

# Eunapius' Νέα Ἔκδοσις and Photius

Aaron Baker

**T**HIS STUDY of the *νέα ἔκδοσις* of Eunapius' *History* seeks plausible answers to two questions: what the *νέα ἔκδοσις* was, and how it came to be.<sup>1</sup> Our principal testimony for the *νέα ἔκδοσις* is codex 77 of Photius' *Bibliotheca*, and it will be a primary concern here to determine the meaning of that testimony and whether it is likely to be reliable. Fragment 41 of the *History*, much cited in the debate regarding *ἐκδόσεις*,<sup>2</sup> will be treated in an appendix below.

In codex 77, the great ninth-century patriarch says this of the two editions in which he found the *History* (54a26–b3):

δύο δὲ πραγματείας τὴν αὐτὴν περιεχούσας ἱστορίαν συνεγράψατο, πρῶτην καὶ δευτέραν. καὶ ἐν μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ πολλὴν κατὰ τῆς καθαρᾶς ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστεως κατασπείρει βλασφημίαν, καὶ τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν ἀποσεμνύνει δεισιδαιμονίαν, πολλὰ τῶν εὐσεβῶν βασιλέων καθαπτόμενος· ἐν δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ, ἣν καὶ νέαν ἔκδοσιν ἐπιγράφει, τὴν μὲν πολλὴν ὕβριν καὶ ἀσέλγειαν, ἣν κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἐσκέδαζεν, ὑποτέμνεται, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τῆς συγγραφῆς σῶμα συνείρας νέαν ἔκδοσιν, ὡς ἔφημεν, ἐπιγράφει, ἔτι πολλὰ τῆς ἐκείσε λύσσης ὑποφαίνουσαν. ἀμφὸν δὲ ταῖς ἐκδόσεσιν ἐν παλαιοῖς ἐνετύχομεν βιβλίοις, ἰδίως ἑκατέραν ἐν ἑτέρῳ τεύχει καὶ ἑτέρῳ συντεταγμένην· ἐξ ὧν αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν ἀναλεξάμενοι ἔγνωμεν. συμβαίνει οὖν ἐν τῇ νέᾳ ἐκδόσει πολλὰ τῶν χωρίων διὰ τὰς γεγεννημένας τῶν ῥητῶν περικοπὰς ἀσαφῶς ἐκκείσθαι, καίτοι φροντιστῆς ἐστὶ τοῦ σαφοῦς· ἀλλ' ὅτῳ τρόπῳ λέγειν οὐκ ἔχω, μὴ καλῶς κατὰ τὰς περικοπὰς ἀρμόσας τοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ ἐκδόσει τὸν νοῦν λυμαίνεται τῶν ἀναγινωσκομένων.

He composed two works embracing the same history, a first and a second; and in the first he scatters much blasphemy against the pure

<sup>1</sup> The *νέα ἔκδοσις* is especially important in that those portions of Eunapius' *History* preserved in the tenth-century *Excerpta de sententiis* (produced at the command of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus) are known to have been drawn from it (the Eunapiian passages, together with a heading that attributes them to the *νέα ἔκδοσις*, are on pages 71–103 of U. P. Boissevain's edition of these *Excerpta* [Berlin 1906]). The *νέα ἔκδοσις* is thus the likely source of those Eunapiian passages preserved in the *Excerpta de legationibus*, another volume of historical extracts produced under Constantine VII (for the Eunapiian passages here, see C. de Boor's edition, II [Berlin 1903] 591–99). The tenth-century *Suda* drew its historical quotations almost exclusively from Constantinian *excerpta*; thus quotations from Eunapius in the *Suda* very likely go back to the *νέα ἔκδοσις* as well (for the historical sources of the *Suda* see A. Adler, *RE* IVa.1 [1931] 675–717 s.v. "Suidas," at 700–06).

<sup>2</sup> Fr.41 Müller=fr.41.1 Blockley=no. 39 in the *Excerpta de sententiis*.

faith of us Christians, and glorifies pagan superstition, inasmuch as he attacks the pious emperors in many ways. But in the second, which he also entitles "new edition," he trims the great violence<sup>3</sup> and wantonness that he scattered against piety, and after stringing together the remaining body of his composition, he entitles it "new edition," as we were saying, although it still contains much of the madness there [*i.e.*, in the previous edition]. We came upon both editions in old books, arranged separately in one volume and another.<sup>4</sup> Having read from them, we recognized the difference. The result, then, is that in the new edition many passages are obscure because of the cuttings that have occurred in the text, although clarity is a concern of his. But, in what way I cannot tell, since he has not adjusted well the language in respect to the cuttings, in the second edition he ruins the sense of what is read.

The first modern scholar who sought to define the character of the *νέα ἔκδοσις* was B. G. Niebuhr, who suggested that the *History* was abbreviated by an ignorant copyist to remove especially offensive anti-Christian passages. He gave as a parallel the expurgation of certain books after the Council of Trent.<sup>5</sup> C. de Boor, elaborating implausibly on Niebuhr, argued that someone edited the *History* as part of a "Weltgeschichte in Einzeldarstellungen," and that the resulting clipped version was the *νέα ἔκδοσις*.<sup>6</sup> J. C. Vollebregt, also following Niebuhr, ventured a simpler suggestion: the *History* was rearranged by someone other than Eunapius to present its historical data in a

<sup>3</sup> τὴν . . . πολλὴν ὕβριν . . . ὑποτέμνεται is difficult; alternatively, it might be rendered "he cuts away most of the violence," which gives a different meaning.

<sup>4</sup> ἀμφοῖν δὲ ταῖς ἐκδόσεσιν ἐν παλαιοῖς ἐνετύχομεν βιβλίοις, ἰδίως ἑκατέραν ἐν ἑτέρῳ συντεταγμένην, seems translatable in roughly two different ways. Photius' most recent editor, R. Henry, offered this interpretation (I [Paris 1959] 159f): "Nous avons trouvé ces deux éditions dans de vieux exemplaires; dans l'un, chacune des deux était à part; dans l'autre, elles étaient combinées." A very different translation is given by A. Nogara, "Note sulla composizione e la struttura della *Biblioteca* di Fozio, Patriarca di Costantinopoli I," *Aevum* 49 (1975) 213–42, esp. 233 n.60: "separatamente era scritta in un volume una (edizione), in un altro l'altra." The same interpretation is given independently by R. Goulet, "Sur la chronologie de la vie et des oeuvres d'Eunape de Sardes," *JHS* 100 (1980) 60–72, esp. 68. Nogara's (and Goulet's) proposal is less ingenious than Henry's but perhaps more plausible; as Nogara points out, one manuscript containing two different editions of the same work was unusual.

<sup>5</sup> See the introduction to his edition of Dexippus, Eunapius, *et al.* (*CSHB* [Bonn 1829]) xix.

<sup>6</sup> "Die *νέα ἔκδοσις* des Eunapios," *RhM* 47 (1892) 321ff. De Boor appealed to a scholium preserved at the beginning of the Eunapian portion of the *Excerpta de sententiis* (p.71 Boissevain). This scholium apparently came from the text of the *νέα ἔκδοσις* used by the imperial excerptors and shows that this text was in a volume that contained also a text of Priscus of Panium; thus the theory of a number of works edited to form a world history.

more regular order, with a severe pruning of redundant polemic.<sup>7</sup> Like de Boor, however, Vollebregt was guilty of an unwarranted assumption, for Photius stresses the removal of anti-Christian material, without hinting at any re-ordering of contents.

A contrary opinion, that Eunapius himself produced the *νέα ἔκδοσις*, has been asserted and, with some modifications, now prevails.<sup>8</sup> The case for Eunapian authorship is made to rest on a number of considerations. First, Eunapius appears to have published his *History* more than once. In his *Vitae sophistarum* he twice says that, God willing, he will describe certain events in the *History*.<sup>9</sup> In all other cross-references from the *Vitae* to the *History*, he asserts that this or that has already been recounted in the latter work.<sup>10</sup> The natural inference is that Eunapius brought out the *History* in installments, one or more of which were available as of the publication of the *Vitae* (probably late in 399).<sup>11</sup> Several scholars have therefore equated the old *ἔκδοσις* with one installment or set of installments (extending to *ca* 378 or 395),<sup>12</sup> and the *νέα ἔκδοσις* with a completed and revised form of the work, ending with 404.<sup>13</sup> Secondly, Photius unambiguously

<sup>7</sup> *Symbola in novam Eunapii Vitarum editionem* (Amsterdam 1929) Theses ix-x.

<sup>8</sup> The following will be cited by author's name: W. R. CHALMERS, "The NEA ἘΚΔΟΣΙΣ of Eunapius' *Histories*," *CQ* n.s. 3 (1953) 165-70; F. PASCHOUD, *Cinq études sur Zosime* (Paris 1975) 171ff, and "Eunapiana," *BHAC* 1982/83 (1985) 239-303, at 284-92 (here, however, he proposes that the *νέα ἔκδοσις* was abbreviated by some other person or persons [290]); T. D. BARNES, *The Sources of the Historia Augusta* (Brussels 1978) 114-17 (he concedes that Eunapius "did not necessarily write both versions in the form described" [114]); A. B. BREEBAART, "Eunapius of Sardes and the Writing of History," *Mnemosyne* SER. IV 32 (1979) 360-75, esp. 361f; R. C. BLOCKLEY, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire I* (Liverpool 1981) 2f; A. BALDINI, *Ricerche sulla storia di Eunapio di Sardi* (Bologna 1984) 75-117.

<sup>9</sup> *VS* 7.3.4 Giangrande (476 Boissonade<sup>2</sup>); 8.2.3 (482).

<sup>10</sup> 6.3.8 (464), 6.11.7 (472), 7.1.5 (473), 7.3.4 (476), 7.3.7 (476), 7.3.8 (476) 7.4.10 (478), 7.6.5 (480), 9.1.3 (483), 10.1.1 (485), 10.7.13 (493), 21.1.4 (498).

<sup>11</sup> See T. M. Banchich, "The Date of Eunapius' *Vitae sophistarum*," *GRBS* 25 (1984) 183-92.

<sup>12</sup> How far Eunapius had taken the *History* when he brought out the *VS* is disputed. C. Müller argued that he had reached the death of Theodosius I in 395 (*FHG* IV [Paris 1851] 8); Müller is followed by Chalmers (165). Barnes initially maintained that Eunapius had reached the battle of Adrianople in 378 (114-17), but in response to criticism from Paschoud, who argues for 395 ("Quand parut la première édition de l'histoire d'Eunape?" *BHAC* 1977/78 [1980] 149-62), Barnes has conceded that the *History* may have continued down to *ca* 383 (in *Constantine and Eusebius* [Cambridge (Mass.) 1981] 403f n.5). Banchich provides additional arguments for the theory that the portion of the *History* available when Eunapius published the *Vitae* concluded *ca* 378 ("Eunapius and Jerome," *GRBS* 27 [1986] 319-24).

<sup>13</sup> Chalmers, Paschoud ("Cinq études" 171ff, "Eunapiana" 284-92), Barnes (114-17), Baldini (75-117). Breebaart (362 and n.13) and Blockley (3) believe that Eunapius produced the *νέα ἔκδοσις* but do not equate the two *ἐκδόσεις* seen by Photius with

attributes the *νέα ἔκδοσις* to Eunapius.<sup>14</sup> Finally, these contentions have been made: both editions must have had some independent value if they were preserved together;<sup>15</sup> the *νέα ἔκδοσις* retains enough anti-Christian bile to render bowdlerizing by a Christian hack unlikely;<sup>16</sup> the deficiencies of this edition are best explained by Eunapius' haste, carelessness, mental decline, or death.<sup>17</sup>

To determine whether this theory—that Eunapius produced the *νέα ἔκδοσις*—can be maintained, the statements that Photius makes in his comparison of both editions must be carefully examined.<sup>18</sup> Having asserted at the beginning of codex 77 (53b.36–54a.4) that the *νέα ἔκδοσις* covered the years from 270 to 404, Photius now makes clear that both it and the first edition had the same temporal span (*δύο πραγματείας τὴν αὐτὴν περιεχούσας ἱστορίαν*). *περιέχω* ('embrace', 'comprise') is unproblematic; Photius evidently liked to use it for the encompassing of periods and events.<sup>19</sup> Whether *ἱστορία* be translated "history,"

---

the installments that Eunapius published. Goulet, who believes (71) that "Nous n'avons donc aucune preuve décisive de l'existence d'une seconde 'édition' de la *Chronique* faite par Eunape lui-même," also maintains that the question of installments of the *History* has no bearing on that of editions.

<sup>14</sup> Chalmers (168) notes this fact without giving it the weight it deserves.

<sup>15</sup> So Chalmers 167. Of more than a little relevance to this argument is the question whether Photius ever saw the two *ἐκδόσεις* bound in one volume (*cf. supra* n.4). If in fact he found them together in one place, but bound separately, of course no pertinent inference could be drawn from their proximity. Chalmers actually says that the two editions were preserved together "often," an assertion justified by no reading of Photius. On the interpretation proposed by Henry, Photius saw both *ἐκδόσεις* bound in one codex with apparently some matter intervening, and bound next to each other in another codex (that by *τεῦχος* Photius means 'codex' is urged, correctly I believe, by T. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur* [Berlin 1882] 26). Twice is not often, and of course one codex could have been copied (with the addition or elimination of intervening matter) from the other. If both editions were ever bound together (and the assertion that they were rests only on a doubtful reading of Photius' difficult Greek), the reason could simply be that they were known to be a first and a second.

<sup>16</sup> So Blockley 3.

<sup>17</sup> So Chalmers 170; Blockley 3.

<sup>18</sup> What follows will show that I agree fully with Goulet's observation (69) that "on peut retenir qu'elle [the *νέα ἔκδοσις*] se caractérisait essentiellement par des coupures ayant laissé un texte parfois décousu et que son extension était la même que le première, du moins au jugement de Photius qui a examiné assez attentivement le texte pour découvrir la disparition de certains passages." Unfortunately, as will become clear, more than a bald assertion of the obvious is necessary.

<sup>19</sup> *Cf.*, for example, cod. 57 on the books of Appian's *Roman History*, 15b.26f, *τούτων τῶν ἐπτὰ (the kings of Rome) ἔργα τε καὶ πράξεις περιέχει*; 37f, *ἃ μὲν ὁ πρῶτος λόγος περιέχει, ταῦτά ἐστιν*; 41f, *ὃ δὲ ἐφεξῆς περιέχει τὸν πρὸς τοὺς Σαννίτας Ῥωμαίων πόλεμον*; 16a.3f, *ὃ δὲ τέταρτος, ἐπεὶ τὸν πρὸς Κελτοὺς περιέχει Ῥωμαίων πόλεμον*; 7–9, *ὃ δὲ ἔβδομος . . . ἐπεὶ τὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἀννίβαν τὸν Καρχηδόνιον περιέχει πόλεμον*; 24–31, *ἐμπεριέχεται δὲ τοῖς ἐμφυλίοις πρῶτον μὲν τὰ περὶ Μάριον καὶ Σύλλαν ἀλλήλων*

“story,” or “narrative” is of little importance here; both editions had one *ιστορία* in common, and if Photius knew that something had been added to the *ιστορία* of the *νέα ἔκδοσις*, he could reasonably be expected to make clear, in the next sentence or so, what it was. Instead, he says that the *νέα ἔκδοσις* had suffered abridgment: anti-Christian matter had been removed and what remained was strung together. Moreover, this job of editing had been done so ineptly that the meaning of the work was often obscured. If Photius has given a correct account of what he saw, the simplest and most plausible explanation is that the old *ἔκδοσις* represented a complete version by Eunapius, and the new a clumsy bowdlerizing of the same. The two *ἐκδόσεις* should then pose a different problem from that of the installments which, on the evidence of the *Vitae sophistarum*, Eunapius seems to have produced.

It must then be asked whether Eunapius was likely to have been the expurgator of the *νέα ἔκδοσις*. Against the opinion that he was, one may first adduce a not very compelling argument from silence: neither reference in the *VS* to a continuation of the *History* indicates that the work will otherwise be altered. More important, Eunapius was a fanatic pagan and, when he finished the *History*, an aging one.<sup>20</sup> Also, whatever moderns may think of his gifts, he was a stylist. That his hatred of Christianity abated is scarcely likely; even if it had, and if he thought himself obliged to moderate his tone, he would hardly have mutilated his life’s work in the way Photius describes, even if his faculties were failing. Nothing, moreover, suggests that he was compelled, or found it politic, to cut portions from his *History*. Furthermore, tampering by a Christian is no less likely because offensive

---

ἐκπολεμησάντων, ἔπειτα τὰ περὶ Πομπηίου καὶ Ἰούλιον τὸν Καίσαρα . . . ἐφεξῆς δὲ τὰ περὶ Ἀντωνίου καὶ Ὀκτανίου Καίσαρα.

<sup>20</sup> Eun. *Hist.* fr.87 Müller (=fr.72.1 Blockley=*Exc. de sent.* 79) is usually believed to provide a *terminus post quem* for the *History* at 414, because it begins *ὅτι ἐπὶ Πουλχερίας τῆς βασιλίσσης* (Pulcheria became Augusta in 414). But because of a possible chronological difficulty posed by this fragment in conjunction with fr.86 (=71.4=78), which can be dated to 404, Blockley suggests that *ἐπὶ Πουλχερίας* is a mistake of the excerptor, and that the events described in fr.87 took place during the tenure of the empress Eudoxia, *i.e.*, no later than 404: “The Ending of Eunapius’ *History*,” *Antichthon* 14 (1980) 170–76; see also *Historians* I 5, II (1983) 149 n.176. If the correct *terminus post quem* should be 404—the earliest propounded by any scholar—then Eunapius, who was born in or near 348, could have been no younger than his late fifties when he finished his work. For the evidence bearing on the chronology of Eunapius’ life, see Goulet 60–64, with criticism by Banchich, “On Goulet’s Chronology of Eunapius’ Life and Works,” *JHS* 107 (1987) 164–67, and by A. E. Baker, *Eunapius and Zosimus: Problems of Chronology and Composition* (diss. Brown Univ. 1986) 1–18, 103–10.

matter remains.<sup>21</sup> In a history whose hero was Julian the Apostate, the elimination of all that gave offense might have meant the elimination of the work.<sup>22</sup> That Photius ascribes to Eunapius the second *ἔκδοσις* and its expurgation is of course important, and Photius must not be lightly dismissed. If the new *ἔκδοσις* was entirely the result of a later hand or hands, Photius was guilty of an easily explained error. The heading of the manuscript (or manuscripts) he saw was probably something like *Εὐναπίου Σαρδιανοῦ ἱστορία ἢ μετὰ Δέξιππον, νέα ἔκδοσις*; and so he could have made a reasonable inference from that title.<sup>23</sup> Thus the theory of Niebuhr should be retained: the *νέα ἔκδοσις* represented an expurgated version, produced by a Christian, who strove to render the work more tolerable to the pious.

The arguments given here would collapse if Photius could be proved to have erred regarding the chronological limits or content of the *ἐκδόσεις*. Two scholars, Baldini and Paschoud, who believe that the *ἐκδόσεις* differed substantially,<sup>24</sup> have in fact charged Photius with error. Baldini (220) considers it unlikely that Photius read in its entirety every book he cites, and to support his skepticism he adduces codices 76 and 82. Codex 76, on the *Jewish Antiquities* of Josephus, after giving the chronological limits of the work, presents a summary confined to Book 20.223–57 (52b.18–53a.34). Codex 82, on Dexippus

<sup>21</sup> In fact, among the extracts from Eunapius' *History* that survive in the *Excerpta de sententiis* and *de legationibus*, as well as in the *Suda*, criticisms of Christian beliefs and institutions (as opposed to attacks on important Christians, such as Constantius II and Theodosius I) are almost lacking. There is a sneer at monks in fr.55 (=48.2=53), and the pagan Fravitta is called *ἡγεμῶν τῆς μὲν θεοφιλοῦς καὶ θείας μερίδος* (fr.60=68=*Exc. de leg.* no. 7), with an implicit gibe at Christianity, but little else can be found (see also fr.78=68=*Exc. de leg.* no. 72). Unfortunately, the paucity of explicitly anti-Christian passages proves nothing about the efficiency with which the expurgator performed his job; the excerptors working for Constantine VII, and the compilers of the *Suda*, as Christians, would probably have omitted anti-Christian matter when they could and when they recognized it as such.

<sup>22</sup> Fr.8–27 (=15–28.7) remain from Eunapius' account of Julian (7a=14.1=4, although about Julian, belongs to Eunapius' account of Constantius II). Fr.8 (=15=5), from the preface to Book 2, is especially important here, for in it Eunapius affirms that Julian is the principal subject of the *History*.

<sup>23</sup> Photius introduces codex 77 with the statement *ἀνεγνώσθη Εὐναπίου χρονικῆς ἱστορίας τῆς μετὰ Δέξιππον, νέας ἐκδόσεως* (53b.34f). The passages from Eunapius preserved in the *Excerpta de sententiis* are introduced by the heading *ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας Εὐναπίου Σαρδιανοῦ τῆς μετὰ Δέξιππον νέας ἐκδόσεως* (p.71). Both notices were probably drawn from titles. That Photius made the inference in question may be supported by his language: he twice says that Eunapius *ἐπιγράφει* the work *νέαν ἔκδοσιν* (54a.31f, 34f).

<sup>24</sup> Baldini suggests that the first *ἔκδοσις* of the *History* began with Augustus (208–30) and concluded with Adrianople in 378 (100–17) and that the *νέα ἔκδοσις* was to some extent a restructuring and re-ordering of the first edition (80). Paschoud's latest judgment ("Eunapiana" 284–92) is that the two *ἐκδόσεις* differed in content and perhaps in temporal span.

of Athens, epitomizes only an initial portion of that author's *Τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον* (64a.21–b.31). To these might be added codex 63, on Procopius of Caesarea, which summarizes his *Wars* no further than Book 2.19. Baldini also (218f n.45), though without much confidence, raises the possibility that the genitive after *ἀνεγνώσθη* at the beginning of codex 77 is partitive (53b.34f, *ἀνεγνώσθη Εὐναπίου χρονικῆς ἱστορίας τῆς μετὰ Δέξιππου, νέας ἐκδόσεως*). He also draws from this sentence the correct inference that codex 77 refers principally to the new, not the old, *ἔκδοσις* (220f). Paschoud (289) urges that one may take it practically for granted that Photius did not compare the *ἐκδόσεις* page by page “comme ferait un bibliographe moderne.” Moreover, Paschoud asserts that the strangeness of the exemplars with which Photius dealt could easily have led him astray.<sup>25</sup>

Neither Baldini nor Paschoud makes a satisfactory case, for neither takes sufficient account of what is known of the methods Photius used to compose his *Bibliotheca*, and both ignore pertinent information provided by codex 77. To ascertain the temporal bounds of both editions, Photius had merely to check the first and last leaves of both, and from the information he gives regarding many works he cites, he very likely made for these the requisite inspection: a quick check of the beginning and end as well as a few other portions of the cited work to give such details as “the author, the title, the dedication, the number of parts in the work, the number of works in the volume, the table of contents, the chapter headings, and a few facts from the first page, the last page, or a page in the middle.”<sup>26</sup> Codex 77 is one of many in the *Bibliotheca* whose arrangement is best explained by the theory of a summary check: it gives the author, the title, the edition,

<sup>25</sup> Paschoud (“Eunapiana” 285) accepts Henry’s interpretation of *ἰδίως ἑκατέραν ἐν ἑτέρῳ τεύχει καὶ ἑτέρῳ συντεταγμένην*. His other arguments are based on a misinterpretation of *συνείρω*, which, apparently following Henry (I 159), he renders as “ramener à l’unité” (284f); “on peut supposer, sans risquer trop de se tromper, un remaniement comportant des suppressions ainsi que des adaptations visant à masquer les lacunes et les sutures résultant de ces suppressions” (290). Paschoud complains because, on his reading of *συνείρω*, Photius later contradicts himself with his statement about clumsy cuttings that obscured the meaning of the new *ἔκδοσις*. To diminish the imagined contradiction, Paschoud posits these stages: abbreviation and restoration by Eunapius, then mutilation by some other hand or hands. In fact, *συνείρω* never means ‘restore to unity’, but simply ‘string together’, ‘connect’. I have inspected every example of *συνείρω* available in the computerized *TLG* as of April 1988, and find none that requires or justifies Paschoud’s (and Henry’s) interpretation. Paschoud should have been guided by *LSJ s.v.*, which correctly defines the word.

<sup>26</sup> W. T. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (Washington 1980) 92; at 84–88 Treadgold describes codices of the *Bibliotheca* in which this procedure was probably followed (under the heading Class II). K. Ziegler, *RE* 20.1 (1941) 667–737, at 716, *s.v.* “Photios (13);” plausibly suggests that Photius used *βίαι* appended to the beginnings or ends of cited books for some of his biographical details.

the number of books (fourteen) and chronological span, as well as noting the existence of two editions and how they were arranged in the manuscripts that Photius had seen (53b.34–54a.4, 54a.26–39). If he customarily inspected the beginning and end of a work, it is hardly over-bold to suggest that he did so for both editions, particularly as he seems to have been interested in how they did and did not differ.<sup>27</sup>

To determine, with a good chance of escaping error, how the old and new ἐκδόσεις were dissimilar, Photius must have read extensively from both. It may be objected that his tendency to extract information from beginning, middle, and end of a given work proves that when he did so, he did nothing else. This objection is ill-founded. In many codices of the *Bibliotheca* that show this tendency, he also gives indications that he did read to a considerable extent, perhaps in full, the work in question.<sup>28</sup> Codex 77 is again typical. It begins with the assertion that Photius read the νέα ἔκδοσις<sup>29</sup> and offers a judgment of Eunapius as stylist that seems based on a close acquaintance with at least one edition (54a.12–25). Thus the quick checking of cited works appears in many cases to have been a quick re-checking.

Elsewhere in the *Bibliotheca*, moreover, Photius admits his inability or unwillingness to read certain works from beginning to end. In codex 35, on Philip of Side, Photius admits that he has seen only the first twenty-four books of that author's *Christian History* (7a.31–33). In codex 40, on Philostorgius, Photius makes clear that he had read the first six books of his *Church History*, but then found a volume containing the final six books (8b.24–27). In codex 41, on John Diacrinomenus, Photius says that he has been able to read five of the ten books of John's *Church History* (9a.15–17). In codex 97, on the enumeration of Olympic victors by Phlegon of Tralles, Photius implies that he found the work too boring to finish (83b.35, 84a.37–84b.2). In codex 176, on Theopompus of Chios, Photius reports the opinion of "ancient writers" that the sixth, seventh, ninth, twentieth, and thirtieth books of the *Philippica* had disappeared, and says that he has not seen them either; but he asserts that he has read the twelfth

<sup>27</sup> Since the *History* ended with 404, the year when John Chrysostom was permanently deposed from the patriarchate of Constantinople (53b.39–54a.4), and since it might have recounted this event in some detail, Photius may have had a special interest in the final parts of both editions: he admired John, and described more works by Chrysostom in the *Bibliotheca* than by any other author (see codd. 172–74, 270, 274, 277; also 96 and 273 [on works whose subject was John], and 59 [summarizing the Synod of the Oak, which first deposed him in 403]).

<sup>28</sup> See Treadgold (*supra* n.26) 84–88 on several codices of this sort.

<sup>29</sup> ἀνεγνώσθη or ἀνεγνώσθη ἐκ are the formulae with which Photius introduces by far the greater number of codices in the *Bibliotheca*.



book, which, according to Menophanes, was lost (120a.8–14). In codex 224, on Memnon's history of Heraclea Pontica, Photius says that he has not yet seen either the first eight books or those following book 16 (240a.9–11). Furthermore, Photius frequently admits or implies that he was unable to find a given work at all; this practice also encourages belief in his candor.<sup>30</sup> Such apparent candor, combined with the circumstantial detail and accuracy of so much of the *Bibliotheca*,<sup>31</sup> renders plausible (though it cannot prove) the inference that, unless he says otherwise, Photius did read each work he cites from start to finish.<sup>32</sup> At the least, unless he was very disingenuous, he read extensively in most of the writings mentioned by the *Bibliotheca*.

Of course one must not ignore the incomplete summaries noted by Baldini. Photius may not have read the *Jewish Antiquities*, Τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον of Dexippus, or Procopius' *Wars* page for page. Incomplete summarization, however, might indicate instead an especial interest in one portion of a work (for instance in the account of the High Priests at *AJ* 20.10) or, on the contrary, a loss of interest in the work as a whole. Photius ends his partial epitome of Dexippus' work on the Successors with these words: καὶ τὰ ἄλλα διεξείσιν ἐν πολλοῖς, ὡς κὰν τούτοις, Ἀρριανῶ κατὰ τὸ πλείστον σύμφωνα γράφων (cod. 82, 64b.31f). In codex 92 the *Bibliotheca* epitomates all ten books of Arrian's history of the Successors. If, as seems likely, Dexippus did little more than imitate Arrian, and if Photius had already composed his summary of Arrian's work, he may have decided, after beginning, that a full summary of Dexippus was redundant.

The strange genitive at the beginning of codex 77 also merits an explanation. As Baldini has suggested, it may be partitive, as may the genitive at the beginning of codex 76: ἀνεγνώσθη Φλαβίου Ἰωσήπου

<sup>30</sup> See, e.g., codd. 14 (4b.19–21), 58 (17b.21f), 98 (84b.32–36, where Photius infers, rightly or wrongly, the existence of a first edition of Zosimus' *New History*, and admits that he has not seen it), 111 (89b.38–90a.1), 213 (171a.19–27), 268 (496b.38–40 [in this codex, devoted to the orator Lycurgus, Photius admits that he has read none of his speeches]).

<sup>31</sup> Photius' detail and accuracy are made apparent in these treatments of the *Bibliotheca*: Ziegler (*supra* n.26) 713–19; Nogara (who emphasizes, however, the casual, unsystematic nature of Photius' reading: 224–40); Treadgold (*supra* n.26) 37–96. For a somewhat less favorable assessment, see N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London 1983) 93–111. Unlike Wilson (95), I see no reason to doubt Photius when he says that he has read speeches by Hyperides (cod. 266, 495b.2).

<sup>32</sup> For the importance of Photian candor, see C. Mango, "The Availability of Books in the Byzantine Empire, A.D. 750–850," *Byzantine Books and Bookmen* (Washington 1975) 29–45, at 39 (reprinted in Mango, *Byzantium and its Image* [London 1984] no. vii). The regular practice of reading books from beginning to end is recommended by the eleventh-century writer Cecaumenus (*Strategicon* pp.212, 240 Litavrin), and so should not be assumed alien to Byzantine readers.

Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀρχαιολογίας, ἐν λόγοις κ' (52b.18f). A partitive genitive might indicate (though it could not prove) partial reading. Yet codex 59, on the Synod of the Oak, also begins with such a genitive: ἀνεγνώσθη συνόδου τῆς παρανόμως κατὰ τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου συγκροτηθείσης (17b.25–27). The summary that follows (so far as can be judged; the acts of the Synod are lost) seems to be based on a complete reading. Indeed, given his interest in Chrysostom, Photius is unlikely to have read the record of the Synod superficially. These genitives are perhaps better interpreted as dependent on an unexpressed word for 'book' or 'manuscript' than as partitive.

Although it is likely that Photius read the *νέα ἔκδοσις* (the principal subject of codex 77, as Baldini asserts) from beginning to end, it cannot be established how extensively Photius explored the first *ἔκδοσις*. But τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τῆς συγγραφῆς σῶμα συνείρας does imply a close acquaintance with the *σῶμα* of the earlier edition; and ἐξ ὧν αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν ἀναλεξάμενοι ἔγνωμεν makes clear that Photius did read in both the old and new *ἐκδόσεις*, whether or not he went through the first in its entirety. If ἐξ ὧν in this clause is taken, together with αὐτῶν, to refer to αἱ ἐκδόσεις, then these are possible renderings: "having read from them, we recognized the difference," or "from them we recognized the difference, having read [them]." Instead of being taken with αὐτῶν, ἐξ ὧν might mean "from that," "from that fact."<sup>33</sup> Unfortunately, regardless of how these words are interpreted, they prove neither that the reading involved was partial nor that it was complete.

Evidence from elsewhere in the *Bibliotheca* shows that Photius did check several divergent manuscripts of a given work, although how closely he compared them is beyond determining. For instance, in codex 112–13, on works falsely attributed to Clement of Rome, Photius says that some manuscripts of the pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions* are prefaced by a letter supposedly from St Peter to St James the Greater, others by a letter purporting to be from Clement to James (90a.15–21). Treadgold points out<sup>34</sup> that while only manuscripts of the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* now contain the letter from Peter, the main text of the *Homilies* has an initial portion identical to the beginning of the *Recognitions*.<sup>35</sup> Thus Treadgold conjectures that Photius, having read the *Recognitions*, saw some manuscripts of the *Homilies*; he noted the different letter, then read a short way, and,

<sup>33</sup> As Baldini suggests, 222 n.52.

<sup>34</sup> Treadgold (*supra* n.26) 70f.

<sup>35</sup> So far as can be determined from Rufinus' Latin translation of the latter work, which is otherwise lost (*Recognitions* pp.6–10.6 Rehm corresponds to *Homilies* 23–26.16 Rehm<sup>2</sup>).

assuming that he was dealing again with the *Recognitions*, went no further. Treadgold's hypothesis is plausible, but one fact should be noted: Photius states emphatically that after the varying introductory letter, all the manuscripts he saw were identical: ἐν πᾶσι γὰρ τοῖς βιβλίοις ἃ εἶδομεν . . . τὴν αὐτὴν εὕρομεν ἀπαραλλάκτως πραγματείαν (90a.29–33). He may have been guilty of hyperbole, or he may indeed have seen, and examined with care (perhaps to the extent of reading them all cover to cover), manuscripts of the *Recognitions* that contained a letter supposedly from Peter. Photius speaks with similar assurance and emphasis about the manuscripts he saw of the *Stromateis* of the Alexandrian Clement: from Books 1 to 7, the manuscripts were uniform (ἐνιαῶι); but in some, the eighth book was replaced by what is now usually known as the treatise *Quis dives salvetur?* (cod. 111, 89b.27–35).

The most plausible conclusion is this: Photius read the *νέα ἔκδοσις* cover to cover, and read enough of the first *ἔκδοσις* to feel confident in asserting how the two editions differed and were alike. He may have read large portions of that *ἔκδοσις*, or he may have read it whole. Given his apparent conscientiousness, he may have carried out what Paschoud is certain he did not: a page-by-page comparison of the two editions. Nor, since Photius seems to have been a careful reader, is he likely to have been misled by the manuscripts of the *ἔκδόσεις*, however strange they might have been. Thus the *νέα ἔκδοσις* was probably what Photius says it was, and the burden of proof rests on those who would argue otherwise.

Once the testimony of Photius concerning the *νέα ἔκδοσις* is taken seriously, an important conclusion follows. Since the *νέα ἔκδοσις* was probably in its entirety the work of a later hand, it may not be used in support of any theory regarding Eunapius' methods of composition. No evidence exists that Eunapius revised his work by either adding or subtracting material. He evidently brought out his *History* in installments, but that he did so is a conclusion established without reference to the *Bibliotheca*.

## APPENDIX: Fragment 41 of the *History*

Fragment 41 of the *History* is often cited in the controversy over installments or editions because of these words in its first sentence:

τὰ μὲν οὖν πρῶτα τῆς συγγραφῆς, οὐδενὸς οὐδὲν σαφὲς λέγειν ἔχοντος ὅθεν τε ὄντες οἱ Οὐννοὶ ὅπη τε κείμενοι τὴν Εὐρώπην πᾶσαν ἐπέδραμον καὶ τὸ Σκυθικὸν ἔτριψαν γένος, ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν συντιθέντι κατὰ τοὺς

είκότας λογισμούς ἔρηται, τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἀπαγγελλομένων δοξάζοντι πρὸς τὸ ἀκριβές. . . .

Cardinal Mai, reading <κατὰ> μὲν οὖν πρῶτα τῆς συγγραφῆς, interpreted the initial phrase to mean “In priore Historiae editione.”<sup>36</sup> This interpretation was accepted by Niebuhr (*supra* n.5: 75). C. Müller, however, understood the phrase to mean: “In priore Historiae parte” (*FHG* IV 30). More recently, Chalmers (168f) has revived Mai’s interpretation without, however, adopting his conjectural *κατὰ*. Chalmers is followed by others.<sup>37</sup> It should be noted that these two interpretations would gain greatly in plausibility if *κατὰ* conjectured by Mai could be proved; but Boissevain, in his apparatus to the *Excerpta de sententiis* (84), is more cautious: “τὰ μὲν οὖν πρῶτα dedi, τι μὲν οὖν πρῶτα legi addidique in re praesenti ‘tres litterae priores prorsus incertae.’”

Blockley (II 140 n.90), who accepts Boissevain’s reading, raises this cogent objection against both Mai and Müller, as well as their respective followers: on the normal interpretation of τὰ μὲν and τὰ δέ, the things joined by the two particles should closely parallel each other. Eunapius “simply says that he is incorporating two different versions of the origin and situation of the Huns, the old, inaccurate version of the written records (τὰ μὲν οὖν πρῶτα . . . ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν) and the new, accurate oral reports (τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἀπαγγελλομένων) . . . with the expression τὰ πρῶτα he is making no reference to a first edition or part of *his own* History.”

Blockley himself, however, incurs a serious objection. Others who have dealt with this passage have understood τῆς συγγραφῆς to refer to Eunapius’ *History*; if they are right, Blockley’s interpretation collapses. His rendering (II 59: “The first accounts of the history of the Huns”) fails to allay the objection, for τὰ πρῶτα τῆς συγγραφῆς cannot be plausibly rendered “first accounts.”

One reasonable solution has been proposed by T. M. Banchich.<sup>38</sup> It is well known that the excerptors who worked at the behest of Constantine VII often altered the beginning or end of an excerpted passage.<sup>39</sup> Banchich suggests that this tendency may account for the first words of fragment 41; apparently dismissing τῆς συγγραφῆς as a hopeless corruption, he comes independently to the same conclusion as Blockley.<sup>40</sup>

Preferable, however, would be an interpretation, otherwise similar to those of Blockley and Banchich, that could plausibly account for the text as it stands. *συγγραφή* often means ‘written account’, and so it has been interpreted by practically all who have dealt with fragment 41. But a *συγγραφή* can also be a subdivision of a written account. The second-century historian

<sup>36</sup> A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus edita* II (Rome 1827) 269.

<sup>37</sup> Barnes, *Sources* 116f; Paschoud (*supra* n.12) 152f; Breebaart 362 (accepting *κατὰ*: n.14).

<sup>38</sup> *The Historical Fragments of Eunapius of Sardis* (diss.SUNY Buffalo 1985) 39–47, 58–60.

<sup>39</sup> See P. A. Brunt, “On Historical Fragments and Epitomes,” *CQ* N.S. 30 (1980) 477–94, at 483ff; Banchich (*supra* n.38) 43–47, 59f.

<sup>40</sup> *Supra* n.38: 44ff, 60, 69, 102.

Appian regularly uses the word when referring to books and other divisions, both larger and smaller than books, of his *Roman History*.<sup>41</sup> Pausanias, his contemporary, uses *συγγραφή* in the same fashion in his *Description of Greece*. In Book 9, his *Boeotica*, he says that what he has heard about Hyettus the Argive and Olmus son of Sisyphus *προσέσται καὶ αὐτὰ τῇ Ὀρχομενία συγγραφῇ* (9.24.3). And indeed both Olmus and Hyettus are mentioned again in that portion of the *Boeotica* which refers to Orchomenus (Olmus, here called Almus, 9.34.10; Hyettus, 9.36.6ff). Plainly, therefore, when Pausanias refers now to his Ἄτθις *συγγραφή*, now to his *Μεγαρική* or *Μεγαρίς συγγραφή*, he means the relevant sections of Book 1.<sup>42</sup> Likewise, *Κορινθία*, Ἄργολίς, and *Σικωνία συγγραφή* all refer to the pertinent divisions of Book 2.<sup>43</sup> Pausanias could also use *συγγραφή* for his description of a single building (10.19.5, *Γαλατῶν δὲ τῆς ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐπιστρατείας ἔχει μὲν τινα μνήμην καὶ ἡ ἐς τὸ βουλευτήριον ἡμῖν τὸ Ἀττικὸν συγγραφή*, a reference to a digression at 1.3.5–4.6). Yet *συγγραφή* does duty also for whole books of his *Description*.<sup>44</sup> What may be another example of the usage here described is provided by the sixth-century chronicler John Malalas, who speaks of the *συγγραφαί* of Diodorus Siculus (*CSHB* p.54). Malalas might, however, have been unsure how many separate works Diodorus wrote. Nowhere else in his extant *oeuvre* does Eupapius employ *συγγραφή* to mean a division (defined, apparently, by subject matter) of a literary work. Yet he does refer once to his *History* with the plural of the related word *σύγγραμμα* (*VS* 6.11.7 Giangrande=472 Boissonade<sup>2</sup>: *ἀλλὰ περὶ τούτων μὲν καὶ ἐν τοῖς καθολικοῖς τῆς ἱστορίας συγγράμμασιν εἴρηται*). Nothing precludes his having used *συγγραφή* with the desired sense in his Hunnic passage.

If the word was so used, the *συγγραφή* in question was probably that

<sup>41</sup> *Hisp.* 1.3, *ἀνάγκη μοι συννευκεῖν ἐς τὴν Ἰβηρικὴν συγγραφὴν ἐγένετο*; *Hann.* 1.2, *ἀκριβέστατα μὲν ἐν τῇ Ἰβηρικῇ συγγραφῇ δεδήλωται*; *Syr.* 51.260, *ἀλλὰ τάδε μὲν ἐντελῶς ἐν τῇ Παρθικῇ συγγραφῇ λέξω* (the *Παρθικὴ συγγραφή* was perhaps never written; see E. Gabba in the Teubner Appian, edd. P. Viereck, A. G. Roos, and Gabba [Leipzig 1962] vii n.1); *BC* 1.6.24, *ὅτι μοι τῆς Αἰγυπτίας συγγραφῆς τάδε προηγούμενα καὶ τελευτήσουσα εἰς ἐκείνην ἀναγκαῖον ἦν προαναγράψασθαι*; 1.6.25 (the conflict between Antony and Octavian), *ἀρχὴ καὶ τῆς Αἰγυπτιακῆς συγγραφῆς ἔσται*; 1.34.151, *καὶ αὐτὸν* (the Social War) *διὰ τάδε συνήγαγον ἐς τήνδε τὴν συγγραφὴν* (context does not make clear whether this *συγγραφή* is his entire account of the Civil Wars, in five books, or Book 1 alone); 2.90.379, *ἀλλὰ τάδε μὲν ἕκαστα ὅπως ἐγένετο, ἀκριβέστερον ἢ περὶ Αἰγύπτου συγγραφῆ διέξεισι* (the Egyptian *συγγραφή* was apparently in four books: see Gabba vii n.2); *BC* 2.92.385, *ὡς μοι κατὰ τὴν Ἀσιανὴν συγγραφὴν δεδήλωται* (this apparently was that section of Appian's Ἑλληνικὴ *συγγραφή* that dealt with Roman actions in Asia Minor: see Gabba vi–vii n.4).

<sup>42</sup> Ἄτθις *συγγραφή*: 2.21.4, 3.11.1, 3.17.3, 4.28.3, 5.10.4, 7.7.7, 7.20.6, 9.6.5; *Μεγαρική* (*Μεγαρίς*) *συγγραφή*: 2.19.8, 9.19.2.

<sup>43</sup> *Κορινθία*: 5.18.8; Ἄργολίς: 4.2.4, 8.4.6; *Σικωνία*: 9.5.5.

<sup>44</sup> *Λακωνική*, 3.3.5, 4.2.4; *Μεσσηνία*, 3.7.5, 3.15.10, 4.6.4, 8.31.1; ἐς Ἀχαιοῦς, 6.3.8; *Φωκίς*, 10.17.13. Thus when in 3.25.7 Pausanias attributes the story of Arion and the dolphin to the *Λυδία συγγραφή* of Herodotus, it is unclear whether Pausanias had in mind the first book of Herodotus as a whole, or a Lydian portion distinct from, for instance, a Babylonian portion (Herodotus tells of Arion in 1.23f).

portion of the *History* dealing with the Huns (almost certainly a digression rather than a full book). Eunapius can be correctly translated thus:

The first elements of the account [*i.e.*, the Hunnic account]—since no one could say clearly where the Huns were from nor where they were situated when they overran all of Europe and crushed the Scythian race—have been stated by composing from the Ancients on the principle of reasonable reckonings; the other elements [have been or will be stated] from oral reports, by forming an opinion with a view towards accuracy. . . .

The passage so interpreted is (for Eunapius) plain in meaning and irrelevant to the controversy regarding editions and installments of the *History*.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
*January, 1989*