Eunapius and Jerome

Thomas M. Banchich

JEROME'S *Chronicle* has played no small part in modern reconstructions of imperial Roman historiography. Besides figuring in several divergent hypotheses regarding the publication and sources of the *Res Gestae* of Ammianus Marcellinus, it has revealed to some a spectre lurking behind the *Historia Augusta*, the *Epitome de Caesaribus*, and Zosimus' *Historia Nova*, which alternatively manifests itself as Virius Nicomachus Flavianus or Eunapius of Sardis.[1] Yet in the case of the latter, a common source long seemed the most reasonable explanation for similarities between the *Chronicle* and Eunapius' two known works, the *History* and *Vitae sophistarum*: for Jerome's translation and continuation of Eusebius had certainly appeared before 383—indeed, very probably closer to 381—while both the *History* and *Vitae sophistarum* were thought to have been published *ca* 396.[2] It has only been since T. D. Barnes' effort to demonstrate that a version of

[1] The classic *Quellenforschungen* of the *Chronicle* remain R. Helm, *RhM* N.F. 76 (1927) 138–70, 254–306, and *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*[2] (Berlin 1956) 279–455. On Ammianus see especially O. Maenchen-Helfen, *AJP* 76 (1955) 384–99; R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford 1968) 17–24, 80–83, with the review of A. Cameron, *JRS* 61 (1971) 255–67; R. C. Blockley, *Ammianus Marcellinus* (= *Coll. Latomus* 141 [Brussels 1975]) 177–82. J. Schlumberger, *Die Epitome de Caesaribus* (= *Vestigia* 18 [Munich 1974]), argues for the influence of Nicomachus' *Annales* on the *Historia Augusta*, Zosimus (via Eunapius), various Latin epitomes, and Jerome's *Chronicle*; T. D. Barnes, *CP* 71 (1976) 258–68, and *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (= *Coll.Latomus* 155 [1978]) 114–23, champions Eunapius. On the related matter of the *Kaisergeschichte*, see A. Enmann, *Philologus* Suppl. 4 (1884) 335–501; T. D. Barnes, *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1968/69* (Bonn 1970) 13–43; H. W. Bird, *CQ* N.S. 23 (1973) 375–77, and *Sextus Aurelius Victor: A Historiographical Study* (Liverpool 1984).

[2] In his proem, Jerome describes the rapidity with which he worked (2.16–3.4 Helm) and names Gratian and Theodosius *Augusti* (7.3–9). *Ep.* 18A1 (I 55.23–26 Labourt), written before the Council of Constantinople in spring 381, refers to the translation of Eusebius as complete. See further J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome* (New York 1975) 72–75. Eunap. *VS* 476 (46.4–6 Giangrande) and 482 (58.22–25), which mention Alaric's invasion of Greece in 395/6, provide a *terminus post quem* for these biographies that has sometimes been presented as a date of publication. In fact Eunapius seems to have written the *VS ca* 399, a date that undermines the chronology proposed by F. Paschoud, *Cinq études sur Zosime* (Paris 1976) 169–80, and *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1977/78* (Bonn 1980) 149–62. See T. M. Banchich, *GRBS* (1984) 183–92. Paschoud advances no new positive arguments in *Bonner Historia Augusta Colloquium 1982/83* (Bonn 1985) 239–303, esp. 284–92.

the *History* was in circulation by *ca* 380 that Jerome's direct dependence on Eunapius has become a possible alternative to a *fons communis*, an alternative that suggestive parallels between the *Chronicle* and *History* seem to support.[3]

Indeed, there are numerous correspondences to Eunapius in Jerome's continuation (which begins with 325). Those that antedate 362 are of limited value for the matter at hand, because Eunapius derived his account of pre-Julianic affairs from published literary sources, any of which might be posited as a link between the two works.[4] Such is not the case with regard to material from 362 to 378, Barnes' suggested *terminus* of an ἔκδοσις of the *History* and the known *terminus* of the *Chronicle*. For that period Eunapius avers that he combined his own observations with the privileged oral or especially-prepared written testimony of a coterie of eastern pagan intellectuals, of which he was a junior member. The distinctive, sometimes unique, result is reflected in the historical fragments, the *Vitae sophistarum*, and the derivative *Historia nova* of Zosimus.[5] If we provisionally accept Barnes' thesis that an ἔκδοσις of the *History* ended with Valens' defeat at Adrianople (9 August 378), then the singular quality of Eunapius' treatment of 362–378, together with the relatively brief interval between its publication and that of the *Chronicle* (from 381 to mid-383), enhances the possibility that the influence of the *History* may be seen in those points of contact between Eunapius and Jerome that occur in their accounts of 362–378 and are not paralleled in extant sources perhaps consulted by Jerome.

[3] Barnes (*supra* n.1) maintains that the *History* broke off *ca* 378 and was published *ca* 380. R. C. BLOCKLEY, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire* (Liverpool 1981–83 [hereafter 'Blockley']) I 2–5, modifies Barnes' thesis to include an initial version of the *History* that covered Aurelian through Julian, followed by a supplement that ended with Adrianople, and, after the publication of the *VS*, a final installment that brought the narrative up to 404. The older view of the chronology of Eunapius' work is conveniently represented by C. Müller, *FHG* IV 8 col.2.

[4] Some noteworthy coincidences are *Chron.* 232a Helm and Zos. 2.29.2, on Constantine's disposal of Fausta; 232g and *VS* 462 (19.22–20.15), on the alleged denudation of provincial cities during the foundation of Constantinople; 233b and *VS* 461 (18.5–7), on Constantine's destruction of pagan temples; and 234c and *VS* 463f (20.22–23.14), on Ablabius. Another possible link is 232h, on Metrodorus, for which see B. H. Warmington, *CQ* N.S. 31 (1981) 464–68.

[5] Eunapius' method of handling sources for events prior to *ca* 362 may be inferred from *VS* 453 (2.6–13) and frr.30 (Blockley II 48) and 41 (II 58), and is reflected in the similarities between fr.5.1 (II 12) and Eutrop. *Brev.* 9.19. *Cf.* also fr.18.6 (II 24–28) and Peter the Patrician fr.18 (*FHG* IV 191), though Peter is generally held without good reason to depend on Eunapius rather than on Eunapius' source. For Eunapius' approach to contemporary history see frr.15, 30, 66.1f, and 71.2. (II 20, 48, 100–02, and 114), together with Blockley's remarks (I 22–25).

Of the four notices from the *Chronicle* that satisfy the above criteria, the first, set in 363, involves Eunapius' teacher Prohaeresius, who appears both in the *History* and *Vitae sophistarum*: *Prohaeresius sofista Atheniensis lege data, ne XPiana liberalium artium doctores essent, cum sibi specialiter Iulianus concederet, ut XPianus doceret, scholam sponte deseruit.*[6] Now, apart from Jerome, Eunapius alone mentions Prohaeresius' predicament (493): Ἰουλιανοῦ δὲ βασιλεύοντος, <ἐν> τόπῳ τοῦ παιδεύειν ἐξειργόμενος (ἐδόκει γὰρ εἶναι χριστιανός) .... If Boissonade's emendation of τόπῳ to τόπου is correct, τόπου τοῦ παιδεύειν should refer to the place where Prohaeresius taught as holder of a πολιτικὸς θρόνος—*i.e.*, to his *schola*; Giangrande's conjecture, <ἐν> τόπῳ, "on the spot," is hardly irreconcilable with Jerome's wording. More problematic is Jerome's claim that Prohaeresius willingly abandoned his school in spite of an imperial dispensation that would have allowed him to continue to teach in an official capacity, a point not noted in the *Vitae sophistarum*. It is, of course, possible that Eunapius dealt with this matter in the *History*, but this is little more than hypothesis.[7] Whatever the explanation of this particular, more important is the very fact that Jerome, with numerous examples of Christian suffering and sacrifice under Julian at hand, chose Prohaeresius; for, if the entry does derive from a literary source, Eunapius' *History* is the only known candidate.[8]

A second point of contact between the *Chronicle* and the *History* concerns the sophist Libanius. In a brief notice for 368 (*Chron.* 245g: *Libanius Antiochenus rhetor insignis habetur*) Jerome seems to allude to a revival of Libanius' prestige that elicited from Valentinian and Valens the offer of an honorary prefecture. That the overture was made, and that Libanius refused the title, is recorded only in a section of the *Vitae sophistarum* expressly said to reproduce material from the *History*, though the historicity and date of the episode may be inferred from Libanius' orations and letters themselves.[9] Thus, if Jerome's comment was provoked by a literary source, we are once more confronted with a reflection in the *Chronicle* of an incident known to us only through Eunapius.

[6] *Chron.* 242f. *Cf.* Eunap. fr.26.2 (II 38), *VS* 485 (63.16–18) and esp. 493 (79.5–11).

[7] *VS* 493 (79.5f with *apparatus*). T. M. Banchich, *JHS* 107 (1987, forthcoming), analyzes the passage within the context of a critique of R. Goulet, *JHS* 100 (1980) 60–72.

[8] *Pace PLRE* I 731 *s.v.* "Proaeresius," Oros. 7.30.3 (Zangemeister, *CSEL* 5.509.18–510.4), makes no mention of Prohaeresius: *aperto tamen praecepit edicto, ne quis Christianus docendorum liberalium studiorum professor esset. sed tamen, sicut a maioribus nostris compertum habemus, omnes ubique propemodum praecepti condiciones amplexati officium quam fidem deserere maluerunt.*

[9] *VS* 496 (84.21–85.3), on which see T. M. Banchich, *Phoenix* 39 (1985) 384–86.

A third relevant entry records: *Valentinianus in Brittania, antequam tyrannidem invaderet, oppressus* (*Chron.* 246c). Both the year, 371, and the name, Valentinianus, are mistakes, for Valentinus was overthrown in 369. Significantly Zosimus, too, substitutes Valentinianus for Valentinus, and that in a section of the *Historia nova* whose chronological inexactiude betrays its Eunapian origin.[10] Here, then, the category of common error points again towards the *History*.

Finally, there appears under the year 373: *Clearchus praefectus urbi Constantinopoli agnoscitur. a quo necessaria et diu expectata votis aqua civitati inducitur*.[11] It has been suggested that this reference to Clearchus' construction of baths was inspired by Jerome's own observations during his sojourn in Constantinople (*ca* 379/80–381).[12] Several factors, however, intimate Eunapius. First, Ammianus Marcellinus links the same *lavacrum* to the discovery of an oracle that prophesied disastrous barbarian incursions (31.1.4f). Socrates Scholasticus explicitly names Clearchus in the same context, and the incident excited the notice of several later writers.[13] Admittedly the story occurs neither in the fragments of the *History* nor in the *Vitae sophistarum*. Nevertheless, Clearchus does have an especially prominent place in the latter—apart from Jerome and several letters of Libanius, his only appearance in contemporary literature.[14] In addition, both the *History* as we have it and the *Vitae sophistarum* testify to Eunapius' fondness for oracles.[15] If a literary source prompted Jerome's entry, it is reasonable to assume that that source made the connection between Clearchus, the baths, and the ominous oracle, the last of which Jerome might have thought best to pass over in silence. What we know of Eunapius leads us to suspect that he would have dealt with the

[10] Zos. 4.12.2: κατὰ τόνδε τὸν χρόνον Οὐαλεντινιανός, διά τινα πλημμελήματα τὴν Βρεττανικὴν νῆσον οἰκεῖν κελευσθείς, ἐπιθέμενος τυραννίδι συναπέθετο ταύτῃ τὸν βίον. Βαλεντινιανῷ δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ νόσος ἐνέσκηψεν, ἥτις αὐτὸν παρὰ βραχὺ τοῦ βίου μετέστησεν. Amm. Marc. 28.3.3–6 is correct. Jordanes *Romana* 308 (39.25f Mommsen: *quo tunc regnante alter Valentinianus in Brittania tyrannidem adsumens in continenti oppressus est*) comes from Jerome, as noted by Mommsen, *MGH AA* I xxvi. Likewise *Romana* 309 (39.32f: *sed apoplexia subito et sanguinis eruptione Bregitione defunctus est*) derives fom *Chron.* 247h (*Valentinianus subita sanguinis eruptione, quod Graece apoplexis vocatur, Brigitione moritur*), which may betray a Greek source.

[11] *Chron.* 247b. For Clearchus' career, see *PLRE* I 211f.

[12] Kelly (*supra* n.2) 72.

[13] Soc. *HE* 4.8; Cassiod. *HE* 7.21; Cedrenus 1.542f; Zonar. 13.16.29–36 (Büttner-Wobst, *CSHB* 46.79.12–81.2); Niceph. Call. *HE* 11.4 (Migne, *PG* 145.593–95). See further E. Patzig, *BZ* 6 (1897) 341f.

[14] *VS* 479f (52.4–54.1). Though the omen does not appear in the appropriate contexts provided by *VS* 480 (55.2–5) and Zos. 4.21, it is significant that contexts exist at all.

[15] *E.g.* frr.27.7, 28.4, 6 (II 40, 42, 44); *VS* 464 (23.15–24.13).

incident in the *History*, precisely the work towards which the other, less equivocal, passages of the *Chronicle* examined above point.

Jerome's account of secular events in his *Epistula ad Heliodorum* (*ca* 396) strengthens the connection to Eunapius suggested by the evidence of the *Chronicle*. Where comparison between the letter, the *Chronicle*, the historical fragments, the *Vitae sophistarum*, and Zosimus is possible, the presentation of particulars between 362 and 378 is consistent.[16] Especially striking is Jerome's lament in the epistle that *Romanus exercitus, victor orbis et dominus, ab his* [the Huns] *vincitur, hos pavet, horum terretur aspectu, qui ingredi non valent, qui, si terram tetigerint, se mortuos arbitrantur*:[17] for it closely parallels the *History* as adapted by Zosimus and, very probably, as preserved in *Suda*.[18] In the case of events after 378, however, the letter differs sharply from the Eunapian version as reflected in the *Historia Nova*. For instance, Jerome correctly names Lugdunum as the location of Gratian's murder, while Zosimus sets it at Sigdunum in Upper Moesia.[19] Jerome and Zosimus also disagree on the fate of Abundantius, who in 396 fell victim to the machinations of the eunuch Eutropius, with Jerome maintaining that the former consul lived the life of a beggar in Pityus on the Black Sea, and Zosimus placing the exile in Phoenician Sidon.[20] Jerome's dependence in the *Epistula ad Heliodorum* on an ἔκδοσις of Eunapius' *History* that extended only to *ca* 378 would readily explain what appears to be their uniform treatment of events prior to that year as well as their divergent accounts of subsequent affairs.

Of course the hypothesis that Jerome used Eunapius involves accepting the proposition that a portion of the *History* had appeared by *ca* 383 at the latest. And even if this were admitted, it might still be objected that the passages adduced above are far from certain proof that Jerome knew the *History*; on the other hand, once the possibility of a date of publication prior to 383 is allowed for the latter, there is nothing in the *Chronicle* that so much as suggests that he did not.

[16] *Ep.* 60.15 (III 105.4–22), on Constantius, Julian, Jovian, and Valens.

[17] 60.17 (III 108.9–12)

[18] *Cf.* Zos. 4.20.4: πῶς γὰρ οἱ μήτε εἰς γῆν πῆξαι τοὺς πόδας οἷοί τε ὄντες ἑδραίως, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἵππων καὶ διαιτώμενοι καὶ καθεύδοντες, with *Suda* A1018f (I 93.20–24 Adler) ἀκροσφαλεῖς· ἄκρως ἐσφαλμένους. ὁ δὲ ἐκέλευσε χωρεῖν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄποδας καὶ ἀκροσφαλεῖς Οὔννους. ἄνευ γὰρ ἵππων οὐ ῥᾳδίως ἂν Οὖννος τὴν γῆν πατήσειεν .... ἐν τῷ βαδίζειν σφαλλόμενοι. τουτέστιν οἱ Οὖννοι. The *Suda* entries do not appear in any edition of the fragments of Eunapius; for the argument for Eunapius' authorship, see T. M. Banchich, *CP* (forthcoming).

[19] *Ep.* 60.15 (III 105.22–25); Zos. 4.35.6. Eunap. fr.81 (II 122) may be from the section of the *History* on which Zosimus depended. Paschoud (*supra* n.2) 79–99 posits a Latin origin of the tale on the basis of the pun *pons/pontifex* reproduced at Zos. 4.36.

[20] *Ep.* 60.16 (III 106.9); Zos. 5.10.5.

What is certain is that, in the space of eight pages in Helm's edition, Jerome discusses Eunapius' teacher; seems to touch on an incident in the life of Libanius described by Eunapius in a section of the *Vitae sophistarum* explicitly said to reflect the *History*; misrepresents Valentinus' usurpation in a fashion similar to the Eunapius-inspired version of Zosimus; and notices in a context suggestive of Eunapius' concerns the historian/biographer's much-admired acquaintance Clearchus. All this may be coincidence, though the additional evidence of the *Epistula ad Heliodorum* would seem to suggest otherwise. Objections that Eunapius' paganism would have caused Jerome to eschew the *History* are inadmissible, given that the saint drew upon other pagan authors.[21] Futhermore, the fragments of the *History* and allusions in the *Vitae sophistarum* show that, in the course of the publication of its two or three installments, the *History* only gradually assumed the character of an anti-Christian polemic attributed to it *in toto* by Photius.[22] Thus, there would have been less to offend Jerome in the *History* as it stood *ca* 383, before Theodosius' assault on paganism, than there would have been in any post-404 version. When all things are considered, therefore, the collective weight of the evidence inclines the balance towards Eunapius as one of Jerome's sources for secular events through 378, and reinforces existing arguments that the portion of the *History* in circulation before the publication of the *Vitae sophistarum* culminated in the battle of Adrianople.[23]

CANISIUS COLLEGE
August, 1986

[21] See Helm (*supra* n.1) and *Philologus* Suppl. 21.2 (1929).

[22] *Bibl.* cod. 77 (I 158–60 Henry). Photius' comments on the two ἐκδόσεις of the *History* examined by him—both of which he says treated the same period (A.D. 270–404), the νέα ἔκδοσις being a careless expurgation of the first, with much anti-Christian sentiment removed—must refer to Eunapius' finished work and a later bowdlerization of the same, not necessarily (indeed, probably not) by Eunapius' hand. *Cf.* B. G. Niebuhr, *CSHB* XIV.1 (Bonn 1829) xix, and Müller *FHG* IV 8 col.2–9 col.1. In any case, ἐκδόσεις as installments (the matter considered here) must be distinguished from ἐκδόσεις as different editions of a coterminous whole. Thus, successive ἐκδόσεις in the first sense, which collectively comprised the first, later revised ἔκδοσις in the second sense, could have become increasingly vitriolic with respect to Christianity. On the development of Eunapius' attitude towards Christianity, see T. M. Banchich, *The Historical Fragments of Eunapius of Sardis* (diss.State University of New York at Buffalo 1985) 132–49.

[23] This neither precludes Jerome's consultation of other sources of information on Julian and his successors nor confirms the use of the *History* by other authors, *e.g.* Ammianus or the compiler of the *Epit. de Caes.*