

**PHOTIUS AND ΜΕΤΑΓΡΆΦΕΙΝ:
Some notes on the linguistic aspect
of Photius' testimony to the nature
of Zosimus' drawing upon the *Histories*
by Eunapius of Sardis***

IVAN PRCHLÍK

ABSTRACT

Photius' statement, if understood literally, seems to indicate Zosimus' *New History* to have been a virtual transcription of the *Histories* by Eunapius of Sardis. Some of the modern scholars mistrust his authority, yet one of them, J. A. Ochoa, tried to analyse Photius' statement in order to achieve a more nuanced interpretation that would even allow for a non-literal reading. In this paper, Photius' usage of the verb μεταγράφειν is re-examined, as well as other reviews of his *Bibliotheca* are pointed to, in which there are compared the authors who are known to have drawn upon one another, yet not exclusively. Both clearly testify that what Photius had in mind was that Zosimus had drawn solely upon Eunapius in the relevant section of the *New History*. One minor observation corroborates the hypothesis that also the opening chapters of the first book are in fact part of this section.

Keywords: Photius; *Bibliotheca*; Zosimus; Eunapius of Sardis; *metagraphhein/metagraphé*

When writing his *New History*, Zosimus drew upon the *Histories* written by Eunapius of Sardis; such a statement can be made without the risk of being challenged. Yet it was not Zosimus himself who had acknowledged his debt to Eunapius, nor had his dependence been recognized by modern scholars by way of comparing the texts of these two authors, nearly completely preserved in the case of Zosimus, fragmentary in that of Eunapius. This comparison had already been made by Photius who had read both authors in full, and had communicated his opinion in his *Bibliotheca*.¹ His authority has universally been accepted since the 18th century,² and corroborated in various ways by modern

* The present paper was written within the framework of the "Centre for Ancient and Mediaeval Thought" (UNCE), Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague, and as part of the post-doctoral project "Vybrané problémy historie a historiografie pozdní antiky" (Selected Problems of the History and Historiography of Late Antiquity), no. FF VS2015/054, supported by the Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague.

¹ For the quotation, see below, p. 35.

² First by Reitemeier (1780: 226–230). An excellent overview of the discussion on Zosimus' sources is given by Paschoud (2000: xxxvi–lxxi) in which none is mentioned who would entirely deny Zosimus'

scholars,³ even if with a slight nuance: since Zosimus covered a larger time span than Eunapius, it is clear that he could not have managed solely with Eunapius.⁴ Even thus, however, Eunapius still remains recognized as a source for the major portion of the *New History*.⁵ Later, however, the question emerged whether Zosimus had drawn upon any other sources also in his Eunapian section, at least in order to supplement what he had taken over from Eunapius, or whether Eunapius had been his unique source there.⁶ The question remains controversial as yet, but Photius' place in this particular debate is rather circumstantial. More often than not, his authority on this detail is being mistrusted,⁷ and rather a comparison between the text of the *New History* and the Eunapian fragments⁸ or internal evidence within the *New History* itself⁹ is sought to resolve it. But although it certainly is true that no decisive argument can be drawn from what Photius says, the benefit of the most accurate possible comprehension thereof can still hardly be doubted.

It is therefore no surprise that an attempt at carefully analysing Photius' statement has already been made. In the debate, however, it is rather being ignored, although its author claims to be going to throw new light on the problem.¹⁰ In fact, his analysis sheds considerably less new light than claimed, as rightfully pointed out by its reviewer,¹¹ which is perhaps one of the reasons behind the lack of interest on the part of the scholarly world. There is, however, another, more serious flaw in this analysis: if conducted properly, it could never support the view as claimed.¹² Instead, the effort – certainly praiseworthy as such – to understand what precisely Photius had meant, ends in an excessive subtlety, overlooking that the meaning under question (specified below), though often not the only possible one, still is, without exemption, by far the simplest and also the most proper one. This, combined with misunderstanding the view under examination – taking it for Zosimus having fairly copied out Eunapius instead of merely having drawn exclusively upon him – leads to that, contrary to what it was intended for, the analysis supports the view that in the relevant section of the *New History*, Zosimus drew solely upon Eunapius. The argument, as admitted above, is not that decisive to conclude the debate, yet

debt to Eunapius. Speck's (1991: 2) conviction that it is possible "nur auf eine Identität des Inhalts [...] schließen, nicht aber, daß Photios nun sagt, Zosimos habe Eunapios als Quelle benutzt und nur umgeschrieben", results from his wholly unconvincing attempt (1991: 1–3) to reconsider Photius' testimony, not from its rejection.

³ The very compatibility of what is preserved of both authors is being invariably affirmed in the scholarly literature ever since. A more detailed comparison with the same result was carried out by Ridley (1969–70: 582–592), Fitton (1976: 7–88) and Baldini (1984: 41–74).

⁴ As also noticed already by Reitemeier (1780: 230–232), or in fact even by Valesius, whom he referred to.

⁵ For further specification, see below, p. 40.

⁶ Reitemeier (1780: 233–235) counted with the former, Martinus (1866: 20–31) tried to vindicate the latter.

⁷ See e.g. Blockley (1980: 394–395); Ochoa (1990: 23–26); Cameron (2011: 653). According to Liebeschuetz (2003: 178) "Photius' observation must be generally speaking correct"; yet even so, he was convinced of Zosimus' having drawn upon an additional source (see below, p. 38 with note 34).

⁸ As e.g. by the above (note 3) cited Ridley, Fitton, or Baldini, none of whom found evidence of any drawing upon a source other than Eunapius in the Eunapian section of the *New History*.

⁹ See esp. Paschoud (2000: lxxv–lxxvii and lxxix–lxxxi), whose argument I consider superior to that of Liebeschuetz (2003: 206–215) or Cameron (2011: 644–654).

¹⁰ See Ochoa (1990: 13–14, esp. 14).

¹¹ Paschoud (1992: 169 = 2006: 242).

¹² For this claim, see Ochoa (1990: 17–18 and also 27).

still it is important to recognize to which side indeed it eventually tips the scales. And in addition, some other important, as yet overlooked, details shall emerge, as the following re-examination is going to show.

Photius' words read as follows: εἶποι δ' ἂν τις οὐ γράψαι αὐτὸν ἱστορίαν, ἀλλὰ μεταγράψαι τὴν Εὐναπίου, τῷ συντόμῳ μόνον διαφέρουσαν, καὶ ὅτι οὐχ, ὡσπερ ἐκεῖνος, οὕτω καὶ οὗτος Στελίχωνα διασύρει· τὰ δ' ἄλλα κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν σχεδόν τι ὁ αὐτός, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν ταῖς τῶν εὐσεβῶν βασιλέων διαβολαῖς.¹³ In his analysis, J. A. Ochoa attempted to discern the exact meaning of ἱστορία on the one hand and μεταγράψαι / μεταγραφή on the other.¹⁴ The former need not be addressed here, since in my view it has no impact on the issue, whatever the exact meaning thereof is.

The latter pair of expressions are of greater significance. According to those denying the use of any other source than Eunapius in the relevant section of the *New History*, this means simply to “copy out”. Ochoa tried to nuance this meaning. In the *Bibliotheca*, nine other occurrences are offered for comparison, six of them in three pairs, each time following immediately one another. For Ochoa, the only one among them to perhaps support the meaning in question concerns a treatise by a physician living in the times of Claudius and Nero, one Pedanius Dioscorides. Photius described his later influence: καὶ ὅσοι δὲ μετ' αὐτὸν περὶ ἀπλῶν φαρμάκων ἔδοξαν γράφειν, οἱ μὲν μετέγραψαν μόνον τὸ βιβλίον, οἱ δὲ οὐδὲ κἀν τῇ μεταγραφῇ τὸ ἀκριβὲς διασώσαι πεφροντικάσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατέτεμον τὸ ὀλόκληρον τῆς περὶ ἐκάστου διδασκαλίας, χωρὶς μὲν εἶδος καὶ φύσιν καὶ γένεσιν τῶν ἀπλῶν συναγείροντες, χωρὶς δὲ καὶ μεμερισμένως τὴν χρεῖαν καὶ ὠφέλειαν διαγράφοντες.¹⁵ In my opinion, here the meaning of “copy out”, strengthened by the adverb μόνον, is the obvious one. But there is more to it, since in the very same breath Photius makes clear, what else μεταγράψαι / μεταγραφή can be: even those who had rearranged the material of the original, still produced a μεταγραφή in the end.¹⁶ Nevertheless, as far as any effect of using other sources, there is not a word here.

Similarly illustrative to me seems also another testimony, although Ochoa disputes the case. Photius had resumed the first three of the fifty διηγήματα of the Augustan mythographer Conon in greater detail than the majority of others, especially the ones immediately following after those three. When passing from the third to the fourth one, Photius admonished himself to brevity: τί μοι δεῖ μικροῦ μεταγράψαι ταύτας, δέον πολλῶ κεφαλαιωδέστερον ἐπελθεῖν;¹⁷ Here Ochoa points out the disbelief, if indeed only slightly implied, of the *Belles Lettres* editor of Photius, that the first three resumes corresponded to the original length of the texts,¹⁸ and on that sole ground himself suggests as a likely meaning “trasladar”, yet specified on one hand with “con cierto detalle”, and on the other with the object dependent thereon, since it is only “la trama de las primeras narraciones”.

¹³ Phot. *Bibl.* XCVIII 84b 27–32.

¹⁴ Ochoa (1990: 14–17).

¹⁵ Phot. *Bibl.* CLXXVIII 123b 24–31.

¹⁶ I agree with Ochoa that here Photius is to be understood this way. The translation of Henry (1960: 183) “les uns n'ont fait que recopier son ouvrage, d'autres n'ont même pas eu le souci de le transcrire exactement”, however, seems to me not to exclude the possibility of a μεταγραφή indeed not being what the others produced, precisely because of not having been copied exactly. For the present purpose, however, this need not be decided.

¹⁷ Phot. *Bibl.* CLXXXVI 131b 19–20.

¹⁸ Henry (1962: 229–230).

For my part, I see no sufficient reason for so a loose translation. And apparently, not even Alan Cameron, thus one of those who credit Zosimus with supplying some information from additional sources, would see any, since he quotes Brown's translation and adds a comment: "Photius's remark [...] 'why should I be virtually transcribing these tales? I ought to be much briefer,' implies that his summaries [...] are not much shorter than the original."¹⁹

Nevertheless, even so Ochoa's translation, while reduced to "trasladar con cierto detalle", still matches what must be thought of as the kind of work with Zosimus drawing exclusively upon Eunapius; but this is due to one important detail that remained overlooked by Ochoa. In what Photius says there is a certain qualification: μικροῦ μεταγράφειν. Yet indeed, when commenting upon Zosimus, Photius too uses even a double qualification: εἴποι δ' ἄν τις and σχεδόν τι, which is usually appealed to by those crediting Zosimus with something more sophisticated than merely copying out Eunapius.²⁰ But now it comes clear that these qualifications apply to quantity rather than quality: Zosimus according to Photius, as well as Photius himself, when resuming the first three διηγήματα of Conon, had drawn only upon their models, abbreviating them somehow, but not supplementing them from elsewhere.

In further testimony, Photius assesses mutual similarity of two lexica to the ten Attic orators, those of Diodorus and Julianus:²¹ δοκεῖ γὰρ ὡσπερ μεταγραφή θατέρω τὸ σπούδασμα, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ἰδίᾳ ἑκατέρω αὐτῶν συνειλέχθαι, yet he adds that he is not able to establish τίς ἐξ ἄλλου μετέγραψε. At various points, Ochoa gives somewhat misguided explanation thereto. He states beforehand that the testimonies to follow will concern literary works, and so inserting information from a source into the new context naturally will be the case, and then refers for Diodorus to Volume II of the *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, where only the fragments of his Περὶ μνημάτων and Περὶ δῆμων are gathered, while his lexicon is not mentioned.²² Yet, since in fact two lexica are concerned in this case, the context for insertion of information from a source could thus not have been so new.

Furthermore, Ochoa insinuates the possibility of both works under comparison being independent compilations, as if perhaps allowed for by Photius: "Focio se decide por entenderlas como dos obras dependientes una de otra, aunque fuera posible considerarlas dos colecciones independientes." But Photius' words are understood differently by Henry: "deux ouvrages dont l'un dépend de l'autre et non deux collections indépen-

¹⁹ Cameron (2004: 72) and see above (note 9) for reference to his view on Zosimus' sources. Neither Henry's (1962: 10) translation "qu'ai-je besoin de les recopier, ou peu s'en faut, quand je devrais en faire une revue beaucoup plus sommaire?", nor Treadgold's (1980: 23) "why should I almost transcribe these things, when I should proceed much more summarily?", supports that of Ochoa at all.

²⁰ Blockley (1980: 395); Cameron (2011: 653). Ochoa (1990: 25f.) and Speck (1991: 2, note 9) emphasized only the former one.

²¹ Phot. *Bibl.* CL 99b 9–15.

²² FHG II, pp. 353–356, where Henry (1960: 112, note 3) refers to as well, while Freese (1920: 222, note 4) identified, if without giving any reason, this Diodorus with a son of Pollio, whose unspecified lexicon is reviewed by Phot. *Bibl.* CXLIX 99a 35–38. Diodorus' identity, however, does not play such a role here, unlike the literary works he authored. And it is true that Photius' actual wording εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπόθεσιν διεπραγματεύσατο does not exclude a possibility of the same subject elaborated in a work of a different kind. Yet, by virtue of the internal cohesion of the whole codex in question, in which even three authors are compared, such a possibility is excluded effectively.

dantes”²³ and especially by Freese: “it is evident that they are not independent compilations”²⁴ It is obvious that each two literary works always can be considered independent of one another, and that is why Photius mentioned this possibility; these two, however, did not seem to him the case anyhow.

Finally, Ochoa cautiously remarks that it cannot be specified to what degree one work was copied from the other, since Julianus we only know thanks to Photius. Nevertheless, Photius himself specifies the degree: οὐδὲν δὲ ἦττον Ἰουλιανοῦ καὶ Διδώωρος εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπόθεσιν διεπραγματεύσατο· πλὴν Ἰουλιανῶ ἢ τῶν μαρτυριῶν χρήσις ἐπὶ πλέον παρατίθεται. Although the comparison through ἦττον seems to point rather to the standards of both lexica, its liaison with μεταγράφειν / μεταγραφή I consider a sufficient reason to understand Photius in the manner suggested for Zosimus with regard to Eunapius, save that in this case the epitomist had not abbreviated his model all that much.

Looking at another testimony, the problem Ochoa sees escapes me completely. Photius reports²⁵ that he came across two manuscripts of Oribasius’ writing dedicated to Eunapius, yet one of them, the latter, had borne a different title, and had been dedicated to one Eugenius; then he states: τὰ δ’ ἄλλα μάλα περιφανῶς μεταγραφή μόνῃ ἐστὶ τῆς πρὸς Εὐνάπιον πραγματείας. In my opinion, this once more clearly points to the meaning suggested for Zosimus with regard to Eunapius, with the same nuance as in the previous case.²⁶

One of the testimonies is entirely omitted by Ochoa. Photius once more tries to establish a relationship between two opuscles, in the present case those by Lucius of Patrae and Lucian,²⁷ and says, among other: οἱ δὲ γε πρῶτοι αὐτοῦ δύο λόγοι μόνον οὐ μετεγράφησαν Λουκίῳ ἐκ τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ λόγου ὃς ἐπιγέγραπται «Λουκίος ἢ Ὀνος» ἢ ἐκ τῶν Λουκίου λόγων Λουκιανῶ. ἔοικε δὲ μάλλον ὁ Λουκιανὸς μεταγράφοντι, ὅσον εἰκάζειν, to which he adds that Lucian is briefer. Here again, the qualification μόνον οὐ brings their relation, as it seemed to Photius, nearer to what must be taken for his opinion on the relation between Zosimus and Eunapius as well. And again, no additional material from elsewhere is signalled in any way, indeed rather the opposite: καὶ γὰρ ὡσπερ ἀπὸ πλάτους τῶν Λουκίου λόγων ὁ Λουκιανὸς ἀπολεπτύνας καὶ περιελὼν ὅσα μὴ ἐδόκει αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν οἰκεῖον χρήσιμα σκοπόν, αὐταῖς τε λέξεσι καὶ συντάξεσιν εἰς ἓνα τὰ λοιπὰ συναρμόσας λόγον, «Λουκίος ἢ Ὀνος» ἐπέγραψε τὸ ἐκεῖθεν ὑποσυληθέν.

The last testimony is irrelevant, according to Ochoa, and rightly so, since the phrase is used within the resume of the plot of the romance by Antonius Diogenes Τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα.²⁸

In addition, Ochoa points to two meanings that are absent from the *Bibliotheca*: “traducción”,²⁹ and especially “corrección”, in the sense of “reescribir, alterar o corregir lo

²³ Henry (1960: 112).

²⁴ Freese (1920: 222).

²⁵ Phot. *Bibl.* CCXIX 176b 5–23.

²⁶ Ochoa’s recourse to Schröder’s (1940: 804) persuasion that the writing dedicated to Eugenius had in fact a different author and was only mistakenly attributed to Oribasius, is once more somewhat misleading. Schröder himself cast no doubt at all on Photius’ statement concerning the uniformity of both texts.

²⁷ Phot. *Bibl.* CXXIX 96b 17–26.

²⁸ See Phot. *Bibl.* CLXVI 111b 25–27: ταῦτα Βάλαγρον εἰσάγει τῇ γυναικὶ γράφοντα, καὶ ὅτι τὰς κυπαριττίου δέλτους μεταγραφάμενος διαπέμψειε τῇ γυναικί.

²⁹ For the verb used by Photius in this sense, see below, p. 39. The same occurs in Phot. *Bibl.* CXCVI 160a 38–160b 5.

que otro ha escrito”, which seems to me the one needed by those who credit Zosimus with supplying some information from additional sources, or even harmonizing the accounts of a number of sources. In the end, Ochoa’s – according to his own view thereof – nuanced conclusion sees Photius’ above quoted statement to mean as follows: “se podría decir que Zósimo no escribió una investigación histórica propia (thus not ‘obra histórica’, yet this nuance I consider irrelevant for the present case), sino que traslada la de Eunapio, siendo mucho más conciso”. Nevertheless, according to François Paschoud, one of those convinced of Zosimus having drawn solely upon Eunapius, this is in accordance with his own view,³⁰ and I agree with him. The contrary view of those advocating the use of supplementary sources on the part of Zosimus is hence not supported at all thereby, even if not outright disproved.

Photius’ usage, however, offers another possibility to learn a little more about the meaning of his above quoted statement concerning Zosimus. Occasionally, there appear pairs of writers in the *Bibliotheca* who are compared somehow one with the other. In some cases we know or can suppose that one of them had drawn upon the other, yet this time not exclusively, which is the procedure some ascribe also to Zosimus when working with Eunapius. Despite the unreliability of an argument *e silentio* eventually arrived at thereby, a closer look may be of interest.

Certainly the most notorious of these pairs is that of the ecclesiastical historians Socrates and Sozomenus, since the latter is known to have taken over considerable amount of material from the former.³¹ Photius’ review of Sozomenus is very brief, yet a comparison with Socrates is still included: ἔστι δὲ Σωκράτους ἐν τῇ φράσει βελτίων, διαφωνεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ κατὰ τινὰς ἱστορίας.³² One is thus tempted to infer that the relation of Zosimus to Eunapius was (or at least seemed to Photius) somehow closer than that of these two.

Less telling may seem the review of the *Panarion* by Epiphanius of Salamis, since he used a number of sources of various kind. Yet the two most important were the *Σύνταγμα κατὰ αἰρέσεων* by Hippolytus of Rome and the *Adversus haereses* by Irenaeus of Lyons, the former often followed as for the layout of the work, with passages from the latter often inserted and quoted at length,³³ which fairly resembles what some suppose to have been the pattern pursued by Zosimus as well.³⁴ Now, precisely these two works Photius reviewed immediately before that of Epiphanius;³⁵ yet even so, when reporting the debt of Epiphanius to his predecessors, he remarks: πάντων δὲ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ κατὰ αἰρέσεων καταβεβληκῶν πόνους πλαυτέρος τε καὶ χρησιμώτερος, ὅτι ἄπερ τε ἐκεῖνοις ἐρρήθη τὸ χρησιμὸν ἔχοντα, οὗτος οὐ καταλέλοιπε, καὶ εἴ τι προσεξευρεῖν ἠδυνήθη, προσέθηκε.³⁶ Here then, unlike in the case of Zosimus, the additions are even fairly pointed to.

³⁰ Paschoud (1992: 169 = 2006: 242).

³¹ For the sources used by Sozomenus, see Bidez, Hansen (1960: xlii–lxiv), for his use of Socrates, see further Rohrbacher (2002: 122–125), according to whom “there is no precedent in ancient literature for two works written at nearly the same time which share so much detail”.

³² Phot. *Bibl.* XXX 6a 41–42.

³³ See Williams (2009: xxv–xxvii).

³⁴ Liebeschuetz (2003: 206–215) whose view is favoured by Hartmann (2014: 60–62). Yet see Paschoud (2005: 370–371 = 2006: 444–447) for its effective refutation.

³⁵ Irenaeus: Phot. *Bibl.* CXX 93b 32–94a 22; Hippolytus: Phot. *Bibl.* CXXI 94a 24–43; Epiphanius: Phot. *Bibl.* CXXII 94b 2–14.

³⁶ Phot. *Bibl.* CXXII 94b 5–9.

Yet another review, however, may raise some suspicion as to the reliability of Photius' judgement. When it comes to the work of the Eusebian continuator, Gelasius of Caesarea, Photius conveys it to be a translation of the Latin continuation by Rufinus of Aquileia. The actual relation between these two was a matter of dispute that lasted for nearly whole of the 20th century, the result being as follows:³⁷ thanks to Jerome we know that Gelasius had died prior to 400,³⁸ thus also prior to the emergence of the *Ecclesiastical History* by Rufinus in 402.³⁹ Both works must have seemed somehow similar, which, however, may point rather to the contrary: that it was Rufinus who had translated Gelasius' original. Earlier scholarship was inclined thereto, yet the recently established *communis opinio* holds Rufinus' work to have been his original endeavour. Among the reasons for this, one is of importance in this discussion as well:⁴⁰ according to Schamp, fragments considered by him to be those of Gelasius' work, suggest the death of Arius as its *terminus ad quem*.⁴¹ If true – and some dispute Schamps' view on the authorship of the fragments⁴² – both works could eventually have little in common, yet it would not indeed be Photius' own judgement to be eventually disqualified, but the judgement of an unknown source of his information: ἡμεῖς δὲ εὕρομεν, ἀνεγνωκότες ἐν ἄλλοις, ὅτι αὐτὸς τε Κύριλλος καὶ Γελάσιος οὗτος τὴν Ῥουφίνου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου μετέφρασαν ἱστορίαν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν, οὐ μέντοι ἰδίαν συνετάξαντο ἱστορίαν.⁴³

Of importance is also a piece of our knowledge of Photius' occasional manner of dealing with works closely resembling one another. From time to time, he probably did not read the latter to the end, as in the case of Arrian's *Τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον*, resumed completely,⁴⁴ and the work with the same title by Dexippus, whose review ends abruptly with the remark: καὶ τὰ ἄλλα διέξεισιν ἐν πολλοῖς, ὡς κἂν τοῦτοις, Ἀρριανῶ κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον σύμφωνα γράφων.⁴⁵ At first glance it may seem that Photius stopped reading here because of such close a resemblance of both works, and thus the work of Zosimus must have contained some added value compared to its source, Eunapius. Nevertheless, a closer scrutiny reveals that the problem is more complex. First of all, Photius certainly did stop resuming Dexippus, but probably at least checked the rest of the text to make sure that it really had come from Arrian.⁴⁶ Further, it simply cannot be excluded that Photius, for whatever unknown reason, had read Zosimus to the end despite the absence

³⁷ As conveniently summarized by Rohrbacher (2002: 100–101).

³⁸ In Hier. *Epist.* 92 init. from 400 his successor on the Caesarean see Eulogius occurs among the addressees. For reference to more detailed discussion, see Henry (1960: 15, note 1).

³⁹ For this date, see Rohrbacher (2002: 98).

⁴⁰ For the others that, in my opinion, unlike this one, are decisive, see Rohrbacher (2002: 100).

⁴¹ Schamp (1987).

⁴² Winkelmann (2000: 410).

⁴³ Phot. *Bibl.* LXXXIX 67a 35–38. According to Treadgold (1980: 63–64) this is one of only two occurrences of reference to a source of information directly read by Photius that eventually need not have been reviewed in the *Bibliotheca*. The fact that Photius himself professes no reading of Rufinus escapes some scholars, e.g. Rohrbacher (2002: 100). Henry (1960: 15, note 1) is aware of it, yet even so he allows for “une erreur au passif de Photius ou plutôt de ses sources”.

⁴⁴ See Phot. *Bibl.* XCII 69a 2–73a 30.

⁴⁵ Phot. *Bibl.* LXXXII 64b 31–32.

⁴⁶ Whom he must have read first, although in the *Bibliotheca* the review comes later, as rightly emphasized by Henry (1959: 202, note to p. 190, l. 13). Eight other similar cases with yet unspecified others are referred to by Treadgold (1980: 25 with note 23). Cameron's (2011: 653 with note 132) inference that Eunapius and Zosimus were not read by Photius one after the other, since the reviews do not follow so in the *Bibliotheca*, is thus simply invalid.

of any added value. And last but not least, there is no certainty that Photius had read Zosimus to the end.

Within the review of Zosimus, his text is not resumed, except for the opening and closing events being enumerated,⁴⁷ which could have been learnt by simply checking the first and the last pages of the manuscript. Yet some indicia even exist that Photius may not have read the Olympiodoran section of the *New History*.⁴⁸ Olympiodorus may not have been mentioned by Photius as Zosimus' source for precisely this reason and if so, Eunapius, as the only one mentioned, becomes all the more likely a source also for the initial section of Zosimus' first book, as for various reasons persuasively suggested by Baldini, and further corroborated by others.⁴⁹ Against such a notion it could be objected indeed that this is ruled out by Photius' observation on Zosimus' treatment of Stilico, being not as harsh as with Eunapius. Usually this is considered an effect of the Olympiodoran section of the *New History*, in which Stilico is even praised. But Photius does not seem to have been aware of directly praising Stilico. His assessment can be due only to the eventual elimination on the part of Zosimus himself, of the harshest attacks within the Eunapiian section of the *New History*.⁵⁰

Finally, two other reviews may contribute a little more to this discussion. That of Ἐκλογαὶ διάφοροι by Sopater of Apamea,⁵¹ the Neoplatonic philosopher put to death by Constantine, consists primarily of an enumeration of sources used in each of the individual books, which is certainly due to the compilatory nature of the work itself. Although comparison with Zosimus may thus be a bit misleading, one aspect still seems to me worth mentioning. For some of these books, namely I, VI, and VIII, Photius, if only implicitly, distinguishes between the main source and the eventual additional ones.

The review of the polemic by John Philoponus concerning the Holy Trinity⁵² is to be mentioned as well. As a heretic, John is sharply criticised by Photius, among other for cribbing from the orthodox, although it is only in these passages that John's text reaches certain level of quality, even if deviations do occur as well. Some of the orthodox authorities are enumerated then, along with the opinion being emphasized that they in no manner contribute to the heretical approach of John. Here again the comparison with Zosimus must be taken as merely showing what may have occurred also in the review of the *New History*, but by no means as what must have occurred. Obviously, the Trinity can be supposed to have attracted greater interest on the part of Photius than the attacks on Christianity by pagan writers, similarly to orthodox authorities as used by John being preferred to any additional sources eventually used by Zosimus. Nevertheless, once more it is to be pointed out that a procedure similar to that used by John is sometimes suggest-

⁴⁷ For those closing, see Phot. *Bibl.* XCVIII 84b 14–26, where in fact Zos. VI 6–13 is summarized.

⁴⁸ Zos. V 26–VI 13; for pinpointing the starting point of the section, see Paschoud (2000: lxx–lxxvi).

⁴⁹ Zos. I 1–46; Baldini (1984: 208–230); Paschoud (1985: 244–247 = 2006: 157–158); Bleckmann (1992: 404–406; 420); Festy (1997: 469–470).

⁵⁰ For Photius' statement, see above, p. 35, Stilico is praised by Zos. V 34, 5–7. Obviously, this would imply that Photius had in fact read a great portion of the *New History* and had left not so much more unread than just the Olympiodoran section. This may seem and indeed is little likely, yet certainly it is possible; thus unless proven not to have been the case, it cannot be excluded.

⁵¹ Phot. *Bibl.* CLXI 103a 18–105a 14.

⁵² Phot. *Bibl.* LXXV 52a 25–52b 16.

ed for Zosimus as well, and that in the case of Zosimus, unlike in that of John, pursuing of such a procedure is not signalled in any way by Photius.

So, the modest aim of this paper I consider fulfilled. All herein examined internal evidence in his *Bibliotheca* clearly testifies that what Photius had in mind was that Zosimus had drawn exclusively upon Eunapius in the relevant section of the *New History*. The double qualification Photius used was not meant to concede Zosimus' having drawn upon any other sources, but his not having copied out Eunapius at length the way others had with their models, but rather having abbreviated Eunapius' text somehow. One minor argument can be added to those indicating that this relevant section had included also the opening chapters of Zosimus' first book. What must be emphasized, however, is that thus only Photius' opinion is made clear. Nevertheless, that his opinion also matches reality is plain from the internal evidence in the *New History* itself, as referred to above.

REFERENCES

- Baldini, A., 1984. *Ricerche sulla storia di Eunapio di Sardi. Problemi di storiografia tardopagana*. Bologna: CLUEB.
- Bidez, J., Hansen, G. Ch., 1960. *Sozomenus, Kirchengeschichte*. Ed. Joseph Bidez, Günter Christian Hansen. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Bleckmann, B., 1992. *Die Reichskrise des III. Jahrhunderts in der spätantiken und byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung. Untersuchungen zu den nachdionischen Quellen der Chronik des Johannes Zonaras*. Munich: tuduv-Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Blockley, R. C., 1980. "Was the First Book of Zosimus' *New History* Based on More Than Two Sources?'. *Byzantion* 50, 393–402.
- Cameron, A., 2004. *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*. Oxford: University Press.
- Cameron, A., 2011. *The Last Pagans of Rome*. Oxford: University Press.
- Festy, M., 1997. 'Le début et la fin des Annales de Nicomaque Flavien'. *Historia* 46, 465–478.
- FHG II = *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*. Collegit, disposuit, notis et prolegomenis illustravit, indicibus instruxit Carolus Müller. *Volumen secundum*. Paris: Didot, 1848.
- Fitton, J. D., 1976. *Eunapius and the Idea of the Decline of the Roman Empire in Zosimus*. A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy. McMaster University <<https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/handle/11375/15911>>.
- Freese, J. H., 1920. *The Library of Photius. Volume I*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge / New York: Macmillan.
- Hartmann, U., 2014. "... und die Pronoia hat die Menschheit noch nicht verlassen". Die Konstruktion der Geistesgeschichte als pagane Gegenwelt in Eunaps Philosophenviten'. In: B. Bleckmann, T. Stickler (eds.), *Griechische Profanhistoriker des fünften nachchristlichen Jahrhunderts* [= *Historia*. Einzelschriften 228]. Stuttgart: Steiner, 51–84.
- Henry, R. 1959. Photius, *Bibliothèque. Tome I (Codices 1–84)*. Ed. and trans. René Henry. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Henry, R., 1960. Photius, *Bibliothèque. Tome II (Codices 84–185)*. Ed. and trans. René Henry. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Henry, R., 1962. Photius, *Bibliothèque. Tome III (Codices 186–222)*. Ed. and trans. René Henry. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Liebescu, W., 2003. 'Pagan Historiography and the Decline of the Empire'. In: G. Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity. Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.* Leiden/Boston: Brill, 177–218.
- Martinus, R. C., 1866. *De fontibus Zosimi. Dissertatio inauguralis*. Berlin: Schade.
- Ochoa, J. A., 1990. *La transmisión de la Historia de Eunapio*. Madrid: ACHH.

- Paschoud, F., 1985. 'Eunapiana'. In: J. Straub (ed.), *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1982/83*. Bonn: Habelt, 239–303.
- Paschoud, F., 1992. Rev. 'J. A. Ochoa, La transmisión de la Historia de Eunapio'. *Orpheus* 13, 168–172.
- Paschoud, F., 2000. Zosime, *Histoire nouvelle. Tome I. Livres I–II*. Ed. and trans. François Paschoud. New ed. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Paschoud, F., 2005. 'Questions d'historiographie tardive: à propos de deux ouvrages récents'. *Antiquité tardive* 13, 363–376.
- Paschoud, F., 2006. *Eunape, Olympiodore, Zosime. Scripta minora. Recueil d'articles, avec addenda, corrigenda, mise à jour et indices*. Bari: Edipuglia.
- Reitemeier, I. F., 1780. 'De Zosimi fide'. In: I. C. Volborth (ed.), *Bibliotheca philologica* II. Leipzig: Weygand, 225–235.
- Ridley, R. T., 1969–70. 'Eunapius and Zosimus'. *Helikon* 9–10, 574–592.
- Rohrbacher, D., 2002. *The Historians of Late Antiquity*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Schamp, J., 1987. 'Gélase ou Rufin: Un fait nouveau. Sur des fragments oubliés de Gélase de Césarée (CPG, N° 3521)'. *Byzantion* 57, 360–390.
- Schröder, H. O., 1940. 'Oreibasios'. In: G. Wissowa (ed.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Supplementband VII*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 797–812.
- Speck, P., 1991. 'Wie dumm darf Zosimos sein? Vorschläge zu seiner Neubewertung'. *Byzantinoslavica* 52, 1–14.
- Treadgold, W. T., 1980. *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies.
- Williams, F., 2009. *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis. Book I (Sects 1–46)*. Second edition, revised and expanded. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Winkelmann, F., 2000. 'Zur nacheusebianischen christlichen Historiographie des 4. Jahrhunderts'. In: C. Scholz, G. Makris (eds.), *POLYPLEUROS NOUS. Miscellanea für Peter Schreiner zu seinem 60. Geburtstag* [= Byzantinisches Archiv. Band 19]. Munich/Leipzig: Saur, 404–414.

**FÓTIOS A ΜΕΤΑΓΡΑΦΕΙΝ
NĚKOLIK POZNÁMEK K LINGVISTICKÉMU ASPEKTU
FÓTIOVA SVĚDECTVÍ O POVAZE ZÓSIMOVA ČERPÁNÍ
Z DĚJEPISNÉHO DÍLA EUNAPIA ZE SARD**

Shrnutí

Podle Fótia, je-li chápán doslovně, bylo dějepisné dílo Zósimovo téměř opsáno z Eunapiova. Někteří moderní badatelé Fótiiovi nevěří, jeden z nich, J. A. Ochoa, se však pokusil Fótiiovu formulaci rozebrat a dospět k takové interpretaci, která by dokonce umožňovala chápat ji volněji. V tomto článku je znovu rozebráno Fótiiovo užití slovesa μεταγράφειν a dále poukázáno na ty části *Bibliothéky*, v nichž jsou srovnávání dva autoři známí tím, že jeden čerpal z druhého, ale nikoli výhradně. Obojí jasně dokazuje, že Fótiiovým názorem skutečně bylo, že v příslušné pasáži svého díla čerpal Zósimos výhradně z Eunapia. Jedním postřehem menšího významu lze podpořit i domněnku, že součástí této pasáže byla také první část první knihy.

Ivan Prchlik
Charles University in Prague
Ivan.Prchlik@ff.cuni.cz