was called Pytho before any Apolline association: hence the aetiology to link the place-name to Apollo.


7) I should like to thank my colleague W. R. Schoedel for his helpful suggestions on this note.

NOTES ON EUNAPIUS 1)

“Stilo et oratione utitur (ut omnes fatentur) affectata, inepta, putida, et (quod pessimum est) obscura et caliginosa”. Thus Cobet 2), who devoted more time to Eunapius than most. I suspect his verdict is congenial to those who have had much to do with the Vitae Sophistarum. However, there are lexical gleanings to be had.

Photius 3) condemned Eunapius’ mania for adjectives ending in—ωςης. Two of the examples cited do not occur in the extant writings of Eunapius; they will have been in lost parts of his historical work.

One of these two examples is ποτημωδής. It is used of tears. LSJ cite only this reference. The other epithet is ἐλαφρῶδης. This one is not in LSJ at all. Cobet regarded it as a variant on ἐλαφρειδής, which is employed by Polybius (34, 10, 8).

Hence, a new word for the Lexicon. There is more. At VS 459, Eunapius has recourse to the adjective θειωδής (in the comparative). Cobet missed this one. LSJ give only the adverbial form (used in the sense of ‘by divine decree’), encountered in a late papyrus. To this lonely reference (and the citation of LSJ is inaccurate) 4), one can add the present passage of Eunapius, and also an example (again in the comparative) from Justin Martyr 5).

Cobet accumulated a number of these adjectives under the rubric “Eunapius finxit de suo”. One of these is γεγαντώδης, which occurs in a fragment of Eunapius preserved by the Suda 6). In point of fact, this particular example can be seen in Philo Judaeus 7) (2, 117).

Another word missing from LSJ is μισοφιλόσοφος. It crops up at VS 481, in a passage reporting Priscus on the subject of philosophical disputations. Perhaps the adjective was a coinage by Priscus?

The verb προσκαταγέω is registered by LSJ as a falsa lectio for προσκαταγέω in Galen (13, 598 K). Kühn, however, retained the form condemned by the Lexicon. The problem recurs in a passage.
of Paulus of Aegina (4, 54) where Galen is being paraphrased. Here, J. L. Heiberg (CMG 9, I 379) emended to the form preferred by LSJ.

What users of the Lexicon do not gather is that προκαταχέω occurs in Eunapius (VS 465), with no manuscript variant. His employment of this verb may indicate its claims to status in the Lexicon as a technical term from medicine, or at least as a verb popular with medical writers.

A contestable claim. One might adduce in its support the noun γόμφωσις, used in a rare medical sense both by Galen (2, 738 K) and by Eunapius (VS 474). The works of Galen were familiar to Eunapius through the abridgements made by his close friend and mentor, Oribasius, who lauds his medical knowledge as out of the ordinary ⁶). Eunapius preens himself on this expertise at VS 505. He is certainly given to medical images and metaphors in his historical writing; Müller ⁹) was justified in saying that he “saepius metaphoris utitur ab arte medica repetitis”.

Recognition of this aspect of Eunapian style might have deterred Cobet from at least one of his often needless emendations. He rejects all instances of ἐγκάμπτω, including one from VS 502 (employed in a description of the crooked fingers of Chrysanthius ¹⁰). In truth, a passage of Galen (18 (2), 353 K) confirms the usage.

By contrast, Eunapius is sometimes given undeserved sole credit for a word. He twice has the adjective παντομυγής (VS 457; fr. 63). LSJ give no other references, and Giangrande ¹¹) marks it as unique to Eunapius. The word is in fact in Synesius (Hymn 7, 14). Which is not to say that Eunapius could not have coined it. One should also note the epithet ἀκόθηρος, claimed (perhaps in a misprint) as solely Eunapian by Giangrande ¹²), but actually to be seen in Cicero (Ad Fam. 7, 32, 2).

Finally, an item of interest both to philologists and historians. An Eastern chief is registered in the Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire (p. 709) as Podosaces Malechus. The PLRE notice says: “The word ‘malechus’ is perhaps not a name but a title meaning ‘king’ or ‘chief’”.

That remark may be unduly cautious. Eunapius (VS 456) claims that Porphyry originally had the name Μάλχος, which is Syrian for ‘king’. And there is confirmation of this in John Lydus’ account of the Saracen who killed the emperor Julian in battle. John states (De Mensibus 4, 118) that the man ἀνέκραγε πατρίως ‘μάλχον’ ὀλοιν βασιλεὺς.

Add, therefore, the word μάλχος to the Lexicon, the references to Eunapius and John Lydus to PLRE, and both word and refer-