

EUNAPIUS' *EPIDEMIA* IN ATHENS

Our more distinct knowledge of the career of Eunapius of Sardis is confined to its first stage, when he resided in Athens and studied under Proaeresius, the Christian from Armenia. Common agreement (with some slight variation) holds that Eunapius reached Athens *c.* 362, when he was sixteen, and that he remained there for five years, returning to Lydia *c.* 367 when he was twenty.<sup>1</sup> These conclusions derive from two passages in the *V. Soph.* in which Eunapius first described the unusual circumstances attendant on his arrival in Athens (10.1.2–2.3)<sup>2</sup> and then alluded to his departure therefrom (10.8.2).<sup>3</sup> But though the first passage is unproblematical enough, the second is less so; as will appear, the very context which includes within it the datum of the five-year-long residence in Athens carries implications which are inimical to it. Reexamination, therefore, may be profitable.

*V. Soph.* 10.8 reads as follows: 'Ιουλιανού δὲ βασιλεύοντος, τόπου (Boiss; <έν> τόπῳ Giangr.) τοῦ παιδεύειν ἐξεργόμενος (ἔδοκει γὰρ εἶναι χριστιανός) συνορών τὸν ἱεροφάντην ὥσπερ Δελφικόν τινα τρίποδα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος πρόνοιαν πᾶσι τοῖς δεομένοις ἀνακείμενον, σοφία τινὶ περιήλθε ξένη τὴν πρόγνωσιν. (2) ἐμέτρει μὲν γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὴν γῆν τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν εἰς τὸν φόρον, ὅπως μὴ βαρύνοντο · ὁ δὲ Προαιρέσιος ἡξίωσε αὐτὸν ἐκμαθεῖν παρὰ τῶν θεῶν, εἰ βέβαια μένει τὰ τῆς φιланθρωπίας. ὡς δὲ ἀπέφθην, ὁ μὲν ἔγνω τὸ πραχθῆσόμενον, καὶ ἦν εὐθυμότερος. (3) ὁ δὲ συγγραφεὺς κατὰ τουτονὶ τὸν χρόνον ἐς ἕκτον πού καὶ δέκατον ἔτος τελῶν, παρήλθεν τε εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ τοῖς ὁμιληταῖς ἐγκατεμίγη· καὶ ἀγαπηθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καθάπερ παῖς γνήσιος, ἡπείγετο μὲν μετὰ πέμπτον ἔτος εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον, οἱ δὲ πατέρες καλοῦντες ἐπὶ Λυδίας ἐξεβιάσαντο · κἀκείνῳ μὲν σοφιστικὴ προὔκειτο, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο ἐξεκάλουν ἅπαντες. (4) Προαιρέσιος δὲ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀνεχώρει μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας · τοσοῦτος καὶ τοιοῦτος γενόμενος καὶ διαπλήσας τῶν ἑαυτοῦ λόγων τε καὶ ὁμιλητῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην.

If this account is correctly preserved, it is curiously lopsided. For we must bear in mind that it functions as the concluding paragraph of the *vita* of Proaeresius and as *such* is surprisingly perfunctory. For how else are we to judge the omission of direct information about Proaeresius' return to teaching after the ban was rescinded, not to mention the utter silence about the details of the last five years of his life? These years, after all, did not constitute the orderly and uneventful passage of a humdrum academic existence. Proaeresius, as Eunapius has made it a point to affirm, had just

<sup>1</sup> The traditional view is represented by, among others, W. Schmid, *RE* vi.1 col. 1121, *PLRE* i.296, F. Paschoud, *Cinq études sur Zosime* (Paris, 1975), p. 169. R. Goulet, *JHS* 100 (1980), 60ff., has argued with some probability that the formula *τελῶν εἰς ἕκτον καὶ δέκατον ἔτος* (*V. Soph.* 10.1.2) means that Eunapius was still in his sixteenth year, had not yet reached his sixteenth birthday, when he arrived at Athens. For a thorough study of the problems involving the dating-formulae the reader should consult A. E. Baker, *Eunapius and Zosimus* (Diss. Providence, 1987), pp 1ff., 103ff. Goulet further argued that Eunapius commenced study with Proaeresius after the rescission of the decree against the Christians passed by Julian on 11 January 364 (*CTh.* 13.3.6), and he has been followed by R. C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire* (Liverpool, 1983), i.ix (Addendum) with p. 1, and A. D. Booth, *AHB* 1 (1987), 14f.

<sup>2</sup> The text is that of J. Giangrande (Rome, 1956).

<sup>3</sup> The approximate absolute dates are supplied by the critical intersection of Eunapius' career with the ban from teaching suffered by Proaeresius in consequence of Julian's edict of 17 June 362 (*CTh.* 13.3.5 with Jerome, *Chron.* s.a.362).

suffered a terrible fate by being excluded from his role as the teacher of his students by becoming a martyr to his religion. We therefore await the dropping of the second shoe – but never hear its fall. Instead of telling us of the rehabilitation of Proaeresius, this text at best casually implies it, if that is what it does, in the phrase *μετὰ πέμπτων ἔτος*, a piece of information which bears not on Proaeresius but on the writer, Eunapius himself. Therefore, when we blandly assume that the temporal reference satisfactorily covers the epochal event of Proaeresius' return and resumption of teaching,<sup>4</sup> the question arises whether our hunger for data may not have rendered us somewhat less exacting than we normally make it a rule to be. If the life of Eunapius were here under description, the assumption would be permissible that the succinct reference to the five-year period carried the implications we are prone to assume. But the major character of this portion of the narrative is Proaeresius, not Eunapius, and our natural expectation must be that if Proaeresius returned to active duty after the catastrophe, we ought to have been directly so informed.

It is striking, moreover, that the sequence of ideas presented in *V. Soph.* 10.8 follows smoothly and with cogency if the phrase about the five-year interval be disregarded. The passage as a whole then becomes logically consequent, rounding out the *vita* by connecting Proaeresius' exit from teaching with Eunapius' departure from Athens and Proaeresius' death shortly thereafter. For it is easy to understand why Eunapius was led to contemplate another location for himself when his teacher was precluded from his duties, and in this context, reference to his departure is suitably motivated. On the other hand, it is difficult to see how Eunapius, had he continued on for five years at the feet of his master, could have left him on his deathbed merely because he wanted to travel to Egypt. Ordinary piety should have kept him in Athens, while reference to his decision in this context is tasteless.<sup>5</sup>

Read, therefore, *μετάπεμπος* for *μετὰ πέμπτων ἔτος*. The mistake (if mistake there was) can easily have come about, whether initiated by the careless duplication of the last syllable or by the resolution of *μετάπεμπος* into its component parts as if they were separate words. In the first case, *μετάπεμπος* became *μεταπεμποστος* (cf. the Laurentianus' *θεραπευσασιν* for *θεραπεύσασιν* in 20.4, *βάσανανσαν* for *βάνανσαν* in 23.4.8), which was then 'corrected' by the addition of an *epsilon* and the adjustment of cases; in the alternative, *μετάπεμπος* was written as two separate words (cf. Laurentianus' *παρα βασιλεως ὦν* for *παραβασιλεύων* in 7.3.6, *συμφέρεται* for *συμφέρει τε* in 21.1.1, *ὁ λόγος* for *ὁλος* in 23.5.1), inviting the addition of *ἔτος* by easy inference. On this hypothesis, Eunapius was 'summoned' from Athens, *arcessitus*, when the ban on his teacher put an end to his prospects in the university city.<sup>6</sup> Eunapius was called home to Lydia by his parents, though he had his own ideas,

<sup>4</sup> e.g. *PLRE* i.731; Goulet's argument (see n. 1 above) that Eunapius commenced his association with Proaeresius after the latter's exclusion and return is, if possible, even more repugnant to the sense of 10.8.3 and the weight we may reasonably allow *μετὰ πέμπτων ἔτος* to bear.

<sup>5</sup> That Proaeresius literally was on his deathbed when Eunapius took his leave, is, of course, improbable. We must distinguish, however, between the actual sequence of events (whatever it may have been) and Eunapius' *presentation* of it, and we should assume that he anticipated the probable effect of what he wrote. To link the five years with Proaeresius to his decision to leave Athens and then to connect this sequence with the notice of Proaeresius' death 'not many *days* later' ineptly and gratuitously conveys the impression of heartlessness.

<sup>6</sup> Eunapius has *ἦσαν μετάπεμποι* in 7.4.4, *ἐτύγχανε... μετάπεμπος ὑπό* in 10.7.1. The usage suggested here conforms with that of Herodotus 8.67.2, *ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπικόμενος προΐζετο, παρήσαν μετάπεμποι οἱ... τύραννοι καὶ ταξίαρχοι ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν*. Compare Thucydides 6.74.1: *Ἀλκιβιάδης γὰρ ὅτ' ἀπῆει ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἤδη μετάπεμπος*, where (of course) the clause beginning with *ἐκ* attaches to *ἀπῆει*, not *μετάπεμπος* (Classen-Steup ad loc.). The need

centring on a trip to Egypt – perhaps to study medicine in Alexandria, where Claudianus, the brother of Maximus, was ensconced (7.1.4).<sup>7</sup> But his parents had set their hearts on his continuing his education at home, if not at Athens, with Chrysanthius, if not with Proaeresius, in order to become a sophist.<sup>8</sup> The words which immediately follow – *κακέινω μὲν σοφιστικὴ προὔκειτο καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο ἐξέκαλουν ἅπαντες* – thus acquire a proper force.<sup>9</sup> The disruption occasioned by Proaeresius' misfortune was not to be allowed to interfere with the parental plans.

The view presented here is fully consistent with the language used by Eunapius to describe his relationship with Chrysanthius while, *per contra*, the same language does not square with the assumption that Eunapius had invested five or six years of his life under the tutelage of Proaeresius. For Eunapius credits Chrysanthius in 23.1.1 with the responsibility for his education: *τὸν τε γράφοντα ταῦτα πεπαιδευκῶς ἐκ παιδός*.<sup>10</sup> *ἐκ παιδός*, 'from boyhood', implies continuity, while that in turn inevitably suggests that the association in Athens with Proaeresius was regarded by Eunapius rather as an interlude in his education than as its major component part. Hence the propriety of his designation of Chrysanthius as 'his teacher' in 5.1.11: *εἰς δὲ τὸν ταῦτα γράφοντα ἦλθεν (οὗτος ὁ λόγος) παρὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου Χρυσανθίου τοῦ ἐκ Σαρδέων*.

When, on the other hand, we seek for counter-indications, there is little to find, and nothing decisive. It is perhaps needless to state that Eunapius' claim to have heard Diophantus and Sopolis *πολλάκις* (12.2, 13.1) is compatible with a year-long sojourn in Athens. Nor do chronological conclusions follow from the mutual affection of Eunapius and Proaeresius. It began warm even before they met because of the unusual circumstances surrounding Eunapius' arrival; as Proaeresius said, before they met, *πέπονθα τι... ἐπὶ τῷ σωθέντι παιδίῳ* (10.2.2). Of itself, Proaeresius' special treatment of Eunapius at that point was enough to engender reciprocal feelings in

for *ὑπό* (as in *V. Soph.* 10.7.1) is obviated by the logic of the sentence. I take it that in the (reconstructed) sentence of Eunapius the *μὲν* and *δέ* contrast *ἡπείγετο* with *ἐξεβιάσαντο* while *μετάπεμptos* qualifies and orients the sentence as a whole.

<sup>7</sup> Medicine was virtually *professio altera* to Eunapius (see, e.g. *V. Soph.* 23.6.3–7, and Oribasius, *Libri ad Eunapium: Nuncupatio*, ed. Raeder, *CMG* vi.3, pp. 317f., reprinted by Giangrande, pp. xxxvii–xxxviii). Eunapius' interest perhaps commenced as a result of the miraculous recovery of his health under the treatment of Aeschines, whom he tells us that he revered (10.1.11–14). The association of Maximus and Chrysanthius ultimately was based on their possession (in common with Proaeresius) of Aedesius as their teacher. If the study of medicine attracted Eunapius at this point in his career (now that his hopes regarding Proaeresius had collapsed), study with one other member of this tightly-knit group was an obvious possibility.

<sup>8</sup> A family connection (7.4.5) tied Eunapius to the profession through Chrysanthius.

<sup>9</sup> The words 'a sophistic career had been prescribed for him' appear to indicate that the trip to Egypt involved the choice of some other profession, an idea his parents rejected. But other explanations are conceivable.

<sup>10</sup> cf. 23.3.15: *τὸν δὲ ταῦτα γράφοντα ἐκπαιδεύσας νέον ἔτι ὄντα, ἥνικα ἐπανήλθεν Ἀθήνηθεν, οὐκ ἔλαττον ἡγάπα κτλ.* The expressions *ἐκπαιδεύσας* and *νέον ἔτι ὄντα*, though they do not speak decisively for any view, nevertheless better suit a brief interlude in Athens than five years of study under one who, in that case, should properly have been regarded by Eunapius as the *διδάσκαλος* of record. The fact must be faced that Eunapius does not designate himself as the student of Proaeresius when *μετὰ πέμπτῳ ἔτος* would not only justify it but should require it. Diophantus was the *διδάσκαλος* of Libanius (*V. Soph.* 16.1.3) although Libanius studied in Athens for only three years and, as Eunapius attests, rarely approached his master. Piety toward Chrysanthius is not compatible with ingratitude to Proaeresius. Eunapius' sweeping assertions of the primacy of Chrysanthius are by themselves enough to sink the notion of a five-year-long residency in Athens.

Eunapius who, of course, came from Lydia all primed to venerate a student of Aedesius.<sup>11</sup>

On the other hand, the *vita* of Himerius might appear to imply a somewhat more lengthy residence in Athens on Eunapius' part than we would wish to allow. Eunapius explains in 14.1 that he never met this sophist because Himerius went off to declaim before the emperor Julian: οὐκ ἔγνω δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ ταῦτα γράφων· καὶ τοί γε ἦν κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους. ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα διαβὰς Ἰουλιανὸν κατ' ἐπίδειξιν, ὥς, διὰ τὴν ἐς Προαιρέσιον ἀχθηδὸνα τοῦ βασιλέως, ἀσμένως ὀφθησόμενος, Ἰουλιανοῦ καταλείποντος τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, ἐνδιέτριψε τῇ ἀποδημίᾳ, καὶ, Προαιρεσίου τελευτήσαντος, Ἀθήναζε ἤπειγέτο. But though this sentence might suggest that a substantial period of time separated the deaths of Julian and Proaeresius, ἐνδιέτριψε is not the proper word to describe a self-imposed exile of five years in duration. The passage proves only that Proaeresius survived Julian and, therefore, that he still lived after 26 June 363. But there is no compelling reason, if we read μετὰπεμπτos, to compress events drastically. Eunapius certainly did not leave Athens on 18 June 362; many months may have passed while he waited on events, for Athens was the place to be for a man of his ideas. Eunapius is also vague about the distance in time separating his departure from the death of Proaeresius, which could have occurred after, as well as before, the date of the repudiation of Julian's anti-Christian decree (11 January 364), though the context of 10.8 certainly suggests that it came sooner rather than later. In this connection, the implication is more serious that Himerius would not have avoided Athens after Julian's death unless Proaeresius had recommenced his teaching. But we are not compelled to treat the anecdote quite so laboriously. It is, after all, nothing more than a malicious inference on the part of Eunapius the precondition of which is simply the fact that Himerius returned to Athens after the death of Proaeresius cleared the way. The sequence, properly or not, suggested that Himerius was jealous of Proaeresius. The anecdote is therefore of a type which can have suggested itself in retrospect whether or not Proaeresius died before or after the date of the rescission of the ban. In that case, it is immaterial to the anecdote that in fact Proaeresius was prevented by death from returning to the θρόνος παιδευτικός.

In *V. Soph.* 7.4.10–13, another passage requiring our attention, Eunapius mentions (in the context of the *Life* of Maximus) the arrest of Maximus and Priscus by Valentinian and Valens and states with some emphasis that at that time (no earlier than summer 364) Priscus was completely exonerated: ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Πρίσκος οὐδὲν ὑποστὰς δεινόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσμαρτυρηθεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἶναι καὶ γεγενῆσθαι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον, ἐπανήλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα· (13) καὶ ὁ ταῦτα γράφων ἐπαιδεύετο κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους παῖς ὢν καὶ εἰς ἐφήβους ἄρτι τελών. Now although it is commonly assumed (on the basis of μετὰ πέμπτων ἔτος in 10.8.3) that Eunapius was in Athens when this event occurred, the question for us is whether this passage independently requires that assumption, and the answer, assuredly, is in the negative. Eunapius here provides his readers direct information about his *age*, not his location. He did so in order to affirm, on the basis of his own recollection, that Priscus was completely exonerated. The exoneration of Priscus was, apparently, an important matter to Eunapius (he alludes to it again in 8.1.10); perhaps it became a subject of debate in later times, when Eunapius was writing the *V. Soph.* Quite possibly, rumour lumped Priscus together with Maximus. In any event, in order to place this issue

<sup>11</sup> Chrysanthius had studied with Aedesius as a νέος (23.1.5), spending what does not appear to have been many years with him (23.1.10). 23.3.15 (quoted in the preceding note) establishes the fact that Chrysanthius had instructed Eunapius prior to the latter's trip to Athens as well as after it.

beyond doubt he deliberately named himself as a witness to the event, providing his approximate age so as to guarantee that he was *αἰσθανόμενος τῇ ἡλικίᾳ*, as it were, and thus in a position to affirm in his own person that Priscus was indeed fully vindicated. His location at the time, at Athens or Sardis, is irrelevant to this contention – which probably is why Eunapius left it unspecified.<sup>12</sup> But the inference that he was in Athens in 364 is unnecessary and, indeed, justifiable only by circular anticipation of *μετὰ πέμπτον ἔτος* in 10.8.3. Eunapius did not cease from his studies when he left Athens, and the language he used to describe his age is not peculiarly appropriate to his residence in Athens.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, 7.4.10–13, when taken (as it must) in isolation from 10.8.3, neither confirms nor denies Eunapius' presence in Athens or elsewhere; it simply informs us of his relative age (*παῖς ὧν καὶ εἰς ἐφήβους ἄρτι τελῶν*) when he observed the restoration of honour to Priscus in summer 364.

Finally, *V. Soph.* 7.3.1–2 warrants our attention. The idea has been advanced<sup>14</sup> (combining 6.1.6 with 7.3.1–2) that in 365–6, when Eunapius allegedly was twenty, he was initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries (and therefore was still a resident of Athens at that time). This inference, however, is based on an erroneous assumption. As Goulet recognized,<sup>15</sup> these passages are substantively unconnected with each other. 6.1.6 forms the conclusion of a paragraph in which Eunapius spoke of the association of Aedesius and Iamblichus (6.1.4–6). The point is made that Aedesius hung on his words and listened to him insatiably until finally Aedesius became virtually another Iamblichus in all spheres except that of prophetic divination (*θειασμός*). On this subject Eunapius has nothing to report of Aedesius, and he conjectures that the reason might be Aedesius' caution or the reverential nature of the subject. In part proof of this assertion (*γούν*) Eunapius affirms that he himself was not deemed worthy to learn these 'higher truths' until his twentieth year: *ὁ γούν ταῦτα γράφων ἐκ παιδὸς ἀκροατῆς Χρυσανθίου γενόμενος, μόλις εἰς εἰκοστὸν ἔτος ἤξιούτο τῶν ἀληθεστέρων, οὕτω μέγα τι χρήμα εἰς ἡμᾶς τῆς Ἰαμβλίχου φιλοσοφίας διετάρη καὶ συμπαρέτεινε τῷ χρόνῳ*. Consequently, as the context makes clear, the higher truths are those of prophetic divination passed down by Iamblichus to Aedesius and, through him, to Chrysanthius and, ultimately, to Eunapius. No reference to the Eleusinian Mysteries is intended. Indeed, the necessary inference from 6.1.6 fully confirms the argument presented here. Eunapius was back in Lydia studying with Chrysanthius at age nineteen.

*V. Soph.* 7.3.1–2 unfortunately is vague about the time of Eunapius' initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries. Here Eunapius wrote that Julian (before becoming Caesar) visited the hierophant of the Two Goddesses; he adds that he considers it improper to name this priest: *ἐτέλει γὰρ τὸν ταῦτα γράφοντα, καὶ εἰς Εὐμολπίδας ἦγε*.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup> This passage would be rather more susceptible to the usual interpretation if Eunapius had pointed it differently. If he had, for instance, told us that Priscus returned to Athens (not to Greece), we might well infer a different train of ideas, e.g. that after Priscus was vindicated, he came to Athens and was met there by Eunapius who at that time was studying in the city. This, however, is precluded by the logic of the passage, which it would be arbitrary to constrain on the basis of the subsequent and unconnected passage of 10.8.3.

<sup>13</sup> That the Athenian ephebate is irrelevant was recognized by Goulet, *JHS* 100 (1980), 62, though his own view of Eunapius' age at this juncture is unacceptable. In general, see A. Baker on this matter (cited in n. 1 above).

<sup>14</sup> *PLRE* i.296.

<sup>15</sup> *JHS* 100 (1980), 63 n. 30.

<sup>16</sup> Giangrande would read *ἐσῆγε*, 'nam inter Eumolpidas inscripsit dicere voluit auctor'. But the sense of *ἦγε* required is one which will contrast the credentials of the (Eumolpid) hierophant with those of his successor, who was not even an Athenian, much less a Eumolpid. Cf. *κατάγω*

Eunapius then describes a prophecy delivered by the same priest in Eunapius' presence foretelling his succession in office by a priest who was 'not even an Athenian' and, worse yet, the devotee of another religion (7.3.2) – Mithra's, as it turned out (7.3.4). The hierophant asserted that his unworthy replacement would look upon the destruction of the temples and the ruin of Greece. This is not the place to discuss so notoriously controversial a passage;<sup>17</sup> it is enough to observe here that it supplies no date for Eunapius' initiation. Moreover, the hasty assumption<sup>18</sup> that this prophecy must have been uttered between 362 and 366–7 would not follow even if *μετὰ πέμπτου ἔτος* were transmitted correctly. We do not know how many times Eunapius visited Greece, though there is, perhaps, some slight indication of his presence in Constantinople between 367 and 371.<sup>19</sup> But the surest sign of Eunapius' presence in Eleusis well after 366 is lodged in the prophecy to which he bore witness. For we must not allow the marvels related in the *Vitae Sophistarum* to mesmerize us into believing that the hierophant was actually gifted with the Second Sight. Knowledge of the times commencing after Julian's death together with prescience *κατ' ἀνθρώπινον* plausibly explain the hierophant's pessimism. But the specific allusion to events which in fact took place between 385 and 395 cannot reasonably be assigned to the sixties.<sup>20</sup> It presupposes the prior assessment of Theodosius' domestic policy as well as the somewhat earlier emergence of the Huns in 376 – the immediate cause of the turmoil culminating with Alaric and the invasion of 395. Probability dictates, therefore, that the hierophant ventured on his prediction sometime around 380. Thus we may assume at least a second visit to Athens (and Eleusis) by Eunapius more than a decade after his first voyage to the city.<sup>21</sup>

The value of the preceding arguments, if they are cogent, is the assurance they provide that *μετάπεμπος* is substantively as well as palaeographically the suitable replacement of the problematical *μετὰ πέμπτου ἔτος* of *V. Soph.* 10.8.3. On that assumption, certainly, the chronology of Eunapius' *ἐπιδημία* is radically simplified. We may combine 14.1 with 10.1.2 and 10.8.3. The first passage of the three guarantees

LSJ s.v. 8. But *ἐξ Εὐμολπιδῶν ἡχθη*, the least violent correction, for *ἐς Εὐμολπίδας ἦγε* (the reading of Laurentianus) does not satisfy.

<sup>17</sup> I shall discuss this elsewhere in connection with the date and contents of the 'first installment' of Eunapius' historical work.

<sup>18</sup> See, e.g. Blockley, *op. cit.* (n. 1 above), i.4.

<sup>19</sup> Eunapius saw the famous thaumaturge and philosopher, Maximus, when he was 'still young' (*νέος ἔτι*, the same phrase he used to describe his own age *after* his return from Athens to Lydia: 23.3.5, quoted above in n. 10) and Maximus was an old man (7.1.1). He further implies (7.1.2–3) that he observed Maximus when engaged in philosophical discussion. The likely context for such scenes was Constantinople between 367 and 371 (7.6.1–2), a period of rare tranquillity in Maximus' otherwise turbulent life and one, moreover, which harmonizes with Eunapius' self-description.

<sup>20</sup> For the destruction of the temples (about 385) see A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1964), i.167, ii.1101 (nn. 75, 76).

<sup>21</sup> A similar conclusion would follow if it were certain that Eunapius' hierophant, the penultimate in the series, was that Nestorius whom Zosimus 4.18.3 describes as *ὑπέργρηρων* and active in Athens shortly after the death of Valentinian in 375. For then we would be impelled to date the prophecy no earlier than the seventies. The precision with which the hierophant describes his successor requires that he was privy, directly or indirectly, to deliberations concerning his replacement. The natural occasion for such discussions can only have come very late in the life of the aged hierophant. But the evidence is much too uncertain to support any such conclusion, accepted though it is by Blockley, *op. cit.* (n. 1), i.4. Zosimus 4.18 is at least in part a doublet of 5.6; and on Zosimus' own authority (4.18.4) we know that he inserted this material into his own account because he thought it 'suitable to the context'. That he has correctly interpolated Syrianus' *ὑμνος* is impossible to believe.

Eunapius' presence in Athens between December 361 and May 362;<sup>22</sup> the second informs us that Eunapius was in his sixteenth year, when, after the autumnal equinox, he arrived at Athens; the third correlates his possession of the same age with the ban on Proaeresius and his own departure from Athens. These passages, taken in combination, yield the information that at least the significant part<sup>23</sup> of Eunapius' stay in Athens fell between autumn 361 and July 362.<sup>24</sup>

*Brown University*

CHARLES W. FORNARA

<sup>22</sup> The Greek is quoted above p. 520. If Eunapius was precluded from meeting Himerius because Himerius left Athens to orate before Julian it follows inevitably that their paths would have crossed in Athens if Himerius had remained there instead. The fact that Himerius approached Julian when he was *αὐτοκράτωρ* confirms what otherwise could be safely presumed, namely, that Himerius proceeded to Constantinople. For the date of Julian's arrival at that city see Ammianus 22.2.4; for his departure see Ammianus 22.9.2 with Seeck, *Hermes* 41 (1906), 514.

<sup>23</sup> It is noteworthy that Eunapius employs the particle *πou* in 10.8.3, when he gives his age *κατὰ τουτονὶ τὸν χρόνον*. Since one is either in one's sixteenth year or one is not, *πou* must have been intended to cover a slight imprecision. Such usage would be justified if Eunapius celebrated his sixteenth birthday not long before his departure from Athens.

<sup>24</sup> It is a pleasure for me to express here my immense gratitude to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation for the generosity which allows me to spend the current academic year (1988–9) in research while on leave of absence from Brown.