

NOTES

On Goulet's Chronology of Eunapius' Life and Works

In the centennial *JHS*, R. Goulet proposed a radical revision of the chronology of the life and literary productions of Eunapius of Sardis.¹ Briefly stated, Goulet argued that Eunapius had arrived as a student in Athens in 364, rather than 362, and identified the later date with the terminus of the first ἔκδοσις of Eunapius' *History*, the publication of which he placed not before 395. This date, in turn, forced him to explain references in Eunapius' other known work, the *Vitae Sophistarum*, to post-364 events that had already been treated in the *History*, as anticipatory allusions integrated into accounts of earlier affairs.² Though Goulet's reconstruction has as yet gone unchallenged,³ its infirm foundation of hypothesis supported by special pleading collapses beneath the weight of the evidence at hand.

Eunapius describes his landing at Piraeus around the Autumnal equinox of his sixteenth year (. . . τελῶν εἰς ἕκτον καὶ δέκατον ἔτος . . .), i.e., when he was fifteen,⁴ and seems to synchronize this episode with the period during which Julian's school law was in force, from 17 June 362 at least until the emperor's death on 26 June 363.⁵ While in Athens, Eunapius, who refers to himself as then πᾶσι ὦν καὶ εἰς ἐφήβους ἄρτι τελῶν, learned of Maximus' and Priscus' fall from favor under Valenti-

nian and Valens.⁶ After five years of study at the feet of the Christian sophist Prohaeresius, Eunapius returned as a νέος to Sardis, where he renewed his tutelage with Chrysanthius, whose pupil he had been ἐκ παιδός, and remarks that 'scarcely in his twentieth year' (μόλις εἰς εἰκοστὸν ἔτος) he became fully acquainted with the philosophy of Iamblichus.⁷

If, as is usually assumed, Julian's school law was in effect when Eunapius reached Athens, the year must have been 362. However, Goulet objects that Eunapius expressly states that, as a result of Julian's educational policy, his mentor Prohaeresius was <ἐν> τόπῳ τοῦ παιδεύειν ἐξεργόμενος.⁸ Goulet's solution to this apparent anomaly is the shift of the beginning of Eunapius' study with Prohaeresius from September 362 to September 364.⁹ This would make Eunapius fifteen in 364—according to Goulet the proper age for entry into ephebic status, thus explaining πᾶσι ὦν καὶ εἰς ἐφήβους ἄρτι τελῶν—and provide the absolute date for the arrests of Maximus and Priscus.¹⁰ As corroboration, Goulet adduces a fragment of the *History* in which Eunapius calls himself a πᾶσι during Julian's reign (ἡνίκα ἐβασίλευσεν).¹¹ The return to Asia would then fall in 369, in Goulet's view justifying Eunapius' reference to himself as a νέος at the time.¹² This reconstruction involves three assumptions: the first, that Julian's *lex scholastica* prevented Prohaeresius from teaching in any capacity; the second, that ages one through fourteen for a πᾶσι, fifteen through seventeen for an ἐφήβος, and eighteen until the end of youth for a νέος are categories applicable to fourth-century AD Athens; the third, that Eunapius used these terms consistently in this specific technical sense.

The difficulties surrounding Prohaeresius' instruction of Eunapius have not gone unnoticed, though Goulet is the first to posit chronological error as an explanation.¹³ Yet all the solutions proposed, Goulet's included, have been based on the premise that Julian's legislation affected all teachers, both public and private, when this does not seem to have been the case. For example, in 363 Libanius interceded with Alexander of Heliopolis, Julian's *consularis Syriae*, on behalf of the sophist

¹ 'Sur la chronologie de la vie et des oeuvres d'Eunape de Sardes', *JHS* c (1980) 60–72, hereafter Goulet.

² The *Vitae Sophistarum* (= *VS*) is cited according to the page and line numbers of the edition of G. Giangrande (Rome 1956), followed by the pagination of J. Boissonade's Didot text (Paris 1850); the historical fragments according to the numeration of R. C. Blockley, *The fragmentary classicising historians of the later Roman Empire* ii (Liverpool 1983) 2–127, followed by their provenance in the *Excerpta de Sententiis* (= *ES*), ed. U. Boissvain (Berlin 1906), or *Suda*, ed. A. Adler (Leipzig 1937).

Arguable cross-references in the *VS* to the *History* are 22.13–15, 18–19/464, 39.20–21/472, 40.9/473, which may refer instead to an otherwise unknown work by Eunapius on Iamblichus, 41.15–18/473, 46.2–5, 47.5–6/476, 50.15–16/478, 55.5–6/480, 58.25–59.3/482, 59.20–21/483, 63.16–18/485, 66.16–17/486, on which see below, p. 166, 79.1–2/493, 82.26–27/495, and 88.6–7/498.

³ E.g., Blockley (n. 2) 1 (Liverpool 1981) p. ix.

⁴ *VS* 63.23–64.24/485.

⁵ *Ibid.* 79.5–16/493: 'Ιουλιανοῦ δὲ βασιλεύοντος, <ἐν> τόπῳ τοῦ παιδεύειν ἐξεργόμενος (ἔδοκει γὰρ εἶναι χριστιανός) συνορῶν τὸν ἱεροφάντην ὡσπερ Δελφικὸν τινα τρίποδα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος πρόνοιαν πᾶσι τοῖς δεομένοις ἀνακείμενον, σοφία τινι περιήλθε ξένη τὴν πρόγνωσιν. ἐμέτρεи μὲν γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὴν γῆν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν εἰς τὸν φόρον, ὅπως μὴ βαρύνοντο· ὁ δὲ Προαιρέσιος ἠξίωσεν αὐτὸν ἔκμαθεῖν παρὰ τῶν θεῶν, εἰ βέβαια μένει τὰ τῆς φιλαυθροπίας. ὡς δὲ ἀπέφησεν, ὁ μὲν ἔγνω τὸ πραχθησόμενον, καὶ ἦν εὐθυμότερος. ὁ δὲ συγγραφεὺς κατὰ τουτουὶ τὸν χρόνον ἐκ ἕκτον πῶν καὶ δέκατον ἔτος τελῶν, παρήλθεν τε εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ τοῖς ὁμιληταῖς ἐγκατεμίγη. Goulet 62 thinks the synchronism is between Eunapius' arrival and the date of the events predicted by the hierophant. However, κατὰ τουτουὶ τὸν χρόνον most naturally refers to the time when Prohaeresius ἦν εὐθυμότερος, i.e., when the hierophant was consulted 'Ιουλιανοῦ βασιλεύοντος.

The school law is recorded at *Cod. Theod.* xiii 3.5. *Cod. Theod.* xiii 3.6, dated 11 January 364 (during Jovian's reign) but ascribed to Valens and Valentinian, is often understood as a repeal of Julian's law.

⁶ *VS* 50.20–51.8/478.

⁷ *Ibid.* 96.7–17/502–3, 18.10–13/461.

⁸ Goulet 61–2, on *VS* 79.5–20/493. <ἐν> is Giangrande's conjecture, and he takes <ἐν> τόπῳ to mean 'on the spot'. Boissonade emended τόπῳ of the manuscript to τόπου, i.e., 'from the field'. Ἐξεργόμενος could be passive or middle, though for the latter ἐξεργῶν αὐτὸν would have been more to the point.

⁹ Goulet 62.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 62–4.

¹¹ *Fr.* 15.6–7/*ES* 5, 76.20.

¹² Goulet 64.

¹³ W. C. Wright, *Philostratus and Eunapius* (1921, reprinted Cambridge 1968) 330, dismissed Eunapius' testimony, asserting that 'it is unlikely that the decree [the school law] was ever carried out with any thoroughness in the few months that elapsed before the Emperor's death'. Goulet himself, 'Les Intellectuels païens dans l'Empire chrétien selon Eunape de Sardes', *Theologies et mystiques de la Grèce hellénistique et de la fin de l'antiquité, École pratique des hautes études, V^e Section* lxxxvi (Paris 1979) 297–303, once argued that Prohaeresius was then a pagan.

Gerontius of Apamea, who had been denied by his city's council exemption from curial liturgies.¹⁴ The affair remained an issue as late as 364, and during the entire period Gerontius was well provided for by fees paid directly to him by the wealthy students of Apamea.¹⁵ Though this pagan's case is far from identical with Prohaeresius', it suggests that sophists could continue to teach privately without the decree of the decurions, being subject all the while to curial liturgies. Indeed, Julian's complaints about the mishandling of classical literature by Christian teachers imply that the latter continued to take on pupils.¹⁶ Even the well-known reaction of the Apollinarii to Julian's educational policy is intelligible only if some form of private instruction persisted.¹⁷ Thus, while in particular instances local enforcement of the law may have affected private education, it is a mistake to assume that this was generally so.

As for Prohaeresius, Eunapius relates that the sophist was awarded a municipal chair (probably *c.* 340), later dismissed, and then reappointed solely on the basis of a proconsul's will.¹⁸ Prohaeresius still held this chair when Julian became emperor in 361. Therefore, it is possible that the problematic words of Eunapius' description of Prohaeresius as <ἐν> τόπω [or τόπου] τοῦ παιδεύειν ἐχειργόμενος reflect the resignation of or expulsion from a πολιτικός θρόνος.¹⁹ If so, Prohaeresius could have continued to teach in his home, which is precisely where Eunapius and his companions were taken upon their landing at Piraeus. Eunapius' observation that the house, formerly Julian of Cappadocia's, had been furnished by that sophist with a theatre to serve as a lecture hall at a time when conditions in Athens prevented instructors from meeting classes in their regular locations, further strengthens the likelihood that this interpretation is correct.²⁰ Furthermore,

¹⁴ Libanius *Epp.* 1366, 1390 reprimand Gerontius' greediness.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* *Epp.* 789, 1136–40.

¹⁶ Julian *Ep.* 42 Bidez,² especially 423a–b: 'Ἀτοπον μὲν οἶμαι τοὺς ἐξηγουμένους τὰ τούτων ἀτιμάζειν τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτῶν τιμηθέντας θεοῦς· οὐ μὴν ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο ἀτοπον οἶμαι, φημί δὲν αὐτοὺς μεταθεμένους τοῖς νέοις συνείναι· δίδωμι δὲ ἀίρειναι μὴ διδάσκειν ἃ μὴ νομίζουσι σπουδαῖα, βουλομένους <δὲ>, διδάσκειν ἔργῳ πρῶτον, καὶ πείθειν τοὺς μαθητὰς ὡς οὔτε Ὀμηροῦ οὔτε Ἡσιοδοῦ οὔτε τούτων οὐς ἐξήγηται * * * καὶ κατεγνωκότες ἀσέβειαν θυοῖαν τε καὶ πλάην εἰς τοὺς θεοῦς. The letter is usually understood as an imperial rescript meant to clarify the school law of *Cod. Theod.* xiii 3.5. Cf., e.g. W. Ensslin, 'Kaiser Julians Gesetzgebungswerk und Reichsverwaltung,' *Klio* xviii (1923) 84–6.

¹⁷ Cf. Socrates *Hist. eccl.* iii 116 and Sozomenus *Hist. eccl.* v 18. See also A. Jülicher, 'Apollinarios,' *PW* i. 2 (1894) cols. 2842–44.

¹⁸ *VS* 67.23–73.15/486–90 describes Prohaeresius' dismissal and reappointment.

¹⁹ This interpretation strengthens, but is in no way dependent on, Boissonade's conjectured τόπου (n. 8).

²⁰ *VS* 59.21–60.7/483. For the distinction between municipal and private lecture halls, cf. Libanius *Or.* i 35, where a Cappadocian rhetor, requested by the council of Athens and sanctioned by the emperor, occupies a θρόνος in the agora; i 101–2 and *Ep.* 405, which describe how, upon his return to Antioch, Libanius first taught fifteen students in his own home, then moved nearer the agora where his established rivals used the Μουσεῖον, and, finally after a municipal appointment, gained the use of the βουλευτήριον; and i 280–1, Libanius' account of how, in the aftermath of the death of Cimon, his son, he withdrew from his formal lecture hall to the confines of his own home: θεάτροις μὲν οὐκ ἄν χρῆσθαι, ἃ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἐν τῷ μαθάνειν, ἐπιπροῦτο κατὰ τὸν νόμον. . . . τὰ δ' ἄλλα προσεγένοντο μὲν διμιλῆται πολλαχῶθεν, λόγοι δὲ ἐργασθέντες ἔμειναν εἰσὼ θυρῶν. Cf. also *Cod. Theod.* xiv 9.3 = *Cod. Iust.* xi 19.1, issued by Theodosius II and Valentinian III at Constantinople on 27 February 425: 'Universos, qui usurpantes sibi

the only other explicit testimony on the matter—Jerome's notice: 'Prohaeresius sofista Atheniensis lege data, ne Ἰπiani liberalium artium doctores essent, cum sibi specialiter Iulianus concederet, ut Ἰπianus doceret, scholam sponte deseruit'—need imply nothing more than the abandonment of a municipal lecture hall distinct from the θέατρον in Prohaeresius' home.²¹ Thus, the reaction of the Christian sophist to Julian's pronouncements on education is no argument against September 362 as the date of Eunapius' arrival in Athens.

But even if the impact of the school law alone does not justify Goulet's shift to 364, the age categories of the Hellenistic schools may yet compel such a move. Within the framework of the traditional chronology of Eunapius' life, the author of the *VS* was a πρῶξις in 362, an ἔφηβος in 365, and a νέος in 367.²² Based on his understanding of M. Nilsson's explanation of these terms, Goulet observes that Eunapius' entrance into the ephelia should have occurred when he was fifteen, the usual age in the Hellenistic period, rather than at eighteen, the norm during the classical period. Scholars who use the *VS* to show that Eunapius was eighteen when Maximus and Priscus were arrested would then be guilty of employing an anachronistic scheme; Eunapius must instead have been fifteen in 364, and, since he plainly states that to have been his age upon his arrival at Athens, this event too must be set in 364.²³

Several objections may be raised. First, none of the epigraphic evidence cited by Nilsson or Goulet in support of the fifteen-to-seventeen age range comes from Athens. Indeed, Nilsson was careful to label Athens an exceptional case, suggesting that the surfeit of teachers in Athens resulted in an extended period of pre-ephebic education.²⁴ In addition, no Attic ephebic inscriptions are known post-dating the second half of the third century AD. But even at that date, when other cities already used fifteen-to-seventeen limits, Athens appears to have retained her traditional practice.²⁵ It could easily have persisted into the fourth century and,

nomina magistrorum in publicis magistrationibus cellulisque collectos undecumque discipulos circumferre consuerunt, ab ostentatione vulgari praecipimus amoveri, . . . Illos vero, qui intra plurimorum domus eadem exercere privatim studia consuerunt, si ipsis tantummodo discipulis vacare maluerint, quos intra parietes domesticos docent, nulla huiusmodi interminatione prohibemus . . . ; and xv 1.53, issued by the same emperors on the same date: 'Exsedras, quae septentrionali videntur adhaerere porticui, in quibus tantum amplitudinis et decoris esse monstratur, ut publicis commodis possint capacitatis ac pulchritudinis suae admiratione sufficere, supra dictorum consessibus deputabit (referring, as the title makes clear, to the urban prefect of Constantinople). . . . One of the most thorough discussions remains J. W. H. Walden, *The Universities of Ancient Greece* (New York 1909) 142–53, 266–9.

²¹ Jerome *Chron. s.a.* 363, p. 242 f Helm. The wording of Augustine *Conf.* viii 5—' . . . quam legem [Julian's school law] ille amplexus, loquacem scholam deserere maluit quam verbum tuum'—would then imply the same situation with regard to the Roman rhetor Marius Victorinus.

²² Cf. *PLRE* i, s.v. 'Eunapius 2', where there is some confusion. Since *PLRE* makes Eunapius sixteen rather than in his sixteenth year when he reached Athens, its dates are one year too low.

²³ Goulet 62–3, following M. P. Nilsson, *Die Hellenistische Schule* (Munich 1955) 34–42.

²⁴ Nilsson (n. 23) 28–9.

²⁵ H.-I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*⁶ (Paris 1965) 539–43 provides exhaustive references to the epigraphic and literary evidence, plus modern bibliography.

in that case, Eunapius would have been eighteen at the time of Maximus' and Priscus' troubles. The absolute date of this episode is unknown, but the possible range is 364–366.²⁶ If Eunapius is referring to 365, then the relative chronology of his life, when based upon an absolute date of September 362 for the beginning of his study in Athens, would mesh as perfectly with the known lower age limit for the Attic ephelia as Goulet's revised chronology meshes with his hypothesized age limit. It also has the added merit of avoiding the conflation of two events. Eunapius' arrival and the Maximus–Priscus incident, that seem to be presented in the *VS* as having occurred at different times.²⁷

In fact, Athens may not have been as unique as Nilsson thought; for a trio of laws from the *Codex Theodosianus* demonstrates that elsewhere in the fourth century some continued to consider a student's eighteenth and twentieth years as important dates in their educational timetable. In 334 Constantine advised Felix, praetorian prefect of Africa, that young men about eighteen who had had some liberal arts training should be encouraged to become architects.²⁸ The same emperor, in a law of 324 addressed to Locrius Verinus, urban prefect of Rome, calls a male's twentieth year 'the age of completed youth.'²⁹ Finally, a constitution issued in the names of Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian in 370 instructs another urban prefect, Q. Curtius Hermogenianus Olybrius, to allow students to pursue their studies at Rome only until their twentieth year.³⁰ Taken together, these laws warn against too sweeping an application of Nilsson's categories.³¹

It must be stressed that both Goulet's and the traditional chronology of Eunapius' life depend, when they are linked to ancient age groups, on Eunapius' strict use of *παῖς*, *ἔφηβος*, and *νέος*, and that such use is perhaps too much to expect from an author so openly prejudiced against attempts at chronological exactitude.³² Indeed, such terms are commonly used in a loose fashion as general indications of age; Julian can even equate *παῖς* and *νέος*, while *Suda* presents *παῖς*, *νέος*, *ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀκμῇ* as a definition of *ἔφηβος*.³³ Though Eunapius' usage in the *VS* implies a more careful selection, *παῖς* as it stands in the historical fragment cited by Goulet in support of his thesis is best taken in a general sense. The context of the fragment was the opening of the second book of the *History*, which probably covered Julian's childhood and tenure as Caesar. Thus, *βασιλεύειν* could easily refer to Julian both as Caesar and Augustus. If so, Eunapius would

²⁶ See *PLRE* i, s.v. 'Clearchus 1', 'Maximus 21', and 'Priscus 5' for the principals. Goulet 62 (n. 22), is more confident of an early date than the evidence warrants.

²⁷ The arrival, *VS* 64.17–24/485, 79.14–20/493; the arrests, 51.7–15/478.

²⁸ *Cod. Theod.* xiii 4.1.

²⁹ *Ibid.* ii 17.1, especially lines 7–9, p. 102 Mommsen: '... cum vicesimi anni clausae aetas adulescentiae patefacere sibi ianuam coeperit ad firmissimae iuventutis ingressum.'

³⁰ *Ibid.* xiv 9.1.

³¹ In a forthcoming Brown University dissertation, *Eunapius' History: Problems of Chronology and composition*, A. Baker raises serious doubts about the general validity of Nilsson's theory of age groups.

³² For Eunapius' attitude towards chronology, see *Fr.* 1.60–90/*ES* 1, pp. 73.17–74.15; 43.4/*ES* 44, pp. 85–6.

³³ *Julian Ep.* 42 Bidez²/424a: *ὁ βουλευόμενος δὲ τῶν νέων φοιτῶν οὐκ ἀποκλείσεται. οὐδὲ γὰρ (εἰκὸς) οὐδὲ εὐλογον ἀγνοοῦντας ἐτι τοῦς παῖδας, . . .* *Suda* E 3889.

have been a *παῖς* by either method of reckoning for most of the period from 6 November 355, when Constantius raised Julian to Caesar, to 26 June 363, the date of Julian's death. Clearly Eunapius' reference to himself as a *παῖς* during Julian's reign should not be pressed to mean that he turned fifteen or, for that matter, eighteen only after Julian's death.³⁴

A decisive complement to these relatively theoretical objections to Goulet's proposals is Eunapius' unambiguous statement in the historical fragments that he was in Sardis at the time of the death of the *vicarius Asiae* Musonius, who fell in an Isaurian ambush.³⁵ Ammianus, too, describes Musonius' demise and, thanks to his account, the episode can be fixed in 368, one year too early for Goulet, who would have Eunapius return to Asia in 369.³⁶ In light of this, there is not only no reason to accept, but also good reason to reject, Goulet's revision of the chronology of Eunapius' life. However, to dismiss this element of Goulet's thesis does not necessarily require abandonment of his view that the first edition of the *History* only went up to 364 and was published later than 395.

To sustain his argument, Goulet attempts to explain those references in the *VS* to the *History* that involve events later than 364 as anticipatory passages, and sees several entries in *Suda* that deal with victims of the violent policy of Valens, but which the lexicon places ἐπι 'λοβιανοῦ, as reflections of this technique.³⁷ Here Goulet may well be correct, but even so this merely sets an initial terminus for the *History* at 364 (no novel notion) and pushes the *terminus post quem* of its composition only to 371.³⁸ Of the remaining relevant material in the *VS*, Goulet is forced to place by far the greatest emphasis on 66. 16–17/486 (καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἔσχεν οὕτως καὶ ἀκριβέστερον ἐν τοῖς κατ' ἐκείνον χρόνοις λελέξεται), which he takes as proof that a detailed treatment of Prohaeresius did not appear in the *History* as it stood before the composition of the *VS*, i.e., according to Goulet, c. 395.³⁹ However, because the meaning of this problematic passage is by no means certain—Wytttenbach took Eunapius rather than Prohaeresius as the antecedent of ἐκείνον and ἐν τοῖς . . . χρόνοις as pointing towards a never-completed section of the *VS* instead of towards the *History*⁴⁰—it would be

³⁴ *Fr.* 15/*ES* 5, p. 76. At *VS* 46.18–19/476 *βασιλεύειν* unambiguously refers to Julian the Caesar: *πειμφθῆς δὲ Καίσαρ ἐπι Γαλατίας οὐκ ἵνα βασιλεύῃ τῶν ἐκείνῃ μόνον, κτλ.*

³⁵ *Fr.* 43.2/*ES* 43, p. 85: 'Ὅτι συνηρῆσθαι τοῦ πολέμου δοκοῦντος Μουσωνίου ἵππον ἐπιβάς ἐξῆι τῶν Σάρδεων. καὶ ὁ Θεόδωρος τὸν συγγραφεὴ μεταπεμφάμενος ἐδάκρυσε τὴν ἔξοδον, καὶ ἀνδρὶ τάλλα γε ἀτραμονί καὶ ἀτέγκτω δάκρυα κατεχέιτο τῶν παρειῶν ἀκρατέστερον.'

³⁶ *Amm. Marc.* xxvii 9.6–8 synchronizes the Isaurian razzia and the death of Musonius 'Asiae vicarius ea tempestate' with the urban prefecture of Vettius Agorius Praetextatus (Haec inter Praetextatus praefecturam urbis sublimius curans . . .), from 18 August 367 at least to 20 September 368. *Cod. Theod.* xiv 3.13 (with the emendation of *IVN.* to *IAN.*) and xiv 8.2, addressed to Q. Clodius Hermogenianus Olybrius, provide a *terminus ante quem* of January 369 for Praetextatus' prefecture.

³⁷ *Fr.* 39.3–6/*Suda* E 3448, I 292, II 792, and Σ 455, s.v. 'Ευετήριος', 'Λάριος', 'Πατρικίος', and 'Σιμωνίδης' respectively.

³⁸ W. R. Chalmers, *CQ* n.s. iii (1953) 165–70, first championed 364. Cf. Blockley i (n. 2) 3–5.

³⁹ Goulet 69–71. T. M. Banchich, *GRBS* xxv (1984) 183–92, argues for c. 399.

⁴⁰ D. Wytttenbach, *Annotatio ad Eunapium* (Amsterdam 1822) 283. For other views, see K. Latte, 'Eine Doppelfassung in dem

foolish to accept Goulet's interpretation simply to support his hypothetical or demonstrably false arguments. So, in the final analysis, his proposals with regard to the chronology of both Eunapius' life and his literary activity are of quite limited value.⁴¹

THOMAS M. BANCHICH

Canisius College, Buffalo, New York

Sophistenbiographien des Eunapios', *Hermes* lviii (1923) 441–7, and T. M. Banchich, 'Vitae Sophistarum x 2.3 and the terminus of the first edition of Eunapius' *History*, *RhM*, forthcoming.

⁴¹ Strictly speaking, arguments for or against a break in the *History* c. 378 do not figure in the matter at hand and hence have been ignored. Blockley i (n. 2) 3–26, summarizes the debate.

Pots and Pisistratan Propaganda

It has become fashionable to discover political allusions in subjects painted on Attic pottery of the Archaic period. These allusions are of two kinds, not always clearly distinguished. One is deliberate party propaganda, especially for or against Pisistratus or his sons. The other, which reflects results of political action, need not have political intent: Theseus, for instance, was becoming more popular in Athens by the end of the sixth century, with official encouragement it seems, and his more frequent representation in art may be due simply to that popularity.¹ Here I am concerned only with partisan propaganda, and particularly that concerning Pisistratus and his equation with Heracles. Though the propagandist theory has by now quite a literature,² it is surprising that there has been little objection, at least in print.³

To begin with generalities, there is no suggestion in our sources, literary or monumental, that before the end of the fifth century the Greeks tolerated any equation of living persons, however powerful, with gods or heroes.⁴ The alleged portraits of Pericles and Phidias in the Amazonomachy on the shield of the Parthenos statue⁵ have been cited as parallels; but whether the story is true

¹ An added attraction may have been a clean-shaven alternative to the bearded Heracles.

² The initiative came from J. Boardman in *RA* (1972) 57–72. Though he put his case well and scrupulously, others—whether from misunderstanding or enthusiasm—have gone much further than he thinks justified (see ed. H. A. G. Brijder, *Ancient Greek and related pottery* [Amsterdam 1984] 239–47 and especially 240, where he expressly limits political allusions to 'imagery'). In this essay I deal mainly with Boardman's interpretations, since they are the best argued and, if they fail, then the less well argued interpretations by others fail also; but the criticisms I make are as much of interpretations of Boardman as of Boardman's own interpretations, and I think he agrees with much that I say.

³ The only detailed opposition I have come across is by W. G. Moon in ed. Moon, *Ancient Greek art and iconography* (Madison 1983) 97–118 (esp. 101–6); and this concentrates on one particular subject. More theoretical attacks, which I do not find altogether convincing, have been made by J. Bazant (*Eirene* xviii [1982] 21–33) and R. Osborne (*Hephaistos* v/vi [1983/4] 61–70); Bazant argues that current political interpretations are contrary to Greek conceptions of symbolism in art, and Osborne considers the representation of the scenes on Boardman's pots too complex ('sufficiently excessive') to be political propaganda. For these last two references I thank M. Vickers.

⁴ The earliest instance seems that of Lysander after the surrender of Athens in 404 BC: even so, this was elevation to divine or heroic status rather than equation with a particular deity or hero.

⁵ Plut. *Per.* 31.4–5.

or not, there it was intrusion into heroic company rather than assimilation to a hero, and even so the perpetrator died in prison. If then Pisistratus equated or encouraged the equation of himself with Heracles, it is surprising that tradition, usually hostile to tyrants, did not fasten on this, though we are told that because of his interest in oracles he was nicknamed Bakis.⁶

Another problem is who devised or adopted subjects intended for political propaganda. The initiative must have come from the court of Pisistratus, from customers of the potters, or from the potters themselves. For the court it is hard to believe in direct instructions to potters, and there is no evidence for models on public display in major works of art sponsored by the tyrant. Customers presumably had some influence on choice of subjects because of what they bought or did not buy; but unless one accepts T. B. L. Webster's second-hand market⁷ (which seems to me fantastic) there is very little evidence for special ordering of what after all were cheap products.⁸ As for the potters, one would not expect time-wasting conferences on the subjects of fairly ordinary pieces and, if they had wished to express loyalty to the regime, it would be surprising that they should do it so obliquely.

Further, the choice of Heracles to represent Pisistratus is not an obvious one. Admittedly Heracles was a protégé of the city goddess, but he was a notoriously violent and aggressive hero, while Pisistratus was sedulously mild, preferring peace and prosperity. Nestor, whom he also claimed as an ancestor, would have been a more appropriate counterpart, or Odysseus, another favourite of Athena.⁹ Anyhow, from the silence of our sources it seems unlikely that Pisistratus did much to promote the cult of Heracles and, unless the Archaic pediments of the Acropolis are relevant, there is no evidence of his having any particular interest in him. Statistics of comparative frequency of representations of Heracles in the arts of various Greek cities¹⁰ are not relevant; if the popularity of Heracles at Athens was connected with his assimilation to Pisistratus, it should have fallen off correspondingly as soon as the Pisistratids were evicted, but there was no sudden fall-off.

Of specific subjects which have been interpreted politically the most crucial is that in which Athena conducts Heracles by chariot to—presumably—Olympus. Here J. Boardman has suggested that Heracles represents Pisistratus.¹¹ Briefly his main arguments are these. The subject appears first towards the middle of the sixth century, when Pisistratus was trying to

⁶ Suidas s.v. Bakis.

⁷ *Potter and patron in Classical Athens* (London 1972) 52, 62.

⁸ Even the François vase, for all its elaboration, does not seem to have been designed to suit a particular customer (as A. Stewart asserts in ed. Moon [n. 3] 69–70); at least that is the simplest deduction from its being found in Etruria.

⁹ This argument has less force if Pisistratus took Heracles over from the Alcmaeonids, though one may still wonder how so universally popular a Greek hero could have been appropriated by one family and transferred to another.

¹⁰ J. Boardman, *JHS* xcvi (1975) 1–3.

¹¹ *RA* (1972) 57–72, esp. 60–67. N. J. Spivey has kindly referred me to an extension of Boardman's theory in ed. M. Cristofani, *Civiltà degli etruschi* (Milan 1985) 123; here F. Zevi attributes to Tarquinus Superbus an Etruscan terracotta group of the Introduction from a temple at Sant' Omobono in Rome and sees in it 'un tema squisitamente "tirannico"'.