarians who had allegedly corrupted it. Indeed, he goes so far in the *Praedestinatus* as to take and rework Augustine’s *De haeresibus* and to add the *praedestinati* as the last heretics in the list. That itself seems to point to an attempt to exploit the very guarded endorsement of Augustine by Celestine in 431. After the pope’s judgement, the great African theologian could no longer be challenged head-on but his reception could be manipulated by isolating and attacking the predestinarian element in his work.⁵⁵

The substantial obstacle to placing Arnobius in the circle of Julian is that other scholars have seen too great a divergence between the beliefs articulated by these supposedly separate figures. In particular, Maurice Abel has pointed out that while Julian of Eclanum repeatedly rejected the doctrine of original sin in any form, Arnobius in contrast seems to accept it through the condemnation of Celestius, the chief opponent of the doctrine, in the *Praedestinatus*.⁵⁶ Although Abel traced an extensive overlap between the teachings and style of these two figures, he concluded that Arnobius was a ‘semi-Pelagian’ (the dubious and now discarded categorisation previously applied to Cassian’s followers) who lived in Rome at the same time and who was influenced by Julian’s teachings. But Abel’s one major objection to Arnobius’ being a returning Italian exile dissolves on closer examination. The key lies in another work attributed to Prosper of Aquitaine, the *Epistola ad Demetriadem*. This was written partly to deter the aristocratic Roman virgin Demetrias from showing sympathy for the returning Italian anti-predestinarians, when some were speaking up for them in Rome.⁵⁷ The author seems to refer to these exiles in his statement when he writes that:

When they were with us they acknowledged the wounds of original sin, but among themselves they showed that they held that the transgression of our first parents had injured only those who had imitated it; a man’s natural endowment suffered no loss because of another’s sin, and he could, if he so willed, merit the abundant bestowal of grace by his own free service.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ See Lambert, ‘Augustine and the Predestinatus’, 149–62.

⁵⁶ M. Abel, ‘Le “Praedestinatus” et le pélagianisme’, *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* xxv (1968), 5–25 at pp. 21–2. Lössl also doubts Abel’s arguments against Julian’s authorship of the *Praedestinatus*: ‘Julian’ 323–4.

⁵⁷ Photius, *Bibliotheca*, i. 54.

⁵⁸ ‘Et cum inter nostros originalis peccati vulnera faterentur, inter suos tamen hoc tenere ostenderunt: quod primorum hominum praevaricatio solis imitatoribus

This stance is in line with the deceit with which Prosper charges Julian and his followers in 439. It is also something that Leo I warned his fellow Italian bishops against when considering the reconciliation of these returning exiles.⁵⁹ Abel and others who have followed him have been too trusting in accepting Arnobius at face value. In reality, his two anti-predestinarian works are in essence an elaborate attempt at deception, to disguise his opposition to Augustine's views on grace and free will in a last-ditch attempt to avoid the complete triumph of Augustinian theology and the renewed proscription of the irreconcilable anti-predestinarian Italian churchmen in the wake of the failure of Julian's appeal to Xystus. If the strictures of Prosper and Leo, who had first-hand experience of dealing with Julian and the returning Italian exiles, are accepted, everything falls into place and Abel's objection dissolves. Arnobius, whoever he might have been, was indulging in dissimulation in common with the rest of Julian's followers. After the condemnation of Celestius' views on original sin by Rome and also at the Council of Ephesus in 431, it was not possible openly to oppose the doctrinal position that Adam's sin was transmitted to all men directly and it is hard to see how the exiled Julian and his party could have obtained a hearing at Rome in 439 without disguising their true opinions on this issue.

When other teachings of Arnobius and Julian of Eclanum are compared they are overwhelmingly close. There is the same emphasis on the essential goodness of *concupiscentia*, that natural desire which, it is argued, does not stem from the devil, and the benign nature of the attraction between the sexes and procreation; the goodness of marriage which the Church blesses; the goodness of man as the creation of God and the belief that any other position is Manichaean; the freedom of the will which has survived the Fall of Adam; and the consequent belief that the *possibilitas mali* is to be welcomed because without it there can be no positive virtue in exercising freedom and choosing good.⁶⁰

obfuisset, naturalem autem facultatem nihil sui in alieno amisse peccato, cui possibile esset et liberum per voluntariam devotionem promereri gratiae largitatem': *Epistula ad Demetriadem*, 172–5, trans. in Hwang, *Intrepid lover*, 206. Hwang erroneously takes this as a reference to Cassian's followers, but the work in question is part of the anti-Pelagian polemic at Rome, where the threat was from the returning exiles of Julian's party and the sympathy shown to them. 'Cum inter nostros' is most obviously a reference to the previous physical presence of these unorthodox elements in Demetrias's own place of residence, namely Rome. R. Villegas Marín correctly identifies this chapter of the *Epistula* as an attack on Julian's doctrines: 'En polémica con Julián', *Augustinianum* xliii (2003), 90, 100.

⁵⁹ Leo, *ep. i*, *PL* liv.593–7. The pope is here condemning the readmission of those implicated in the Pelagian or Celestian heresy into catholic communion without a clear condemnation of such opinions, so that 'Nihil in verbis eorum obscurum, nihil inveniatur ambiguum' (594B).

⁶⁰ Abel, 'Le "Praedestinatus" et le pélagianisme', 5–25.

Another striking similarity between the works of these two supposedly distinct figures is their emphasis on reason. Julian stressed the primacy of reason in his scriptural exegesis and polemical works, exalting it above authority. In his Commentary on Job he employs the word *ratio* no less than sixty-three times.⁶¹ Arnobius takes the same attitude, condemning his predestinarian opponent, not by resorting to authority, but by employing ‘true reasoning’.⁶²

Moreover, the style of Arnobius, and his arguments, are very reminiscent of Julian. There are eight clear echoes of the latter’s literary *oeuvre* (as cited by Augustine) in the *Praedestinatus* which are noted in Gori’s edition.⁶³ Of these, seven parallels are particularly notable (see table 1). The final image, that of the shaven hair, is used by Julian (cited by Augustine, *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum* 1.13.26; 1.22.40) and Arnobius (*Praedestinatus* II.7.35–41) alone. Echoes of style and ideas cannot themselves be conclusive, but they do show a close connection between the two authors. A number of other characteristics of the former bishop of Eclanum appear in the two works of Arnobius identified by Bouwman, Baxter and Morin.⁶⁴ Both authors constantly use words with the suffix -tor, -tas and -tio.⁶⁵ There is the same fondness for verbs ending in -escere.⁶⁶ Baxter identified that the author of the *Praedestinatus* used the word ‘applicare’

⁶¹ K. B. Steinhauser, ‘Job in patristic commentaries and theological works’, in F. T. Harkins and A. Canty (eds), *A companion to Job in the Middle Ages*, Leiden 2016, 57.

⁶² ‘eos non de potestate, sed de ratione vera damnauimus’: *Praedestinatus* III. 2, CCSL xxvB.66–7. Compare the *Epistula ad Demetriadem*, where the author apparently counter-attacks against such reliance on reason (‘per dolos falsae rationis armarent’): *Epistula ad Demetriadem*, 172, line 46.

⁶³ Arnobius Iunior, CCSL xxvB. *Praedestinatus* III. 37, 8 = Augustine, *Contra Iulianum* 4, 8, 52; *Praedestinatus* III. 37, 36–7 = *Contra Iulianum* 5, 16, 62; *Praedestinatus* III.8, 146–50 = Augustine, *Opus imperfectum* 1, 32; *Praedestinatus* III.19, 51–2 = *Opus imperfectum* 1, 67, 4off.; *Praedestinatus* I, 90, 18–19 = 1.97, 4ff.; *Praedestinatus* III.6, 2–13 = I. 134, 15–30; *Praedestinatus* II.7 = ibid. III. 184. *Praedestinatus* II.7, 35–41 (shaven hair) = Augustine, *Contra duas ep. Pelagianorum* 1, 13, 26; *Praedestinatus* III.30, 50–4 = *Contra duas epp.* 1, 22, 40.

⁶⁴ C. Paucker, *Vorarbeiten zur lateinische Sprachgeschichte*, ed. H. Rönsch, Berlin 1884, III/2, 53; G. Bouwman, *Das Julian von Aclanum Kommentar zu den Propheten Osee, Joel und Amos: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Exegesis*, Rome 1958, esp. pp. 28–37; J. H. Baxter, ‘Notes on the Latin of Julian of Eclanum’, *Bulletin du Cange* xxi (1949), 5–54; G. Morin, ‘Un Ouvrage restitué à Julien d’Eclanum’, *Revue bénédictine* xxx (1913), 1–24, esp. pp. 9–17.

⁶⁵ Morin, ‘Ouvrage’, 14–16. A word search has been carried out in the *Commentarii in Psalmos* (excluding biblical quotations) along with the preface and book III of *Praedestinatus*. These are the most pertinent sections for the analysis of style as book I draws information on heresies from other sources and book II is deliberately written in the style of Augustine. There are 83 separate words with the suffix -tas, 114 with -tio and 50 with -tor. Many terms (for example, ‘voluntas’) are used repeatedly.

⁶⁶ Morin, ‘Études’, 334, and ‘Ouvrage’, 16. Arnobius uses 14 separate verbs ending in -escere within the sections of the two works under consideration (ardescere, arescere,

Table 1. *Similarities between Arnobius and Julian (as transmitted via Augustine)*

Arnobius	Julian
<p><i>Praedestinatus</i> III. 6. 8–13, CCSL xxvB. 72: Audi apostolum, non dei praeordinationi hoc, sed hominis negligentiae uel diligentiae applicantem. <i>In magna, inquit, domo non sunt tantum uasa aurea et argentea, sed et lignea et fictilia, et quaedam quidem sunt in honorem, quaedam autem in contumeliam. Si quis ergo mundauerit semetipsum ab his, erit uas in honore sanctificatum, utile deo ad omne opus bonum paratum</i> [italics original]. [2 Timothy ii. 20–2].</p> <p><i>Praedestinatus</i> III. 30. 49–54, CCSL xxvB. 116: Anthemamus qui dicunt: ‘nec per Adam mors, nec per Christum uita.’ Anthemamus qui dicunt de duobus baptizatis qui nascitur baptismum indigere non posse.</p> <p><i>Praedestinatus</i> III. 8. 146–50, CCSL xxvB. 78: Erit ergo secundum Manichaeum alius deus malorum, alius bonorum, ut quae bona sunt bono ascribantur, et quae mala sunt, malo. Ne uideamur peius Manichaeis inclamare blasphemium, cum unum eundemque deum quem bonum confitemur et iustum, hunc praedestinasse omnia scelera aestimemus.</p> <p><i>Praedestinatus</i> III. 37. 7–9, CCSL xxvB. 123: Vnum uobis eligit e duobus: aut bona est generatio hominis, et bona est concupiscentia, aut malae sunt nuptiae, et iniqua concupiscentia.</p>	<p>Augustine, <i>Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum</i> 1.134.24–30, CSEL lxxxv.1. 149–50 Iul[ianus]: A quo autem uasa eiusmodi in susceptionem horum quae diximus praeparentur, ipsius apostoli sermo patefacit. <i>In magna, inquit, domo non sunt tantummodo uasa aurea et argentea, sed et lignea et fictilia, alia quidem in honorem, alia in contumeliam. Si ergo mundauerit, quis semet ipsum ab his, erit uas in honore sanctificatum, utile domino, ad omne opus bonum paratum</i> [italics original].</p> <p><i>Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum</i> 1.22.[40], CSEL lx.457: ‘Gratiam Christi’, inquit ‘omnibus necessariam et maioribus et paruulis confitemur et eos qui dicunt de duobus baptizatis natum non debere baptizari, anthemamus.’</p> <p><i>Opus imperfectum</i> 1.32, CSEL lxxxv.1, p. 24 Iul[ianus]: Quod si neutrum horum quae diximus facies et huic deo te asseris credere, cuius institutis iniustitiam communiri aestimas cognosce multo te novum antiquo Manichaeo esse peiorem, qui talem deum habeas, qualem Manicheus dei sui est commentus inimicum.</p> <p><i>Contra Iulianum</i> 4.8, PL xlv.764: ‘Bona igitur concupiscentia naturalis’ inquit (erubescis enim dicere carnalis) ‘quae cum intra modum suum tenetur’ inquis, ‘nulla mali aspersione turpatur.’ Quomodo tenetur intra modum suum, quaeso te, quomodo tenetur, nisi cum ei resistitur? Cur autem resistitur, nisi ne impleat desideria mala? Quomodo est igitur bona?</p>

Table 1. (*Cont.*)

Arnobius	Julian
<i>Praedestinatus</i> III.37.34–7, CCSL xxvB.124: Hoc autem ideo dixit, ut specialiter nuptiarum coniunctionem ex deo esse monstraret. Nec enim esse potuit aut sine coniunctione commixtio aut absque commixtione coniunctio.	<i>Contra Iulianum</i> 5.16.62, <i>PL</i> xlv.818: ‘Nihil aliud’ dicis ‘esse nuptias, quam corporum commixtionem’: et dicis postea, quod et verum est, ‘sine appetitu mutuo et sine opere naturali propagationem esse non posse.’ Numquid tamen negas, sibimet etiam adulteros appetitu mutuo et opere naturali et corporum commixtione conjungi? Non est ista ergo definitio nuptiarum.
<i>Praedestinatus</i> II.7.22–4, CCSL xxvB.63–4: Nam illa membra quae in baptismatis hora confusione carent, postea confusionem recipiunt, qui eitent ubique conspectum, et quarent pudendo secretum.	<i>Opus imperfectum</i> III.170.8–11, CSEL lxxxv.1.472: [Iulianus] ... ‘Quod postea propagatione fecerunt, hoc est conubii bonum, quod vero prius confusione texerunt, hoc est concupiscentiae malum, quod vitat ubique conspectum et quaerit pudendo secretum’.
<i>Praedestinatus</i> II.7.35–41, CCSL xxvB.64: Et ideo dicit: <i>spes autem quae videtur spes non est</i> , ne forte aestimarentur per baptismum ita tolli peccata ut etiam radices ipsae peccatorum pariter euellantur. Motus enim ille pollutionis, qui per praeuaricationem naturam inuasit, ita remanet in baptizato, sicut radix capilli, cum fuerit nouacula in superficie emundatus et rasmus. Rasmus enim est ut emundaretur locus, non est eradicatus ne ulterius nasceretur.	<i>Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum</i> I.13.[26], CSEL lx.445: ‘Dicunt etiam’, inquit, ‘baptisma non dare omnem indulgentiam peccatorum nec auferre crimina, sed rarare,* ut omnium peccatorum radices in mala carne teneantur’, quis hoc adversos Pelagianos, nisi infidelis affirmet? Dicimus ergo baptisma dare omnium indulgentiam peccatorum, et auferre crimina, non rarare; nec ‘ut omnium peccatorum radices in mala carne teneantur quasi rasorum in capite capillorum unde crescant iterum resecanda peccata’.

*The alternative reading ‘radere’ seems preferable here and later in the passage as given in the notes to this edition: CSEL lx.445.

in a special sense of 'to impute to' or 'attribute to' which is characteristic of Julian.⁶⁷ Notable too, is the privileging of St John Chrysostom, the eastern Father revered by Julian and his followers.⁶⁸ Furthermore, if the *Hypomnesticon* attributed to Prosper of Aquitaine is taken into account the connection becomes even closer. The author of the work makes a charge against his opponent which is highly distinctive. He accuses his antagonist of loquacity in the context of an attack in *responsio* iv.7.295 on the belief propagated by Julian of Eclanum that moderate concupiscence is essentially good: 'Pergite adhuc per campos loquacitatis vestrae.'⁶⁹ The charge of loquacity, or what Henry Mayr-Harting has memorably referred to as verbal diarrhoea, is a highly unusual and distinctive one to bring against a theological opponent. It is regularly used of one individual and one only in the course of fifth-century controversies, and originates with Augustine in speaking of Julian.⁷⁰ Clearly, he is attacking not just Julian's beliefs but Julian himself. As the author of *Hypomnesticon* frequently uses the second person singular to address his opponent in *responsiones* iv–vi, it looks very much as though he is addressing the same individual throughout. If so, it points strongly to Julian being the target of his invective as otherwise it would have been appropriate to differentiate the subject of *responsio* vi (the so-called Arnobius who had savaged Prosper in the *Praedestinatus*) from Julian in *responsio* iv.

The pieces of the jigsaw now come together. Morin made much of the 'African' traits of Arnobius, including a claim that he used versions of the African Bible and that there are echoes of the African Church's liturgy in his writings such as the use of the phrase *sursum cor* rather than the Italian usage *sursum corda*.⁷¹ Even if this is correct, the influences can be accounted for in other ways. In particular, Morin ignores the fact that Julian of Eclanum had himself spent time in Africa, at Carthage in about 409–10.⁷² He also passes over the knowledge of eastern liturgy which

erubescere (repeatedly), evanescere, exardescere, fulgescere, innotescere, liquescere, lucescere, mollescere, quiescere, requiescere, tabescere and torpescere).

⁶⁷ Baxter cites *Praedestinatus* iii. 1 (*PL* liii.633B); iii. 3 (637A); and iii. 10 (618C) = CCL xxB, *Praedestinatus* iii. 6, 8, 15 (72. 8–9; 77. 115–16; 93. 47–8): 'Notes', 18–19.

⁶⁸ K. Cooper, *The fall of the Roman household*, Cambridge 2007, 270–1, and sources there cited.

⁶⁹ *Pseudo-augustinian Hypomnesticon*, ii. 164.
⁷⁰ For Augustine's charge of 'loquacitas' against Julian see *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum* 3.20; 4.57; 5.26; 5.39 (CSEL lxxxv.1.363; lxxxv.2.63, lines 219–23, 237–9), together with M. Lamberigts, 'The Italian Julian of Aeclanum against the African Augustine of Hippo', in *Augustinus Afer*, Fribourg 2003, 83–93. Chisholm notes that Marius Mercator uses the term once in relation to Celestius who is not mentioned again after the Council of Ephesus in 431: *Pseudo-augustinian Hypomnesticon*, 148 n. 2.

⁷¹ Morin, 'L'Origine', 177–84, esp. pp. 180–4. 'Et in sacerdotalis vox ad percipienda mysteria nobis omnibus clamat: Sursum cor': *Commentarii in Psalmos*, Psalm cxx, CCL xxv.205, lines 8–9.

⁷² Augustine, *Opus imperfectum contra Iulianum* 5, 26, CSEL lxxxv.1.220, lines 25–30.

Arnobius displays,⁷³ and his familiarity with the Greek text of the Bible.⁷⁴ Furthermore, Arnobius is clearly steeped in the *passiones* of martyrs venerated in Rome and suburbicarian Italy.⁷⁵ The intimate knowledge of Greek church practices and the Italian references fit well with the circumstances of Julian's party of exiles who spent long years in the East after their expulsion from Italy in 419. There are numerous other stylistic fingerprints of the deposed bishop of Eclanum in the works of Arnobius against predestination. The jeering sarcastic, tone of the *Praedestinatus* towards the 'predestined one' closely parallels the irreverent stance which Julian adopted towards Augustine over grace, concupiscence and original sin.⁷⁶ It would be entirely in keeping for Julian or one of his associates to propagate his opposition to the bishop of Hippo's more contentious views under the guise of a name suggestive of an older African Christianity in the *Commentarii*.⁷⁷

It may not yet be time to remove Arnobius the Younger from the reference books, but his existence is certainly highly questionable. It is much more plausible and economical to ascribe the two works most clearly emanating from his pen to Julian or his exiled associates. Of those followers, allowing for the fact that some such as Turbantius had fallen away by the 430s,⁷⁸ it is difficult to see who might have had the knowledge and range which these works display. Bishop Florus could in theory be a possible candidate. He was one to whom Julian addressed works before 430. But there is no evidence that he was ever a polemicist, although he remained active in the vicinity of Naples during the 440s.⁷⁹

On the current balance of probabilities, Prosper's hated opponent Julian is the prime candidate for authorship of these works, disguising his views where necessary in order to carry on the fight against Augustine and to prove himself a true Catholic in the face of African innovation. It

⁷³ 'quod Graeci canunt: Anima mea in minibus meis semper, secundum illam sententiam': *Commentarii in Psalmos*, Psalm cxviii, CCSL xxv.190*; 'Dissipata insunt ossa nostra secus infernum. Graecus dicit ossa eorum': Palm cxl* (239, lines 37–9); 'Sic enim in Graeco psallitur: Dirigatur oratio in conspectus dei sicut thymiana': Psalm cxl (239, lines 65–7).

⁷⁴ 'nec in tabernaculis viri beneplacitum est ei, id est, in confidentia suae habitationis. Unde et Graecis non dicit in tabernaculis, sed in tibiis': *Commentarii in Psalmos*, Psalm cxlvi, CCSL xxv.249, lines 70–2; ⁷⁵ See *ibid.* 178–9, lines 38–46.

⁷⁶ Bouwman, *Julian von Aecclanum*, 18.

⁷⁷ The African Arnobius of Sicca, a rhetorician and teacher of Lactantius, and a defender of Christianity in the early fourth century, might well have inspired a suitable fictional *persona* for the classically educated Julian who also interpreted Christianity in the light of ancient learning and philosophy. Erasmus confused this figure with the fifth-century author of the *Commentarii in Psalmos*.

⁷⁸ Augustine describes the reconciliation of Turbantius: *ep. x**, CSEL lxxxviii.46. This letter dates from 422 or 423.

⁷⁹ Quodvultdeus, *De promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei* 6.12, CCSL lx. 198.

is hard to think of any other figure with the chutzpah to attack Augustine's teaching on predestination by claiming that his works had been contaminated by heretics. Certainly, there is evidence that Julian remained active in Italy during the 440s, and since the *terminus ad quem* for his death is March 455,⁸⁰ the disguised or dissimulating works, *Commentarii in Psalmos* and *Praedestinatus*, appearing to stem from the pen of an otherwise unknown Arnobius, would neatly help to fill the void in terms of literary productions from this inveterate polemicist and biblical commentator in the years after 439.⁸¹ It is precisely the period when Prosper and Leo were involved in countering the returning exiles led by Julian and when the former bishop of Eclanum is most likely to have wished to attack Prosper as the leading proponent of Augustine's extreme predestinarian teachings.

⁸⁰ Gennadius, *De viris illustribus* 46, ed. E. C. Richardson, Leipzig 1896, 78.

⁸¹ Baxter, 'Notes', 10.