

## VIT. SOPHIST. X. 2. 3 AND THE TERMINUS OF THE FIRST EDITION OF EUNAPIUS' *HISTORY*

Scholarly interest in the relationship between the two ἐκδόσεις of Eunapius of Sardis' Ἱστορία ἢ μετὰ Δέξιππον, which in its final form covered the years A.D. 270–404, is at least as old as the so-called Byzantine renaissance of the ninth century<sup>1</sup>). Yet it is only recently that the proposed re-dating of the publication of the first edition of the *History* to around 380, and the thesis, contingent upon that date, that the work was consulted by Ammianus Marcellinus and the authors of the *Historia Augusta* and *Epitome de Caesaribus* have made the matter an important concern for students of late antique historiography<sup>2</sup>).

Debate has focused increasingly on cross-references to the *History* in Eunapius' extant *Vitae Sophistarum*, itself composed after 395<sup>3</sup>). While the majority of these references appear to direct

---

1) The *Excerpta de Legationibus* and *Excerpta de Sententiis*, edd. by C. de Boor and U. Boissevain as vols. I and IV of *Excerpta Historica Iussu Imp. Constantini Porphyrogeniti Confecta*, edd. Boissevain, de Boor, and T. Büttner-Wobst (Berlin 1903, 1906), and *Suda* preserve what remains of the second edition of the *History*. C. Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (Paris 1851), IV, pp. 7–56, will be superseded as the standard collection of the fragments with the publication of vol. II of R. Blockley's *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire*.

Photius *Bibl. Cod.* 77, ed. R. Henry (Paris 1959), I, pp. 158–160, describes the two ἐκδόσεις, and Arethas seems to have figured in the transmission of the second edition, as argued in my *Eunapius and Arethas*, *GRBS* 24 (1983), pp. 179–182. W. Chalmers, *The NEA ΕΚΔΟΣΙΣ of Eunapius' Histories*, *CQ* n.s. 3 (1953), pp. 165–170, summarizes earlier scholarship; Blockley, *op. cit.* (Liverpool 1981), I, pp. 1–26, discusses subsequent interpretation.

2) See T. Barnes, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta*, Vol. 155 of *Collection Latomus* (Brussels 1978), and the same author's *The Epitome de Caesaribus and Its Sources*, *Review of Die Epitome de Caesaribus*, by Jörg Schlumberger, *CPh* 71 (1976), pp. 258–268. Barnes' thesis has been attacked by F. Paschoud, *Quand parut la première édition de l'histoire d'Eunape?*, *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1977/1978* (Bonn 1980), pp. 149–162, but supported by Blockley, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 3–5.

3) The method of reference to the *VS* used here needs a word of explanation: the divisions of the text are those of G. Giangrande, followed by the page number

the reader to topics already treated in the *History* – presumably in the first edition or in a previously published installment –, three refer to subjects to be dealt with in the future – presumably in the νέα ἔκδοσις or in a forthcoming installment<sup>4</sup>). Two of the latter, VS VII. 3. 4–5<sup>5</sup>) and VIII. 2. 2–4<sup>6</sup>), seem to support, or at least to present no insurmountable obstacles to, proponents of a first edition terminating with the battle of Adrianople (Aug. 9, 378) and published around 380<sup>7</sup>). The third passage, VS X. 2<sup>8</sup>), is more problematic. There Eunapius describes the special attention he, as a newly arrived student who had been taken seriously ill, received from his teacher Prohaeresius:

Ὁ δὲ θεϊότατος Προαιρέσιος οὐπω τὸν συγγραφέα τεθεαμένος, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὅσον οὐκ ἤδη κατοδυρόμενος, ὡς ἐπύθετο τὴν ἄλογον ταύτην καὶ ἀνεκκλήτων σωτηρίαν, μετακάλεσας τοὺς κρατίστους καὶ γενναιοτάτους τῶν ὁμιλητῶν καὶ παρ’ οἷς ἐπηνεῖτο χειρῶν ἀλκῆς ἔργον, “πέπονθά τι” πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν “ἐπὶ τῷ σωθέντι παιδίῳ, καὶ τοί γε οὐπω τεθεαμένος, ἀλλ’ ὅμως ἔπασχον ἡνίκα ἀπώλλυτο. εἴ τι δὴ βούλεσθε χαρίσασθαι μοι, τῷ δημοσίῳ λουτρῷ τοῦτον καθήρατε, πάσης χλευασίας φεισάμενοι καὶ παιδιᾶς, ὥσπερ ἐμόν τινα παῖδα ψαῖροντες.” καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἔσχεν οὕτως καὶ ἀκριβέστερον ἐν τοῖς κατ’ ἐκείνους χρόνοις λελέξεται ὅμως δὲ ὁ συγγραφεύς, ὁμολογῶν τὰ ἐς αὐτὸν θεοῦ τιнос προνοίας τετυχηκέναι, ἐκ τῆς Προαιρεσίου σπουδῆς οὐδὲν εἰς τὸ καθόλου περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀποστήσεται τῆς ἀληθείας, εἴ γε πεπηγὼς ὁ Πλάτωνος λόγος, ὡς ἀλήθεια πάντων μὲν ἀγαθῶν θεοῖς, πάντων δὲ ἀνθρώποις ἡγεῖται. (X. 2)

---

of his edition – Eunapii Vitae Sophistarum (Rome 1956) – and then, after a slash, the page number of J. F. Boissonade’s edition as it appears in Philostratorum Eunapii Himerii Opera, ed. A. Westermann, et al. (Paris 1850), pp. 449–550. This will facilitate consultation of the Loeb edition of W. C. Wright, Philostratus and Eunapius (Cambridge 1921), pp. 317–565, which uses Boissonade’s pagination. Eunapius’ mention of Alaric’s invasion of Greece, VS VII. 3. 4–5, pp. 45–46/476, provides a *terminus post quem*.

4) The distinction between installments and editions was made by W. Chalmers, Eunapius, Ammianus Marcellinus, and Zosimus on Julian’s Persian Expedition, CQ n.s. 7 (1957), p. 157, and has been modified by Blockley, op. cit., pp. 4–5.

5) Pp. 45–46/476, the reference to Alaric.

6) Pp. 58–59/482, concerning the death of the sophist Hilarius at the hands of Alaric’s Goths.

7) See Barnes, The Sources of the Historia Augusta, pp. 115–117.

8) P. 66/486.

R. Goulet<sup>9</sup>) has adduced this text as evidence for his radical revision of the chronology of Eunapius' life and literary activity, understanding it as proof that Eunapius planned a fuller treatment of this episode in a consideration of the times in which Prohaeresius lived that would appear in the yet-to-be-published νέα ἔκδοσις of the *History*<sup>10</sup>). Moreover, he observes that this suggests that the first edition of the *History* failed to cover in detail the year of Eunapius' arrival in Athens, an event usually placed in 362<sup>11</sup>). As this seems impossible, since the testimony of the historical fragments<sup>12</sup>) indicates that Julian's death in Persia (June 26, 363) was the climax of the original *History*, Goulet proposes setting the events of VS X. 2 in late 364<sup>13</sup>), the year which he goes on to maintain was the terminus of the first ἔκδοσις of the *History*. Any cross-references to the *History* in the VS that involve material dated by Goulet to later than 365 (including one dealing with Prohaeresius<sup>14</sup>) must, on this reckoning, be allusions to events that occurred later than the formal subject matter of the initial edition of the *History* but before its publication, which Goulet places after 396<sup>15</sup>).

Upon careful consideration, it becomes evident that Goulet's argument depends primarily on a series of tenuous hypotheses<sup>16</sup>), and that the validity of his reconstruction of both the *History* and the chronology of Eunapius' life stands or falls on his understanding of ἐν τοῖς κατ' ἐκείνον χρόνοις at VS X. 2. 3. Given their importance, it is incumbent to note that these very words have played a central role in another on-going controversy in Eunapian scholarship – whether or not the *Vitae Sophistarum*, like the *History*, also saw a νέα ἔκδοσις.

9) Sur la chronologie de la vie et des œuvres d'Eunape de Sardes, JHS 100 (1980), pp. 60–72.

10) Ibid., p. 66 with n. 42.

11) Ibid., pp. 64–67.

12) Excerpta de Sententiis 1, p. 74, ll. 21–25, and 5, p. 76, ed. Boissevain = Fragments 1 and 8, Müller, FHG, IV, p. 13, col. 2, and p. 15, col. 2–16, col. 1. Cf. the comments of Photius Bibl., Cod. 77, p. 159, ll. 9–12, ed. Henry.

13) Goulet, op. cit., pp. 61–64.

14) VS X. 1. 1, p. 63/485.

15) Goulet, op. cit., p. 72.

16) Goulet assumes that Julian's school law, Cod. Theod. XIII. 3. 5, prevented Christians from teaching the classics in any capacity; that the ages of 1–14 for a παῖς, 15–17 for an ἔφηβος, and 18 until the end of youth for a νέος are categories applicable to fourth-century A. D. Athens; and that Eunapius consistently uses these terms in this specific sense. All three assumptions are, I believe, demonstrably false.

V. Lundström<sup>17</sup>), on the basis of differences he observed during a collation of the life of Libanius in the VS with the *vita* that stands before the text in the majority of the manuscripts of Libanius' letters, first championed a second edition of Eunapius' biographies. According to Lundström, the discrepant versions of the *Vita Libanii* indicated that Georgius Lacapenus, the fourteenth-century Byzantine editor of the letters, had copied this life from the νέα ἔκδοσις of the VS and set it before his text of the epistles<sup>18</sup>). W. Kroll<sup>19</sup>), J. Vollebregt<sup>20</sup>), and G. Giangrande<sup>21</sup>) have disposed of this theory by demonstrating that the textual disparities are the products of Lacapenus himself. Vollebregt also refuted the principal argument of K. Latte<sup>22</sup>), who, having been inspired by Lundström's thesis to search the VS for internal evidence of a second edition, had alleged that the work contained two recensions of the life of Sosipatra. However, he left unchallenged an interpretation of VS X. 2. 3 far different than Goulet's that Latte thought confirmed the *Doppelfassung* theory.

Latte accepted D. Wyttenbach's linking of κατ' ἐκείνον to the preceding συγγραφέα, i. e., to Eunapius rather than Prohaeresius, along with his explanation of ἐν τοῖς . . . χρόνοις as a reference to an extended autobiographical treatment in the VS<sup>23</sup>). But, since the surviving manuscripts of that work contained no such self-appreciation, Latte took the additional step of asserting that VS X. 2. 3 proved the existence of another edition.

17) Prolegomena in Eunapii Vitas Philosophorum et Sophistarum, Vol. VI, pt. 2 of Skrifter utgivna af K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Upsala (Upsala 1897), pp. 20–35.

18) R. Förster, Libanii Opera (Leipzig 1904), I. 1, pp. 4–8, prints the life. Boissonade, followed by Wright, incorporated the readings of the Lacapenian *vita* into his text without warning the reader. Cf. VS XVI. 1–2. 10, pp. 81–85/495–496. For Lacapenus, see K. Krumbacher, Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur<sup>2</sup> (Munich 1897), I, pp. 558–560.

19) Review of Lundström in BPW 30 (July, 1898), cols. 932–934.

20) Symbola in novam Eunapii Vitarum editionem (Amsterdam 1929), pp. 6–48, esp. pp. 20–22.

21) On the 'Recensio Lacapeniana' of Eunapius' *Vitae Sophistarum*, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (1954), pp. 386–394.

22) Eine Doppelfassung in den Sophistenbiographien des Eunapios, Hermes 58 (1923), pp. 441–447. Cf. Vollebregt, op. cit., pp. 91–93.

23) Op. cit., p. 446. Wyttenbach, Annotatio ad Eunapium, Vol. II of Boissonade's original edition of the VS, Eunapii Sardiani Vitas Sophistarum et Fragmenta Historiarum (Amsterdam 1822), p. 283, comments: "Junius reddidit in Annalium historia. Equidem puto Eunapium hoc ipsum de Vitis Sophistarum opus significasse, in eoque de se quoque scripturum fuisse, quum eum ordo scriptiois ad sua tempora deduxisset. Nam ἐκείνον refertur ad συγγραφέα".

Indeed, ἐν τοῖς κατ' ἐκείνους χρόνοις does seem to suggest the *History* rather than the *VS*; but only at first glance, for a consideration of Eunapius usage strengthens the case for the latter. First, of the fifteen certain references in the *VS* to the *History*, none employs χρόνος or a synonym<sup>24</sup>). Second, phrases like ἐν τοῖς κατ' ἐκείνους χρόνοις appear repeatedly in the *VS*: Eunapius characterizes Porphyry's βίοι as extending εἰς Πλάτωνα . . . καὶ τοὺς ἐκείνου χρόνους<sup>25</sup>), and limits his subject chronologically, describing the method he uses for writing up τοὺς χρόνους<sup>26</sup>). Though verbal parallels occur in the historical fragments, the passages noted above demonstrate that the wording of *VS* X. 2. 3 does not necessarily imply the *History*, but may simply reflect Eunapius' belief that the connection between βίοι and ἱστορία was at least as strong as that between χρόνοι and ἱστορία<sup>27</sup>). Finally, there is an unambiguous reference to upcoming material in the *VS* VI. 10. 6<sup>28</sup>),

24) *VS* VII. 6. 5, p. 55/480; VIII. 2. 3, p. 59/482; X. 7. 13, p. 79/493 ἐν τοῖς διεξοδικοῖς; VII. 4. 10, p. 50/478 ἐν τοῖς διεξοδικοῖς τοῖς κατὰ Ἰουλιανόν; IX. 1. 3, p. 59/483 ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Ἰουλιανόν . . . διεξοδικοῖς; VII. 3. 4, p. 46/476 ἐν τοῖς διεξοδικοῖς τῆς ἱστορίας; VII. 3. 8, p. 47/476 ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Ἰουλιανόν βιβλίοις; XVI. 1. 9, p. 82/495 κἀν τοῖς βιβλίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὸν Ἰουλιανόν; VI. 3. 8, p. 22/464 ἐν δὲ τοῖς κατὰ τὸν θεϊότατον Ἰουλιανόν; VII. 1. 5, p. 41/473 ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Ἰουλιανόν; XXI. 1. 4, p. 88/498 ἐν τοῖς κατ' ἐκείνους (Julian); VII. 3. 7, p. 46/476 ἐν τοῖς περὶ ἐκείνους (Julian); VI. 3. 8, p. 22/464 ἐν τοῖς περὶ ἐκείνου (Constantine); VI. 11. 7, p. 39/472 ἐν τοῖς καθολικοῖς τῆς ἱστορίας συγγράμμασιν; X. 1. 1, p. 63/485 ἐν τοῖς ἱστορικοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἐξηγήσιν. *VS* VI. 11. 11, p. 40/473, ἐν τοῖς κατ' ἐκείνους (Iamblichus), may not refer to the *History*, but to an otherwise unknown work by Eunapius on that philosopher.

25) *VS* II. 1. 1, p. 2/454.

26) *Ibid.* II. 2. 6–8, p. 5/455. Cf. also *VS* IV. 3. 1, p. 10/457; X. 6. 1, p. 73/490; and XIX. 1. 1, p. 86/497. Some more idiomatic uses of χρόνος are *VS* II. 1. 5, p. 3/453; II. 1. 9, p. 4/454; VI. 1. 5, p. 18/461; VII. 4. 13, p. 51/478; IX. 1. 1, p. 59/483; X. 6. 12, p. 75/491; X. 7. 1, p. 76/492; XIV. 1. 1, p. 81/494; and XV. 1. 1, p. 81/494. Καιρός for χρόνος appears at *VS* V. 3. 1, p. 15/460; VI. 2. 8, p. 19/462; VII. 4. 12, p. 51/478; VII. 5. 2, p. 52/479; and VII. 5. 4, p. 53/479.

27) *Excerpta de Sententiis* 1, pp. 71–75; 8, pp. 77–78; 44, p. 86; 48, p. 87; 54, p. 90; 63, p. 93; 64, p. 94; 69, p. 95, ed. Boissevain, and *Excerpta de Legationibus* 7, p. 597, ed. de Boor = Müller, FHG, IV, fragments 1, 10, 45, 48, 56, 73, 74, 75. 5, and 60 respectively. The biographical emphasis of Eunapius' *History* is emphasized by Blockley, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 15–24.

28) P. 37/471. Prof. Robert J. Penella, in a letter of January 14, 1983, was kind enough to point out several references in the other direction – οὗ καὶ πρὸ βραχέος ἐπεμνήσθην, also at *VS* VI. 10. 6, p. 37/471; Μαξίμου καὶ πρότερον ἐμνήσθην, at VII. 1. 1, p. 40/473; and περὶ δὲ Προαιρεσίου καὶ προλαβοῦσιν ἱκανῶς εἰρηται, at X. 1. 1, p. 63/485 – cautioning that “These might suggest that Eunapius would make a forward reference with expressions like ‘below’, ‘in what follows’, ‘soon’”.

which, while different in form from X. 2. 3, nevertheless illustrates Eunapius' use of the method attributed to him by Latte.

How then, with the theory of two editions of the *VS* discredited, is this allusion to material not found elsewhere in the biographies to be explained, except as a cross-reference to the *History*? A possible answer is that Eunapius had planned to conclude the *VS* with his own βίος, but, for some unknown reason, was unable to do so. The abrupt end of the *VS* at the very point – the death of his teacher Chrysanthius – where Eunapius could be expected to deal with his own life, might support the interpretation<sup>29</sup>). Another possibility is that Eunapius planned a separate autobiographical work, perhaps modeled on the Ὑπόμνημα of Oribasius<sup>30</sup>) or, less likely, Libanius' Or. I<sup>31</sup>). Either alternative is preferable to believing that the *History* contained a description of Eunapius' student days at Athens that was ἀκριβέστερον than the one extant in the *VS*, especially when such an assumption entails the revision of so much seemingly sound chronology. These things considered, *VS* X. 2. 3 should play no decisive role in the discussion of cross-references between those biographies and the *History*, though, if Eunapius' death is recognized as the most likely reason for his failure to fulfill the promise of *VS* X. 2. 3, it may support advocates of a late date for the composition of the *VS*<sup>32</sup>).

Canisius College,  
Buffalo, N.Y.

Thomas M. Banchich

---

29) On the other hand, Eunapius' final words could be modeled on the conclusion of Philostratus' *VS*.

30) Oribasius' memoir was consulted by Eunapius, cf. *Excerpta de Sententiis* 5, p. 77, 1–4 = Müller, *FHG*, IV, fragment 8, p. 15, col. 2.

31) These are, of course, merely possibilities. On autobiography in late antiquity, see G. Misch, *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity*, trans. by E. W. Dickes (Westport, Conn. 1973), II, pp. 593–692.

32) As noted earlier, *supra* n. 3, we have only a *terminus post quem* for the *VS*.