

*DEXIPPUS CHRONICLE
AND THE ATTACK BY EUNAPIUS UPON IT*

R. C. BLOCKLEY / CANADA

Amongst the works of the third century A. D. rhetorician, statesman and soldier, P. Herennius Dexippus, is recorded a chronicle, which is called ἡ χρονικὴ ἱστορία by Eunapius (*Vit. Soph.* 457, p. 362, ed. Wright), σύντομον ἱστορικόν by Photius (*Bibl., cod.* 82), and χρονικὰ by Stephanus of Byzantium¹. The fragments of this *Chronicle* identified in the collections are very few, being drawn mainly from Eunapius (frag. 1), Syncellus and the Augustan historians «Capitolinus» and «Pollio»², with minor additions from, amongst others, the *Suda* and Stephanus of Byzantium³. The older opinion, that the part of Zosimus' history which dealt with events before Eunapius began drew exclusively upon Dexippus⁴, has been rejected⁵. However, it does appear that material in Zonaras and the Latin epitomes did derive ultimately from the *Chronicle*, perhaps by way of a lost *Kaisergeschichte*⁶. But because the lines of transmission of this material are not known in detail, it is impossible to determine its extent or the degree of distortion to which it has been subjected. This is also the case with Syncellus, and here it is particularly galling since he certainly preserves from the *Chronicle* much more material than that attributed to Dexippus by name, which is included in the collections⁷. Unfortunately, the attempted identifications by Gelzer and others of Dexippian material in Syncellus must be treated as no more than guesses⁸. Furthermore, since Dexippus also produced a history called the *Scythica*, which traced the wars between the Romans and the Goths from before the middle of the third century A. D. until the reign of Aurelian⁹, it is impossible in some cases to decide from which work even the named passages were derived¹⁰, a fact which calls into question some of the fragments ascribed to the *Chronicle* in the collections.

In this paper, the purpose of which is to discuss, as far as the evidence allows, the form of Dexippus' *Chronicle* and Eunapius' criticisms of it, the question of which material to attribute to the *Chronicle* has been approached conservatively. Of the twenty fragments of the *Chronicle* printed by Jacoby (frags. 1-5 and 9-23), 1-5, 9-11 and 22 can with certainty or confidence be ascribed to that work, since 1-5 name it, 9-11 contain material not germane to the *Scythica*, and 22 preserves the calculation of the length of a reign, which is more suitable for a chronicle. None of these passages are from the *S.H.A.* or the *Suda*. The passage from the *Suda*, which Jacoby prints as frag. 12, is from a dissertation upon the greatness and extent of the Roman state. Two problems attend this passage. First, the *Suda*, places the name Dexippus after the piece, and some of the important MSS read δὲ

after the name, which would refer it to the next passage (under the same notice, Ῥωμαίων ἀρχή), which is also on the greatness of Rome¹¹. Second, although the *Suda*-passage is referred without comment by Jacoby to the *Chronicle*¹², there is no reason why it (or the alternative extract) could not have come from a set-speech in the *Scythica*¹³. If either is from the *Chronicle*, the contents suggest that it might have occurred in one of the prefaces¹⁴.

Similar doubts surround the material from the *S.H.A.*, nothing of which can with absolute certainty be assigned to the *Chronicle*. Frags. 13 and 14 can reasonably be placed there, since they deal with Alexander Severus, whose reign predated the presumed beginning of the *Scythica*. Frags. 15-19 and 21, which constitute a large part of the material from the *S.H.A* and all of which deal with events of the year 238 A.D. (specifically, the elevations of the Gordians, Balbinus and Pupienus, and the conflict with Maximinus Thrax), are of such brevity that, although they would very suitably come from a chronicle, they could equally well represent brief notices on internal events inserted in the narrative of the *Scythic War*. Frag. 23, which notes the death of Quintillus, was placed by Müller with the *Scythica*; although Jacoby, following Mendelssohn, assigned it to the *Chronicle*, with some reason, since Quintillus enjoyed a reign of only seventeen days and thus Eunapius, who says in frag. 1 that the work ended with Claudius II, could reasonably have overlooked the brother and short-lived successor of Claudius¹⁵. Frag. 20 is placed by Jacoby with the *Chronicle* on the ground that, although the fragment remarks the invasion of Moesia by the Carpi and identifies this invasion as the beginning of the war with the Scythians, the passage dates the events to 238 A.D., whereas Jordanes (*Get.* XVI, 89), who used Dexippian material at second- or third-hand, appears to place the beginning of the war during the reign of Philip (243-49 A. D.). Two considerations weaken this reasoning: First, Jordanes can hardly be taken as a reliable guide for a work which he drew upon so indirectly. Second, the *Scythica* would have had an introduction, which may well have summarized the earlier hostilities in a fashion similar to that of Procopius in the introductions to his *Wars*; and thus, even if the narrative did formally begin with the reign of Philip, earlier hostilities could well have been noted¹⁶. In short, although all the material in the *S.H.A.* could have come from the *Chronicle*, most of it could also have come from the *Scythic War*¹⁷.

Thus, with the material from the *Suda* and the *S.H.A.* thrown into doubt, important evidence for the contents and nature of the *Chronicle* is removed from primary consideration¹⁸, and we are cast back heavily upon frag. 1 (= Eunapius, frag. 1). This is a substantial and important passage, which directly discusses aspects of Dexippus' methodology. But, as is often the case with Eunapius, the pomposity and obscurity of the style makes it hard at times to penetrate to his meaning.

In the fragment Eunapius' major interest is in the structure of the *Chronicle*, and especially its use of chronology. Dexippus' work, which was probably divided into twelve books¹⁹, ran, according to Eunapius, from the period before the institution of archons and consuls to the year of the reign and death of Claudius II (269-70 A. D.). The starting point of the work is not clear, though it did deal with Αἰγυπτίους Χρόνους (frag. 1, 3); the earliest independent fragment (frag. 9) notes the attack upon the Peloponnese by the sons of Herakles, dated by Jacoby to 1103/2 (?) B. C.²⁰ The method of dating and organizing this earlier material is also not clear, though the phrase Αἰγυπτίους Χρόνους has been taken to suggest some reference to Egyptian reigns and dynasties²¹; and the words which follow, συνωθούμενος ἐπὶ τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τελεώτερα τῶν παρ' ἐκάστοις ἄρχων, indicate that the history of different peoples was recorded²². When he came to the period after the institution of the Olympic games (which constituted the bulk of the material), Dexippus utilized a structure based on Olympiads, noting the Olympic victors (frag. 2) and entering archons and consuls under each Olympiad²³. When he reached the Roman imperial period, he also apparently gave reign-lengths of the Emperors, though whether he merely calculated these as a total figure²⁴, or whether, as well, he inserted the reign-years into the continuous chronology, cannot be discovered.

Eunapius, after he has noted that the *Chronicle* ended at the reign of Claudius II, continues, εἶτα ὀλυμπιάδας καταλογίζεται τόσας καὶ τόσας καὶ ὑπάτους καὶ ἄρχοντας ἐπὶ ταύταις, τὴν χιλιάδα τῶν ἐτῶν ὑποβάλλων, ὡσπερ ἀγωνιῶν, εἰ μὴ πολλῶν λίαν ἐτῶν ἀποδοίη λόγον τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν. Precisely what this means is unclear. Gelzer suggested that it refers to a synoptic table of dates that followed the *Chronicle* proper²⁵. Jacoby accepts this and proposes also that it served as a sort of index. This interpretation is the best that has been offered²⁶; and it appears to be supported by the expression εἶτα... καταλογίζεται. The contents of the table clearly included Olympiads, archons and consuls; but the nature of τὴν χιλιάδα is disputed. Gelzer took it as a reference to some sort of millenarian concern on the part of Dexippus when he suggested that the table only covered the first thousand years of Rome, up to 247 A. D.²⁷. But, as Jacoby points out, this would be very odd in a work which shows no particular orientation towards Rome²⁸. Millar, in a rather inaccurate paraphrase of a part of frag. 1, appears to opt for a table covering a thousand years of Olympiads (rather short of the full total), when he renders the words quoted above as, «Then he makes a calculation of Olympiads and consulships and archon-years, making the total a millenium, as if afraid to put an account for too many years before his readers»²⁹. This is weak on two counts. First, it reverses the apparent sense of ὡσπερ ἀγωνιῶν,... ἐντυγχάνουσιν, which seems rather to mean, «as if he were anxious unless he placed before his readers an account of an excessive number of

years»³⁰. Second, the notion which lies behind Millar's translation, that Dexippus wished to cut down on the number of years, runs counter to the drift of the whole fragment, in which Eunapius is concerned to criticize his predecessor's excessive pre-occupation with chronology. As an alternative I would suggest that the words τὴν χιλιάδα τῶν ἔτων ὑποβάλλων indicate that, in addition to Olympiads, consular —and archon— years, Dexippus also noted in his table the years by the thousand, an interpretation which would not only fit more naturally into the context of the whole passage, but which would also make better sense of the article before χιλιάδα³¹. In addition, it would indicate that Dexippus either took a starting point such as the fall of Troy for his calculation by thousands, or counted from the creation of the world³².

Jacoby argues that, despite Dexippus' concern for chronology, his work was not, in fact, a chronicle, but a true history comparable with that of Diodorus, and that, therefore, the terms used of the work and its author by the Byzantine writers are misleading. Jacoby bases this contention on «*die Fragmente ebenso wie die Charakteristik (F. 1) und die Fortsetzung durch Eunapios* (op. cit. II, C, 305). The fact that Eunapius decided to continue this work is indeed puzzling; possible motives are discussed below (p. 10-11). As for the characteristics set out in frag. 1, they seem to be entirely typical of a chronicle, with their stress on chronological computations; the structure wholly based upon regular chronological units³³; and a tendency to condensation and selectivity which *Eunapius* (frag. 1, 4) characterizes thus: πάντα δέ, ὅσα πρὸς τε τὸ κοινὸν πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀξιόλογα καὶ κατ' ἄνδρα δι' ἀρετὴν περιττοῦ τινος ὀνόματος τετυχηκότα, λάβρως ἐπιδραμών³⁴, and «*Capitolinus*» (Vit. Gord. 2, 1) sums up in the word *breviter*. As for what Jacoby means by *die fragmente*, I do not know, unless he is referring to an expansion in the treatment of events of the third century A. D. (assumed also by Millar³⁵), which at first glance the concentration of fragments there seems to indicate. However, while the majority of surviving fragments certainly do come from the third century, none of the material is other than what one would expect of brief notices in a chronicle. Indeed, the passages in the *S.H.A.*, which provide the bulk of the references to the third century, contain surprisingly little information. For instance, the six fragments on the revolts against Maximinus Thrax (frags. 15-19 and 21, made up from more than that number of passages from the *S.H.A.*) contain remarkably few details — the elevations of Gordian I and II; Gordian III the son of Gordian II; the revolt of Titus; the elevation of Balbinus and Pupienus Maximus; the resistance of Aquileia to Maximinus; the deaths of Maximinus, his son and praetorian prefect. The form is unexceptionable for chronicle-notices; and even if there were an expansion of the text for the third century (for which the evidence is clearly tenuous³⁶), such an expansion in the more modern material is paralleled by later *Chronographies*, such as that of Theophanes.

From the first fragment of Eunapius a little more information can be gleaned about the *Chronicle*. In the treatment of early history it rejected the stories more germane to the poets, being thus rationalizing and brief³⁷. If the phrase τοὺς ἡγεμόνας καὶ πατέρας τῆς ἱστορίας ἐκτίθησιν (frag. 1, 3) refers to Dexippus' treatment of his sources³⁸, he clearly cited the major ones; and the subsequent words of the same passage make it clear that he also cited many sources³⁹, being especially careful to give references for disputed or discrepant details⁴⁰ (and there seem to have been many of the latter, especially in chronology⁴¹). He provided prefaces, perhaps for each book, in which he used a style more elevated than that of the body of the text⁴². If frag. 12 (or its alternative from the *Suda*, printed by Müller) is really from a preface of the *Chronicle*⁴³, it indicates that in his prefaces Dexippus discussed general historical developments, in this case the growth of Roman power. Indeed, if the *Suda*-passage which Jacoby prints as frag. 12 is from the *Chronicle*, then Dexippus took note of the theory of the development of the four world-empires (a theme of anti-Roman history⁴⁴), for in that passage the might of the Romans is compared and contrasted with that of the Assyrians, Persians and Macedonians. Furthermore, when Eunapius says that Dexippus passes on to τὰ πρῶτα καὶ τελειότερα τῶν παρ' ἐκάστοις ἀρχῶν (frag. 1, 3), he might, in the word τελειότερα⁴⁵, be indicating that Dexippus was thinking in terms of the decline of nations from the golden age of their foundation⁴⁶, a regular characteristic of classical historical thought.

In sum, despite the doubts of *Jacoby*, Dexippus' χρονικὴ ἱστορία appears to have been a regular chronicle, conceived and written firmly within the classical tradition, as were his other works, the *Σκυθικά* and τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον. If this were so, two questions arise: First, why did Eunapius, who proposed to write a true history in the grand manner continue a chronicle rather than a work such as the histories of Herodian or Dio Cassius, which were much closer in style and purpose? Second, why, when he had decided to continue the *Chronicle*, did he then proceed to attack its concern with chronology, which was inherent in the form?

To attempt to answer the first question: Despite its stress on chronology, Eunapius clearly approves of Dexippus' *Chronicle* in other respects. He calls it (frag. 1, 3), ῥωπὸν τινα ποικίλον καὶ χρήσιμον εἰς ἕν μυροπάλιον, and when, at the end of the same fragment, he says that he intends to deal with the period between Dexippus and the present, «which has not found a notable historical account», he implies that the work of Dexippus did meet this criterion⁴⁷. Two reasons for approval suggest themselves: First, Eunapius, who produced a *Lives of the Sophists*, showed in this work and in his *History* a great interest in men educated in the classical tradition⁴⁸; and he himself describes Dexippus as full of erudition and logical power⁴⁹. Second, whatever shortcomings Eunapius saw in

the structure of the *Chronicle*, he clearly approved of its style, which he calls dignified (σεμνότερα, frag. 1, 3⁵⁰), a judgement with which Photius apparently agrees, calling it, «simple and rejoicing in majesty and dignity»⁵¹.

Moreover, Eunapius in his first fragment was prefacing a work which was to have the Emperor Julian as its centrepiece⁵²; and behind this design, which involved the idealization of the author of an attempted pagan revival, lay an hostility to Christianity for which Eunapius was notorious⁵³. Since this was the purpose of the work, to begin further in the past, at the point where Herodian of Dio Cassius had ended, would have been to weaken the impact of Julian as the core of it. Far more effective to begin closer to the reign of the hated Constantine I, the champion of Christianity; to describe the disasters of his sons; and then to pass on immediately to the glories of Julian. If this were in Eunapius' mind, the end of the *Chronicle* of Dexippus provided an excellent starting-point, since it would not only bring him closer to Constantine I, but it would also enable him to begin his work with a successful pagan Emperor, Aurelian, and to omit the disasters which preceded his reign.

Within the context of a combination of hostility to Christianity and a desire to write history in the classical grand manner (a manner highly appropriate for a work centred upon the Emperor Julian), the attack upon Dexippus' chronological concerns plays a definite role. For there appears to have been a dearth of elevated historical writing since Herodian, and Eunapius was probably quite aware that he was reviving the form⁵⁴. Certainly, in condemning Dexippus for a failure to observe the norms of a type of historical writing which he had clearly chosen not to produce, Eunapius was attacking a straw man. But the attack is really upon chronology as a form (i.e. upon chronography), and it leads into a positive assertion of some of the characteristics and concerns of history in the grand manner⁵⁵. For Eunapius declares that the function of history is to record the true facts without bias⁵⁶ and, by covering many facts in a short span, to enable the reader to accumulate quickly the experience necessary for decision-making⁵⁷ — sentiments which could be paralleled from the classical historians, both Greek and Roman. The rejection of chronology is based not only upon aesthetic considerations and the difficulties of certainty with dates⁵⁸, but also upon the ground that precise chronological calculations are irrelevant to the purpose of history. When Eunapius asks, «What does chronology contribute to the wisdom of Socrates or the cleverness of Themistocles?»⁵⁹, he is asserting the traditional values which underlie history in the grand manner, as well as its moral-biographical approach to its material.

But does this explain why Eunapius shows so much concern, which amounts almost to an obsession, to attack chronology? Perhaps there is a desire to justify his avoidance of the difficulties involved in careful attention to chronological

detail⁶⁰. But part of the reason may well derive from the importance of Christianity at the period, both in the interpretation of history and in the shaping of historical writing. Eunapius was nothing if not reactive in this attitude towards Christianity and its products; his *Lives of the Sophists* has been described as a response to the *Lives* of the saints⁶¹. Thus, it is possible to see in the attack upon Dexippus' preoccupation with chronology and the production of a form of historical writing which was shaped by chronology, a general attack upon chronography, a form of historiography which, though pagan in origin, had by the late fourth century A. D. long been adopted by the Christians and which had become, especially in the controversies over the temporal primacy of the great figures of pagan and Judaeo-Christian antiquity, a major weapon for them. It is perhaps worthy of note that Eunapius congratulates Dexippus on passing quickly over the more remote period of history, on the grounds that there few facts are certain and, thus, it is best left to poets⁶². This was one of the areas of major interest for the historian polemicists of the Christian Church⁶³.

If this interpretation of the motives of Eunapius in attacking Dexippus is correct, then a final observation is suggested: that one of the few passages in which a classical or classicizing historian discusses historical methodology (as distinct from historical philosophy) was stimulated by the emergence of a new and threatening view of history, which in turn gave birth to new forms and priorities in historical writing. It is a commonplace that late pagan culture was to a large extent reactionary and reactive in its dealings with Christianity. *Eunapius'* History and the attitudes which underlie the work are another example of this.

ΣΗΜΕΙΩΣΕΙΣ

1. *Steph. Byz.*, s. vv. Δυρράχιον, Σουκχαῖοι and Ἐλουροί (the last = *Et. Magn.* 333,5). A fragment in Cramer, *Anec. Paris*, 11, 153, 2, also calls the work Χρονική Ἱστορία.

2. I avoid the dispute over the authorship of the various «Lives», since it is not relevant to the present study.

3. The collections which I have consulted are *F. Jacoby*, ed., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, IIA and C, Berlin 1926; *C. Müller*, ed., *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, III and IV, Paris 1849 and 1851; *F. Niebuhr*, ed., *Dexippi, Eunapii, ... quae supersunt (Corp. Script. Hist. Byz.)*, Bonn 1829. Dexippus and Eunapius, frag. 1, are cited from Jacoby's text, except for the parts of Eunapius that he omits. These, and the rest of the fragments of Eunapius' *History* are taken from Müller, IV.

4. *B. Rappaport*, «Hat Zosimus 1, 1-46, die Chronik des Dexippus benutzt?», *Klio* 1, 1901, 427-42; *R. C. Martin*, *De fontibus Zosimi*, Berlin 1866.

5. *L. Mendelssohn*, in his edition of Zosimus (Leipzig 1887), p. xxxiii-xxxiv, proposed that Zosimus used the *Scythica* but not the *Chronicle*. *F. Graeber*, «Eine Zosimosquelle», *BZ.* 14, 1905, 87-105, goes further, admitting no material from Dexippus.

6. *Graeber*, art. cit. 118-25. His argument (p. 122-23) that the *Anon. post Dionem* used Dexippus is not persuasive.

7. For instance, Syncellus' notice on the one-year reign of Claudius II (*Corp. Script. Hist. Byz.* XII, p. 720, 13-14). reproduces an error found in Dexippus (frag. 1, 4). Again, *Graeber*, art. cit. 121-22, makes a good case that the version of Valerian's capture which is common to Syncellus (p. 715-16) and Zonaras (XII, 23, *Corp. Script. Hist. Byz.* XLV, p. 593-94) derives from Dexippus (against see *Rappaport*, art. cit at n. 4, 434 ff).

8. *H. Gelzer*, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, Leipzig 1885-98, I and II, 1, passim; *G. Boehme*, «Dexippi fragmenta ex Iulio Capitolino Trebellio Pollione Georgio Syncello collecta», *Diss. Ienenses*, II, Leipzig 1883, 73, ff. The latter makes a comprehensive attempt to find Dexippian material in the *S.H.A.* and Syncellus, and identifies a large amount to his own satisfaction (without attempting to assign it to the appropriate work). His attempt is founded upon a number of premises, including the following three: that «Capitolinus» and «Pollio» used Herodian only via Dexippus; that Zosimus used Dexippus; that the *Anon. post Dionem*, whom Zonaras used, himself used Dexippus. Thus, by comparing passages from these writers with Syncellus, he is able to extract much «Dexippian» material. Unfortunately, none of these premises is securely founded, and the attempt fails.

9. On the *Scythica* see, most recently, *F. Millar*, «P. Herennius Dexippus. The Greek World and the Third Century Invasions», *JRS.* 49, 1969, 23-24.

10. See the remarks of *Millar*, art. cit. 23. *Jordanes*, in his *Getica*, names Dexippus as a source (which he used at second or - third-hand). His material would have come from the *Scythica*.

11. Although Adler, in her edition of the *Suda* (Leipzig 1928-35, vol IV), rejects the δέ, it is clearly an old reading and there are really no grounds for deciding whether to accept or reject it. *Müller*, op. cit. (at n. 3) III, 687, prints both passages as frag. 31, speculating that perhaps δ' (i.e. the fourth book of the *Chronicle*) should be read. *Niebuhr*, op. cit. (at n. 3) 35, prints only the passage omitted by Jacoby.

12. *Müller* and *Niebuhr* (loc. cit.) refuse to assign it.

13. Speeches from the *Scythica* are represented by frags. 6 and 28.

14. On the prefaces of the *Chronicle* see below p. 9.

15. *Jacoby*, op. cit. (at n. 3) IIC, 310; *Mendelssohn*, op. cit. (at n. 5) note to p. 33, 10.

16. A third consideration is that Dexippus is unlikely to have identified the Carpic invasion as the beginning of the Scythian war if he began his *Scythica* during the reign of Philip. However, this is weakened by the possibility that if the statement on the Carpic invasion were made in the *Chronicle*, Dexippus could have changed his mind when later he came to compose the *Scythica*. (*Millar*, art. cit. 23, thinks that frag. 23 refers to the beginning of the *Scythica* in 238 A. D.)

17. Cp. *E. Schwartz*, «Dexippus» 5, RE. V, 1 (1934) 292-93, who holds that the *S.H.A.*'s use of Dexippus was marginal. *F. Altheim*, *Literatur und Gesellschaft in ausgehenden Altertum*, I, Halle/Saale 1948, 175-92, argues that the *Chronicle* is, with Herodian, the major Greek source for the *Lives* of the *S.H.A.* from Maximinus Thrax to Claudius II. Even if Altheim is correct (a view by no means accepted — cp. *Millar*, art. cit. 23, n. 104), he has by no means dispelled the possibility that both the *Scythica* and the *Chronicle* were used, the latter perhaps primarily for the chronological framework. (Another possibility is overlapping notices). At any rate, the doubts are such that little use can reasonably be made of the *S.H.A.* in the present paper.

18. Evidence from the *Suda* and the *S.H.A.* is further discussed on p. 8.

19. Frags. 3 and 4 remark material from the tenth book, frag. 5 from the twelfth. If the reference to the Heruli in frag. 5 comes from the context of the Herulian invasion of 267-68 A. D., then the twelfth book would have been the last.

20. *Evagrius*, H.E 5, 24, says that he began from mythical times.

21. So *Schwartz*, art. cit. 289.

22. Unless ἀρχων refers to the successive Egyptian dynasties. Further discussion of this phrase below on p. 9. The phrase ἱκανοὶς ἔτεσι in frag. 9 might suggest some vagueness in dating.

23. Frag. 1, 1: Δεξίππῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ κατὰ τοὺς Ἀθήνησιν ἀρχοντας... ἱστορία συγγεγραπται, προσριθμουμένων καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν ὑπάτων, 1, 2: συναριθμεῖται τὸν χρόνον ἕξ τε τὰς ὀλυμπιάδας περιγραφῶν καὶ τοὺς ἐντὸς ἐκάστης ὀλυμπιάδος ἀρχοντας.

24. This is the procedure of frag. 22 (from Syncellus), which gives the reign-length for Gallus and Volusianus.

25. Op. cit. (at n. 8) II, 1, 90.

26. Op. cit. IIC, 305.

27. Loc. cit.

28. Loc. cit.

29. Art. cit. (at n. 9) 22, possibly picking up the suggestion of *Jacoby* (*loc. cit.*) that the number one thousand was *rundzahl*.

30. I therefore take the construction as past indefinite, with ἀγωνιῶν representing the imperfect. I have to thank my colleagues, Professors T. R. Robinson and A. Fotiou, for discussion of this point.

31. Cp. the tables of *Syncellus* in *Corp. Script. Hist. Byz.*, vol. XIII (I am not suggesting that they were derived from Dexippus).

32. If Dexippus did mark the years from the beginning of the world, that could have been an additional annoyance to Eunapius, who regarded the period before the foundation of the Olympic games as not susceptible to accurate knowledge (see the passage quoted at n. 62). This, of course, is pure speculation, but it would nicely fit that appears to be the sarcastic tone of ὑποβάλλων.

33. As well as the characterization by Eunapius noted above (p. 5), see also the phrase in frag. 1, 6: κατὰ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἕκαστον ἱστορίαν γράφειν, which refers to the *Chronicle*.

34. Cp. also frag. 1, 3: ἐξηγησιν κατακεκλειμένην καὶ συνηγμένην, and the expression of *Photius* (*Bibl. cod.* 82), σύντομον ἱστορικόν.

35. *Art. cit.* 23.

36. In this connexion note also the doubts expressed (p. 3-4) on the attribution to the *Chronicle* of the fragments from the *S.H.A.*

37. Frag. 1, 3 (especially the word συνωθούμενος); *Jacoby*, op. cit. IIC, 305.

38. In this interpretation I follow *Millar*, art. cit. 22. For the expression cp. *Plato*, *Lysis*, 214a: πατέρες τῆς σοφίας εἰσὶν καὶ ἡγεμόνες.

39. καὶ περιφέρει γε τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ πανταδαπῶν τῶν ταῦτα εἰρηκότων...

40. ἐνδηλος ὦν καὶ σχεδὸν τι μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι τῶν ἀπιστουμένων ἕκαστον ἕτερος προλαβὼν εἴρηκεν. This I understand to mean, «making it clear and almost swearing that each of the doubtful details was incorporated into the tradition by an authority other than himself». *Millar*, loc. cit., has a different interpretation.

41. Frag. 1, 6: καὶ περιφανῶς ἑαυτοῦ κατηγορεῖν, ὡσπερ ἐκεῖνος, ὅτι χρονικὴν ἱστορίαν γράφων πλανωμένην τινὰ καὶ μεστήν τῶν ἀντιλεγόντων...

42. Frag. 1, 3: πρόθυρα δὲ κάλλους ἀνάμεσα προθείς... *Millar*, loc. cit., takes πρόθυρα to refer to a single preface.

43. See p. 2-3.

44. See *J. Swain*, «The Theory of the Four Monarchies. Opposition History under the Roman Empire», *C. Ph.* 35, 1940, 1-21; *C. Trieber*, «Die Idee der vier Weltreiche», *Hermes* 27, 1892, 321-44.

45. So *Jacoby* with the MSS. *Bekker* offered the feeble conjecture παλαιότερα.

46. *Millar*, loc. cit., has a totally different interpretation — «the earliest and the least contaminated source for the history of each people».

47. Frag. 1 (Müller, IV, 13): οὐπω λόγου τε καὶ ἱστορίας ἐμφανούς τετυχηκότα.

48. See *I. Opelt*, «Eunapios», *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum*, 1965, 935.

49. *Vu. Soph.* 457 (p. 362, ed. Wright): ἀνὴρ ἀπάσης παιδείας τε καὶ δυνάμεως λογικῆς ἀνάπλεως. The *Suda*, s. v. Δέξιππος, calls him ῥήτωρ, as does the inscription set up in his honour by his sons (I. G. 11², 3669).

50. For the use of the term of dignified style, see *Aristotle*, *Poet* 1458a 22.

51. *Bibl. cod.* 82: ἀπερίττος τε καὶ ὄγκῳ καὶ ἀξιώματι χαιρῶν. *Photius* then proceeds to characterize him as another *Thucydides*, but with greater clarity, especially in the *Scythica*. The other works are not excluded from this judgement.

52. *Eunapius*, frag. 1 (Müller, IV, 13): καὶ πάντα γε ἐς τὸν Ἰουλιανὸν ἀναφέρειν ἐδόκει. Frag. 8 (Müller, IV, 15): φέρεται δ' ἐντεῦθεν ὁ λόφος ἐφ' ὄνπερ [sc. ἐς τὸν Ἰουλιανόν] ἐφέρετο ἐξ ἀρχῆς.

53. *Photius*, *Bibl. cod.* 77.

54. The primacy of *Eunapius* or *Ammianus* in reviving the form is not at issue here. Although they both used a simiral form, they wrote in different languages, and thus were, in a sense, both pioneers.

55. There was probably more in the original, but the end of the fragment is lost.

56. Frag. 1, 6: τὰ πραχθέντα ὅτι μάλιστα δίχα τινὸς πάθους ἐς τὸ ἀληθές ἀναφέροντα γράφειν.

57. Frag. 1 (Müller, IV, 12): εἰ γὰρ ἐσχατος ὄρος τῶν περὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν καλῶν τὸ πολλῶν καὶ ἀπείρων πραγμάτων ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ καὶ διὰ βραχείας ἀναγνώσεως πειρὰν λαβεῖν, καὶ γενέσθαι γέροντας ἔτι νέους ὄντας δι' ἐπιστήμην τῶν προγεγονότων, ὥστε, τίνα μὲν φευκτέον, τίνα δὲ αἰρετέον, εἶδέναι...

58. Frag. 1 (Müller, IV, 12): ὅτι ταῦτα οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους, ἀλλὰ τῷ μὲν οὕτως, τῷ δὲ ἑτέρως ἔδοξε, καὶ περιφανῶς ἑαυτοῦ κατηγορεῖν, ὡσπερ ἐκεῖνος, ὅτι χρονικὴν ἱστορίαν γράφων πλανωμένην τινὰ καὶ μεστήν τῶν ἀντιλεγόντων, ὡσπερ ἀπρόεδρον ἐκκλησιαν, ἐκτίθησι τὴν γραφήν, ὀξέως δὲ καὶ τῆς Βοιωτίας ἀκοῶν παροιμίας, ὅτι οὕτως αὐλεῖν οὐ πρέπει... Note also the attack on *Thucydides* later in the fragment (Müller, IV, 13).

59. Frag. 1 (Müller, IV, 12): τί γὰρ Σωκράτει πρὸς σοφίαν καὶ Θεμιστοκλεῖ πρὸς δεινότητα συντελεῖται παρά τῶν χρόνων; The point made by the question is then expanded.

60. Towards the end of frag. 1 (Müller, IV, 13) *Eunapius* says that he will use only the reigns of Emperors as time-divisions (τὸ δὲ κατὰ χρόνους, οἱ τοῖς βασιλεῦσι περιγράφονται, κρίνας ἀληθέστερον). In frag. 12 of the *History* there is a trace of a war-year, and in frag. 14, 3 a sub-division of a reign.

61. So *A. Momigliano*, «Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A. D.», in *A. Momigliano* ed., *The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*, Oxford 1963, 95.

62. Frag. 1, 2: τὸ δὲ ἐν κεφάλαιον τῆς ἱστορίας, τὰ μὲν ἀνωτέρω καὶ ὅσα τὸ ποιητικὸν νέμεται γένος, ἐφεῖναι καὶ ἐπιτρέψαι τῷ πιθανῷ καὶ μᾶλλον ἀνακείθοντι τὸν ἐντυγχάνοντα.

63. This should not be overstressed, for with Eunapius we might compare the sentiment of Eusebius preserved by Jerome (Chron., ed. Helm, 86d): *ab hoc tempore [sc. the first Olympiad] Graeca de temporibus historia vera creditur. Nam ante hoc, ut cuique visum est, diversas sententias protulerunt.* But it should be noted that Eusebius/Jerome apply this only to Greek history, whereas Eunapius gives his words a general application.