



Himerius and the Fourth Century

T. D. Barnes

Classical Philology, Vol. 82, No. 3. (Jul., 1987), pp. 206-225.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0009-837X%28198707%2982%3A3%3C206%3AHATFC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-4>

Classical Philology is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HIMERIUS AND THE FOURTH CENTURY

T. D. BARNES

THE SOPHIST HIMERIUS finds few readers on the score of his merits as a writer. He has a justly deserved reputation for practicing eloquence as an end in itself, for concentrating on rhetorical ornamentation at the expense of serious content:¹ as the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* puts it, "Himerius in the main displays a talent for saying nothing gracefully and at length."² Yet Himerius has recently received a sympathetic portrayal as an early Byzantine orator.³ And he has undeniable value to classical scholars, both for his quotations from and allusions to early Greek lyric poets, such as Sappho and Ibycus,⁴ and as a quarry for literary commonplaces which help to elucidate passages in Hellenistic poetry or Roman elegy.⁵ Moreover, much as he preferred to avoid contemporary reality in his speeches, Himerius inevitably lets slip some valuable remarks about the Roman Empire of his own day—for example, the exclusively Christian character of Constantine's new city of Constantinople before Julian introduced pagan cults (*Or.* 41. 8).⁶

Himerius' writings survive in three main ways.⁷ First, Photius describes a corpus of some seventy-five speeches, which he knew and had read

I am most grateful to Alan Booth, Christopher Jones, and the Editor for their kind advice and criticism, and to audiences at Toronto and Stanford who helped me to clarify the exposition of a complicated subject.

1. W. von Christ, W. Schmid, and O. Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, vol. 2.2⁶ (Munich, 1924), p. 1000: "reiner Dekorationsredner"; H. Gärtner, "Himerios," *Der kleine Pauly*, vol. 2 (Munich, 1975), col. 1149: "die gänzlich unpolitische Beredsamkeit des Himerios."

2. *OCD*², s.v. "Himerius," p. 516.

3. G. A. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton, 1983), pp. 141–49.

4. C. Teuber, *Quaestiones Himerianae* (Ph.D. diss., Breslau, 1882); G. E. Rizzo, "Saggio su Imerio il sofista," *RFIC* 26 (1898): 513–63; J. Mesk, "Sappho und Theokrit in der ersten Rede des Himerios," *WS* 44 (1925): 160–70; J. D. Meerwaldt, "Epithalamica I. De Himerio Sapphus imitatore," *Mnemosyne* 7 (1954): 19–38; L. E. Woodbury, "Ibycus and Polycrates," *Phoenix* 39 (1985): 193–214, at pp. 209–13.

5. J. C. Yardley, "The Roman Elegists, Sick Girls, and the Soteria," *CQ* 27 (1977): 400.

6. The passage is adduced, but undervalued, by G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451* (Paris, 1974), p. 376: "L'éloge vibrant qu' Himérios vient prononcer à Constantinople n'est que rhétorique."

7. See the edition by A. Colonna (Rome, 1951), upon which all statements made here about the text are based, except where otherwise noted. On the excerpts, see A. Colonna, "Disputationes Himerianae," *Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione della Edizione nazionale dei classici greci e latini* 1 (1941): 147–69; and on the reliability of Photius, A. Colonna, "Il testo di Imerio nella 'Bibliotheca' di Fozio," in *Miscellanea G. Galbati*, vol. 2, *Fontes Ambrosiani* 26 (Milan, 1951), pp. 95–106.

There have been important discoveries since Colonna's edition: S. Eitrem and L. Amundsen, "Fragments from the Speeches of Himerios. P. Osl. inv. no. 1478," *C&M* 17 (1956): 23–30 (papyrus fragments, esp. of *Or.* 46); A. Guida, "Frammenti inediti di Eupoli, Teleclide, Teognide, Giuliano e Imerio da un nuovo codice del Lexicon Vindobonense," *Prometheus* 5 (1979): 210–14 (excerpts in another Naples manuscript, Bibl. Naz. gr. II D 29).

©1987 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved

0009-837X/87/8203-0002\$01.00

(*Bibl. cod.* 165). Second, Photius excerpted a large number of rhetorical flosculi from Himerius (*Bibl. cod.* 243), and numerous brief extracts are preserved elsewhere, in a fourteenth-century manuscript at Naples (*Bibl. Naz. gr.* II C 32) and in the lexicon of Andreas Lopadiota. Finally, some thirty-two speeches are extant in their own right. Unfortunately, the most important manuscript, of the thirteenth century (Paris. supp. gr. 352), which originally contained the full text of thirty-two speeches, was extensively trimmed in the fifteenth or sixteenth century, so that the text of several speeches which it preserves is extremely lacunose. (The other two manuscripts offer, respectively, nine and three of the same thirty-two speeches.) However, besides the text of the speeches themselves, the historian can use the headings that an ancient editor supplied, from which the titles given by Photius and found in the Naples excerpts are derived: these headings sometimes provide authentic information that cannot be deduced from the speech itself.⁸ The medieval manuscripts, the excerpts, and Photius' reports all appear to derive from a collected edition made, presumably by a pupil, shortly after Himerius died.

The sophist Himerius was not a totally insignificant figure in his own day. He addressed proconsuls and, it appears, spoke before the emperor Constantius (frag. 1. 6). He became acquainted with Julian in 355, when the young prince studied briefly in Athens, and he traveled to the imperial court at Constantinople when Julian, now sole emperor, was about to undertake the restoration of Hellenism. At the lowest count, therefore, it would be a useful exercise to reconsider what Himerius reveals about his career and about the Roman governors whom he addressed, because a careful winnowing of his verbiage should allow the gleaning of something new, interesting, and important. But there is also some prospect that a fresh examination of the speeches may begin to build up a coherent career and personality for one of the most elusive writers of the fourth century.

I

Himerius' birth is normally set very early in the fourth century.⁹ The standard date appears to derive from, or at least to be heavily influenced by, B. Keil's contention that Himerius was born ca. 300.¹⁰ Keil deduced his date from Himerius' address to the city of Constantinople early in 362 (*Or.* 41); but though a date for Himerius' birth can indeed be deduced from this speech, it is one significantly different from that proposed by Keil. Himerius refers to his studies in Athens and to an earlier visit to the city on the Bosphorus (*Or.* 41. 2):

8. E.g., the names of the *vicarius* Musonius and the *consularis* Calliopius (*Or.* 39, heading). Observe, however, that the title printed by Colonna for *Or.* 39 on the basis of the Naples excerpts is misleading: the speech is not a *λαλία* addressed to the emperor Julian and Musonius but an address to the city of Thessalonica.

9. H. Schenkl, "Himerios (1)," *RE* 8 (1913): 1624–25 (ca. 303); Christ-Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte* 2.2^o:1000 (ca. 310); *OCD*², "Himerius" (ca. 310); *PLRE* 1:436 (early in the fourth century).

10. "Zwei Identificationen," *Hermes* 42 (1907): 548–63, at pp. 551–56.

My speeches, as if by some superior fate, have long (ἄνωθεν ἄρα)¹¹ been destined to belong to the city. The proof, a very strong one, is as follows. When it was time, after my contests in Athens and the great garlands of Athena Parthenos, for my words to plow and seed the rest of the world with Attic discourse, fate did not lead them to the western Rhine or direct their foreign travels to the legendary sea of Ocean but brought them to you still in the flower of youth, green with their first downy beard, so that they might weave a hymn to the city with still-fresh flowers. But since, on this second occasion, white is their hair and white already their locks, they have praised the emperor in private,¹² so that the city again may become the prologue of hymns in his praise.

Keil argued that Himerius' white hairs proved him already an old man: he saw in the Rhine and Ocean allusions to Constantine's court at Arles ca. 316, and hence he inferred that Himerius was probably born between ca. 300 and ca. 304.¹³ But Keil felt able to advance this argument only because he assumed that no datable event in Himerius' life need be later than 368/69. That assumption appears to be mistaken, since the proconsul Flavianus, to whom Himerius addressed three speeches (*Or.* 12, 36, 43), was almost certainly the proconsul of Asia for 383/84.¹⁴ The dating of these three speeches to 383 should be regarded as one of the few fixed points for establishing the chronology of Himerius' life: hence, an allusion to Himerius as a young man ca. 316 becomes implausible.

The passage in fact alludes, not to the court of Constantine, but to the court of his son Constans at Trier. K. Münscher, criticizing Keil, detected the specific reference.¹⁵ Himerius contrasts himself implicitly with his rival in Athens, the sophist Proaeresius, who made a famous journey to Trier in or shortly after 343 (Eunap. *VP* 10. 7, p. 492). But why does Himerius mention both Rhine and Ocean? Münscher omitted to discuss that detail, while Schenkl hesitantly and unconvincingly suggested an allusion to Spain¹⁶—which would have no obvious point. The mention of Ocean surely alludes to Constans' expedition to Britain in the winter of 342/43, after which the emperor's crossing of the English channel and his overcoming of Ocean and the elements provided an obvious and easy

11. I am uncertain whether ἄνωθεν ἄρα should be translated "from on high" or "from long ago": both meanings are appropriate to the context and are found in Himerius (cf., respectively, *Or.* 32. 1, 46. 8 and *Or.* 36. 18, 39. 5). The sophist also uses ἄνωθεν to mean "inland" (*Or.* 37. 1, 39. 6).

12. Accepting Wernsdorf's emendation καθ' ἑαυτούς for the transmitted καθ' ἑαυτὸν, which Colonna defends as meaning "for himself." Keil, "Identifikationen," p. 552, n. 1, diagnosed deeper corruption: "Das corrupte καθ' ἑαυτὸν kann ich nicht heilen; der Sinn verlangt οἱκοὶ ᾄδειν ἐπήνεσεν (d.h. die εἰσαγγέλην)."

13. Two centuries earlier, it was possible for a Lucian or an Aelius Aristides to go to Gaul to teach; cf. C. P. Jones, *Culture and Society in Lucian* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), pp. 11–12. The evidence of Libanius and Eunapius shows that Eastern sophists no longer did so in the fourth century.

14. See section IV, below, on *Or.* 12, 36, 43. Schenkl, "Himerios," col. 1625, rejected the identification altogether, whereas O. Seeck, "Flavianus (11)," *RE* 6 (1909): 2506, and "Flavianus (15)," *RE* 6 (1909): 2512, identified the Flavianus of *Or.* 12 as the proconsul of Asia in 383/84 but made the addressee of *Or.* 36 a proconsul of Africa; the latter identification, including Seeck's erroneous date of 361 (instead of 357/58), is repeated by R. Henry, ed., *Photius: "Bibliothèque,"* vol. 6 (Paris, 1971), pp. 124–25. That all three speeches are addressed to the younger Nicomachus Flavianus is assumed at *PLRE* 1:345.

15. "Bericht über die Literatur zur zweiten Sophistik (rednerische Epideiktik und Belletristik) aus den Jahren 1905–1909," *Bursians Jahresbericht* 149 (1910): 157.

16. "Himerios," col. 1622.

theme for any who wished to praise or flatter him.¹⁷ But if that is so, then the two allusions to Rhine and Ocean coincide closely in time, and hence imply that Himerius completed his studies in Athens in the early 340s. His birth, therefore, should fall ca. 320 rather than at the very beginning of the fourth century. That his hair was white by 362 provides no counterargument, as many a middle-aged man will reluctantly testify.

II

Photius preserves a series of miscellaneous excerpts from speeches that he does not identify (between his extracts from *Or.* 11 and 12). One of them clearly comes from a speech addressed to Constantius between 351 and 354 (frag. 1. 6):

O brightest eye of your race, you who have become for your family exactly what your ancestor Helios has often been for you! For of this fine pair, the one, like the morning star at dawn, has risen with you who illumine the great thrones, imitating your bright rays with his reflected lights; while the other, shining forth from the herd of young men, like some high-spirited bull that leads the herd, has leapt in the meadows of the Muses, like a young horse full of divine spirit who holds his neck high, and has imitated the young man in Homer, the son of Thetis, having become a good speaker of words and doer of deeds (*Il.* 9. 443).¹⁸

Behind this rodomontade there may lurk something highly significant, though otherwise unattested. The allusions to Constantius, Gallus, and Julian seem indisputable.¹⁹ The language suggests that Gallus has recently become Caesar (morning star) to Constantius as Augustus (sun); indeed, Himerius speaks as if he is celebrating the *ortus* of a new emperor—and sun-imagery was all the more appropriate for a young Caesar just summoned to court from the obscurity of a private station.²⁰ Further, Himerius speaks as if Gallus and Julian are present (τῆς γὰρ συνωρίδος ταύτης δὴ τῆς καλῆς ὁ μὲν . . .). In brief, the fragment implies that Himerius was in Sirmium on 15 March 351, when Constantius appointed Gallus Caesar (*Chron. min.* 1:238)—and that Julian was there too, as an honored guest at the proclamation of his brother. That Julian nowhere vouchsafes any hint is no counterargument to the admittedly tenuous deduction drawn here: on the contrary, his silence could be construed as an example of his mendacity when he writes about Constantius.

As concerns Himerius, the fragment has implications entirely independent of any hypothesis about the exact date and occasion of the speech from which it comes. It implies that he traveled to Constantius and spoke before him. But it is not certain that he did so on behalf of Athens, the city where he resided and taught for many years, and where he recited most, though not all, of his surviving speeches.

17. Firm. Mat. *Err. prof. rel.* 28. 6; Lib. *Or.* 59. 139 ff.

18. Translated into French by J. Bidez, *La vie de l'empereur Julien* (Paris, 1930), p. 95. He appears to date the speech to the period when Gallus was already residing in Antioch.

19. Colonna, "Testo," p. 97.

20. E. Kantorowicz, "Oriens Augusti—Lever du Roi," *DOP* 17 (1963): 119–77; S. G. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1981), pp. 20–21, 199.

III

Himerius was the son of the rhetor Ameinias from Prusias in Bithynia (*Suda* I.348 [2:633 Adler]). It has been argued so far that he was born ca. 320, came to Constantinople after his studies at Athens in or shortly after 342/43, and delivered a panegyric before Constantius, probably on 15 March 351. It may now be suggested that in his teaching positions both at Constantinople and later at Athens he followed in the footsteps of the Antiochene Libanius. To establish that proposition, it will be necessary to digress in order to consider Libanius' career between 340 and 353.

The accepted chronology for the career of Libanius between his departure from Athens in 340 and his permanent return to his native Antioch derives from the work of G. R. Sievers over a century ago, whose conclusions O. Seeck accepted and employed in his standard treatment of Libanius' correspondence.²¹ It needs a critical reexamination, since Sievers expressly deduced his date of 342/43 for Libanius' departure from Constantinople from the supposed fact that Constantius suppressed the riots that preceded his departure (*Lib. Or.* 1. 44) during the winter of 342/43.²² But Constantius' journey to Constantinople belongs to the preceding winter (i.e., 341/42).²³ Moreover, the recent accounts of Libanius' career given by A. F. Norman and the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* entail the impossible corollary that Libanius delivered in Constantinople a speech whose text states that it was delivered in the city where Constantine died, i.e., in Nicomedia (*Lib. Or.* 59. 72).²⁴

Libanius began to teach in Constantinople at the beginning of the winter of 340/41 (*Lib. Or.* 1. 31–33). He was compelled to leave the city by Limenius, who had recently replaced Alexander, after that proconsul had been wounded in a riot and forced to flee to Perinthus (*Lib. Or.* 1. 44–47). Neither the riot nor Libanius' departure can be at all precisely dated. The riot in which the proconsul was wounded should be different from the more famous riot of early 342, in which the military commander Hermogenes was lynched when he attempted to expel the bishop Paul (*Jer. Chron.* 235^f Helm; *Historia acephala* 1. 4 Martin; *Soc. HE* 2. 13. 1–5; *Chron. min.* 1:235). And the proconsulate of neither Alexander nor Limenius is dated independently of Libanius—unless an adventurous emendation be permitted to show the latter proconsul in office on 27 August 342.²⁵ Nor can anything precise be discovered about Libanius' subsequent brief sojourn in Nicaea (*Lib. Or.* 1. 48).

21. Sievers, *Das Leben des Libanius* (Berlin, 1868), pp. 42–71; Seeck, *Die Briefe des Libanius zeitlich geordnet*, Texte und Untersuchungen 30.1–2 (Leipzig, 1906); cf. R. Förster and K. Münscher, "Libanios," *RE* 12 (1925): 2488–91.

22. *Leben*, p. 53, n. 10.

23. T. D. Barnes, "Imperial Chronology," *Phoenix* 34 (1980): 160–66, at p. 163.

24. *Libanius' Autobiography (Oration I)* (London, 1965), p. vii; *PLRE* 1:505. In his commentary, however, Norman correctly dates Libanius' departure from Nicomedia to 349 (pp. 161, 169).

25. Barnes, "Chronology," p. 164, emending the addressee and date of *CTH* 11. 39. 4 (transmitted date: 27 August 346).

After Libanius left Nicaea, however, he spent five years in Nicomedia, which he later proclaimed the best five years of his life (Lib. *Or.* 1. 51). Libanius presumably reckons by academic years running from autumn to summer,²⁶ and these five years almost certainly run from 344 to 349. The one fixed point is provided by Libanius' panegyric on the heroic deeds of Constantius and Constans (Lib. *Or.* 59), which he delivered in Nicomedia in late 348 or 349.²⁷ Libanius' quinquennium in Nicomedia, therefore, must include the academic year 348/49 and hence cannot have begun before 344. Soon after delivering the speech, Libanius returned to Constantinople when the praetorian prefect Philippus, who had earlier allowed Libanius to resist persuasion, compelled him to move by means of an imperial letter (Lib. *Or.* 1. 74). It seems natural to assign Libanius' return to Constantinople to 349.

Libanius' second departure from Constantinople is also problematical. His autobiographical speech records that in two successive summers his love for Bithynia led him to revisit his old haunts (Lib. *Or.* 1. 77); then Strategius, whom Constantius had appointed governor of Greece "after the removal of the usurpers, one by persuasion, the other by force," persuaded the Athenians to invite Libanius back to a chair of rhetoric there (Lib. *Or.* 1. 81–84). The accepted chronology of this stage of Libanius' career rests on the deduction that, since Strategius was appointed after the removal of both Vetrano and Magnentius, he was therefore appointed proconsul of Achaia in A.D. 353.²⁸ But Constantius gained control of the Balkans when Vetrano abdicated on 25 December 350, and he defeated Magnentius at the battle of Mursa on 28 September 351.²⁹ Strategius could have been appointed after Mursa for the proconsular year 352/53, or even before the battle for 351/52. Either of these dates seems to fit the explicit indications in Libanius better than the accepted date of 353: in 350 and 351 Libanius revisited Bithynia; in 352 he was offered a chair in Athens; and he then visited Antioch before returning there permanently during the winter of 353/54 (Lib. *Epist.* 386; cf. Amm. Marc. 14. 7. 2).³⁰

Himerius (it is known) visited Bithynia while Libanius was teaching in Nicomedia.³¹ Photius reports a speech given "in Nicomedia at the urging of Pompeianus, the governor there" (p. 9. 75–76 Colonna). The speech is

26. On the importance of "années scolaires," see P. Petit, *Les étudiants de Libanius* (Paris, 1957), pp. 48–59; A. D. Booth, "À quel âge Libanius est-il entré à l'école du rhéteur?" *Byzantion* 53 (1983): 157–63.

27. R. Förster, *Libanii Opera*, vol. 4 (Leipzig, 1908), p. 201. This speech has so far not received the systematic historical analysis that it deserves.

28. Seeck, *Briefe*, pp. 282–83; id., "Strategius (1)," *RE* 4A (1931): 182; Norman, *Autobiography*, p. 169; *PLRE* 1:611.

29. For full narratives, see O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, vol. 4 (Berlin, 1911), pp. 96–120; J. Sasel, "The Struggle between Magnentius and Constantius II for Italy and Illyricum," *ZAnt* 21 (1971): 205–16.

30. On this stage of Libanius' career, "between Constantinople and Antioch," see R. A. Kaster, "The Salaries of Libanius," *Chiron* (1983): 37–59, at pp. 41–50.

31. On the problem of distinguishing between different men called Himerius in the correspondence of Libanius, see H. Schenkl, "Zur Biographie des Rhetors Himerios," *RhM* 72 (1917–18): 34–40.

lost, but it appears to have been given on an occasion described by Libanius in a letter of 362 (*Epist.* 742):

When I was enjoying that happiness in Nicomedia, not enjoying greater riches than others but having leisure for speeches, the governor of Bithynia was Pompeianus, a noble and just man, who in no way despised poverty, who honored genuine eloquence and rejected its opposite. Surely you do not forget how he mocked that finely tailored fellow from Athens, forcing him to speak against his wishes and intending to show his feebleness.

This is good-natured banter rather than barbed insult. If "the finely tailored fellow from Athens" is Himerius (as appears to be entailed by external testimony),³² then the description would be apt only if the Bithynian were newly arrived from Athens—which suggests that the episode should be located early in Libanius' sojourn in Nicomedia.

In an earlier letter, of 355/56, Libanius had written to Gorgonius, an assessor of the governor, to ask him to aid Himerius in a lawsuit involving property in Armenia (*Epist.* 469):

An opportunity has arrived that enables you to do good to the whole Greek world (ἄπαν τὸ Ἑλληνικόν). Himerius' life is education, and the place of his teaching (τόπος τῆς συνουσίας) is Athens, but he has property in Armenia.

At the time of the letter, Himerius was a teacher of rhetoric at Athens. There he taught two brothers who later became Christian bishops, Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus, and probably also, very briefly in the spring of 355, the future emperor Julian (*Soc. HE* 4. 26. 6, whence *Soz. HE* 6. 17. 1).

The evidence considered so far is consistent with the hypothesis that Himerius taught rhetoric in Constantinople from 343 to 352 and that he only began to teach at Athens in the latter year. It now becomes necessary to inquire what a prosopographical study of the speeches Himerius addressed to Roman officials and governors can contribute to an understanding of his career.

IV

The speeches of Himerius, even in their often lamentable state of preservation, sometimes disclose information about Roman governors and officials that has not always been correctly evaluated or exploited. The following notes discuss the named proconsuls and other officials whom Himerius addresses: the order reflects the first occurrence of each name in the relevant speeches in Colonna's edition.³³

Severus (*Or.* 9 and 24). Severus was a native of the province of Diospontus who studied with Himerius: the orator composed an epithalamium for his marriage in Athens to a woman from Philippopolis

32. Schenkl, "Biographie," pp. 39–40, halfheartedly questions the identification.

33. Colonna's edition contains some egregious errors: it turns a praetorian prefect into a lowly *praeses* (p. 176, on *Or.* 42) and makes the addressee of *Or.* 12, 36, and 43 a proconsul of Achaëa (p. 178).

(*Or.* 9, esp. 5, 13–14, 17). A second speech, whose title is reported as εἰς Σεβήρον ἑταῖρον (*Or.* 24), describes his official career in a passage among the most lacunose in the whole corpus. Himerius alludes to his addressee's Pontic origin (line 26), to the relationship of master and pupil (lines 10–20), and to Severus' official career. At least four posts or honors receive mention.³⁴ First, "Galatians were a prelude of his honors" (line 36), i.e., Severus was governor of Galatia.³⁵ Then, "Bithynians after them"—the text breaks off, resuming after a gap of some thirty-two letters with another reference to Bithynia or Bithynians (lines 36–37): Severus, therefore, was *consularis* of Bithynia. It was presumably after this that Severus became a *comes* of the emperor. Himerius' allusion seems clear enough, despite the lacunae (lines 32–33): "they opened to him the imperial . . . having . . . they at once enrolled [him] among the emperor's friends." Finally comes a post that should be last in time, though mentioned first by Himerius. Severus obtained "the authority of a prefect" (line 29: τὴν ὑπαρχον ἐξουσίαν): Himerius' allusions to the Bosphorus and Rome (lines 27, 28), and what appears to be a conceit based on the fact that, as prefect, Severus was close to Bithynia (line 37), make it certain that the post in question is that of *praefectus urbi* at Constantinople. That establishes a firm terminus post quem for Himerius' speech: the first city prefect of Constantinople was Honoratus, appointed on 11 December 359 (*Chron. min.* 1:239; cf. *Jer. Chron.* 241^e Helm, *Soc. HE* 2. 41. 1), and there is no substantial gap in the fasti of the prefecture before 366.³⁶ Himerius could have addressed Severus in Constantinople as prefect between 366 and 372 (when the next prefect is attested). If the chronology proposed in the present article for Himerius' career is correct, then the epithalamium cannot be earlier than ca. 353—which implies that the whole of Severus' public career falls after that date. The epithalamium, it should be noted, describes Severus as a youth rather than as a mature adult (*Or.* 9. 15).

The speech whose title Photius reports as εἰς Σεβήρον νέηλυν ἐπιστάντα συμπληγάδι (p. 9. 48–49 C.), i.e., "to Severus the new arrival on the occasion of a quarrel," can hardly be addressed to the same Severus, unless it is much earlier than the epithalamium.

Flavianus (*Or.* 12, 36, 43). Photius styles the addressee of *Oratio* 12 "consul of Asia" (*Bibl. cod.* 165, p. 8. 40 C.): this muddled information (Photius means "proconsul") derives from the heading to the speech in the collected edition whose contents Photius summarizes. Unfortunately, all three speeches are extremely fragmentary, and the fragments of only one contain a clear reference to Asia (*Or.* 12. 30). Nevertheless, the preserved details cohere with the supposition that all are addressed to the same man; and Photius also identifies the addressee of *Oratio* 43 as a

34. O. Seeck, "Severus (24)," *RE* 2A (1923): 2004, notes only three; *PLRE* 1:832, but two.

35. The evidence for the title of the governor of Galatia in the mid-fourth century is inconclusive. The rank of the governor of Bithynia was raised from *praeses* to *consularis* ca. 325 (*AE* 1969–70, 116).

36. See *PLRE* 1:1056.

proconsul (p. 9. 66–67 C.). Flavianus was a young man (*Or.* 43. 3), who had recently been in Africa (*Or.* 36. 1, 3, 5, 11). If he was on his way to Asia, then he must be the younger Nicomachus Flavianus, proconsul of Asia for the year 383/84 (*CTh* 7. 18. 8 + 9. 29. 2, 12. 6. 18; *Symm. Epist.* 2. 24);³⁷ and that identification dates the speeches to March or April 383 (cf. *Or.* 36. 1). But what had Flavianus been doing in Africa? The inscription that records his career is silent about any African office (*ILS* 2948 [Rome]): presumably, therefore, *legatus* to a recent proconsul who was a relative or a friend of his family. Nicomachus Flavianus had been *consularis* of Campania before 382, and Himerius duly presents his proconsulate as his second governorship (*Or.* 12. 16: *πάλιν γὰρ σκῆπτρα, πάλιν τῆς δίκης οἱ θρόνοι. . .*).

Why did Himerius compose three speeches for a man who merely passed through Greece en route to Asia? Flavianus' prominent pagan sympathies ought to be relevant. Despite the headings that style *Oratio* 12 *προπεμπτήριος* and *Oratio* 36 *προπεμπτικός*, *Oratio* 36 appears to be a speech of welcome on behalf of the provincial council of Achaea (*Or.* 36. 12).³⁸ *Orationes* 12 and 43 should therefore be speeches on the occasions of Flavianus' welcome to and departure from Athens.

Musonius (*Or.* 20 and 39). Two homonyms must be carefully distinguished:

- (1) the addressee of *Oratio* 20, who was proconsul of Achaea at the time of that speech and who later was present when Himerius delivered *Oratio* 39 in Thessalonica in the winter of 361/62 (*Or.* 39. 14–15, and heading);
- (2) a sophist, *vicarius* of Macedonia in 361/62 (*Or.* 39, heading), who was killed by Isaurian brigands ca. 367/68 (*Amm. Marc.* 27. 9. 8; *Eunap. frag.* 45 Müller = 43 Blockley).

The proconsulate of the former Musonius seems to belong before 356: like Ampelius (see below), he was *magister officiorum* as well as proconsul of Achaea; but unlike Ampelius, he was proconsul before becoming *magister officiorum*, in which post he is first attested in June 356 (*CTh* 8. 5. 8^S).³⁹

Ursacius (*Or.* 23). A *comes*, and from Illyria (*Or.* 23. 5): Himerius compares him to Abaris, who, though a northerner and Scythian in dress and appearance, was nevertheless Greek in language and character (*Or.* 23. 4, 7). Perhaps the same as Ursacius, *magister officiorum* in 364 and 365, whom Ammianus denounced as a rude Dalmatian (26. 4. 4, 5. 7). However, to judge from the scanty surviving fragments of the speech, Himerius praised his Ursacius as a soldier by profession.

37. For the date (instead of 382/83), see B. Malcus, "Die Prokonsuln von Asien von Diokletian bis Theodosius II.," *Oath* 7 (1967): 118; T. D. Barnes, "Proconsuls of Africa, 337–392," *Phoenix* 39 (1985): 144.

38. *Or.* 36 A 3 seems to imply delivery at Corinth: for the attribution of the fragment to this speech, see Colonna, "Disputationes," pp. 159–62.

39. M. Clauss, *Der "magister officiorum" in der Spätantike (4.–6. Jahrhundert)*, *Vestigia* 32 (Munich, 1980), p. 171, adducing *Lib. Epist.* 558.

Scylacius (*Or.* 25). Proconsul of Achaea (heading): Himerius alludes to his claim to descend from the Aeginetan hero Aeacus (lines 47 ff.) and to two earlier posts, one at court (line 33), the other in Ionia (lines 33–34) and by the River Maeander (lines 68 ff.), in which he pursued Pisidian bandits (lines 68, 95 ff.). The former post defies inquiry, but Scylacius is attested as *vicarius* (sc. of Asiana) by an inscription recording his building activities at Laodicea ad Lycum;⁴⁰ and an imperial constitution addressed to him on 24 February 343 establishes the date (*CTh* 11. 30. 22). Since Constans ruled Achaea until his death early in 350, Scylacius was presumably proconsul after this date.⁴¹

Athenaeus (*Or.* 28). Photius, reporting the lost title, styles Athenaeus a *comes* (*Bibl.* cod. 165, p. 9. 54 C.). Two fragments of the surviving text suggest rather an official with clearly defined territorial responsibilities:

Of virtue in governing there are two proofs, the votes of an emperor and the desires of the governed (4);

These are the first fruits of your friendship and words: the words, being prophetic and also clever at predicting such things and better, proclaim good luck, rule over Greeks (σκηπτρα Ἑλλήνων), honors from the emperor, and praise (9).

Athenaeus may have been *vicarius* of Macedonia.

Ampelius (*Or.* 29, heading; *Or.* 31, 50). Proconsul in 359/60 (*Syll.*³ 905). The building activities that *Oratio* 31 stresses are documented by several inscriptions from Sparta, Chalcis, and Aegina.⁴² One phrase that Himerius uses in a list of Ampelius' virtues is problematical (*Or.* 31. 13): "Honored by emperors, an object of fear to tyrants (τυράννοις εὐλαβής), affable to ordinary people, respected by the wise, most pleasing to the old, an object of affection to all conditions and ages alike." The passage survives only in the Naples collection of brief excerpts from Himerius. When publishing the excerpts, H. Schenkl emended the manuscript's εὐβλαβής to εὐλαβής (also printed by Colonna) but declined to explain what he thought Himerius meant by the phrase τυράννοις εὐλαβής.⁴³ If the adjective has its normally favorable connotation, then τυράννοις will have to have the rare, though well-attested, sense of "foreign princes" or "minor princelings."⁴⁴ In that case, however, it is hard to see how Himerius could expect an audience to divine his meaning. It is better to suppose that he uses εὐλαβής in the unfavorable sense which the corresponding verb often has.⁴⁵ τυράννοις can then have its normal

40. Published and discussed by L. Robert, *Laodicée du Lycos: Le Nymphée. Campagnes 1961–1963* (Québec and Paris, 1969), pp. 339–51, no. 15, with an elucidation of lines 72 ff. in Himerius' speech as describing Scylacius' construction of canals and dikes at Miletus.

41. E. Groag, *Die Reichsbeamten von Achaia in spätromischer Zeit*, Dissertationes Pannonicae 1, 14 (Budapest, 1946), p. 34.

42. Quoted by Groag, *Reichsbeamten*, p. 42.

43. "Neue Bruchstücke des Himerios," *Hermes* 46 (1911): 424.

44. The word is used of the rulers of Axum in the heading to the imperial letter quoted by Athanasius, *Apol. ad Const.* 31. 1; cf. A. Dihle, *Umstrittene Daten: Untersuchungen zum Auftreten der Griechen am Roten Meer* (Cologne, 1964), p. 53.

45. For the meaning "fear," see G. W. H. Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961), p. 567. Himerius uses the verb in this sense in *Or.* 6. 17: νῦν δὲ τῶν μὲν εὐλαβηθεὶς τὴν τόλμαν, τῶν δὲ αἰσχυνθεὶς τὸν πόλεμον, αὐτὸς οἴκοι μένειν ἐβουλεύσατο.

meaning of "usurper" or "evil ruler." Ampelius was an Antiochene who had been *magister officiorum* (Amm. Marc. 28. 4. 3). Himerius could be alluding to dealings with Magnentius—which would imply that Ampelius served as *magister officiorum* some years earlier than is normally supposed.⁴⁶ An allusion to Gallus as Caesar in Antioch seems tasteless and improbable. In any event, the difficult phrase alludes to an otherwise unknown episode in Ampelius' career.

Anatolius (*Or.* 32). Himerius salutes Anatolius as "the great prefect" (*Or.* 32. 3; cf. Phot. *Bibl. cod.* 143). He was, therefore, praetorian prefect: presumably the Anatolius who was prefect of Illyricum from 357 to 360, not the homonym who visited Athens while praetorian prefect not long after 343 (Eunap. *VP* 10. 6, pp. 490–91).⁴⁷

Alexander (*Or.* 33). *Oratio* 33 is addressed to Phoebus, the son of the proconsul Alexander. It is tempting to identify this Alexander with the proconsul of Constantinople who supported Libanius (*Or.* 1. 44–45).⁴⁸ That would date the speech to ca. 342 and imply that Himerius went to Constantinople before Libanius was forced to leave. The title of the speech implies otherwise: "To [Phoebus], the son of the proconsul Alexander [lacuna of ten letters] to him by his father after the schools in Corinth." Moreover, the implicit comparison of Himerius' teaching Phoebus with Isocrates' teaching Nicocles, whom Evagoras, the ruler of Cyprus, sent to him in Athens (lines 14 ff.), may suggest that the speaker is resident in Athens. Alexander could well be an otherwise unattested proconsul of Achaëa.⁴⁹

Arcadius (*Or.* 34). Doctor and *comes* (heading).

Cervonius (*Or.* 38). The heading identifies Cervonius as proconsul and states that "this is the first *λαλιά* that (Himerius) delivered in the *praetorium* at Athens." Cervonius is independently attested as proconsul at Thespieae (*SEG* 15. 323 = *IG* 7. 1855). On the chronology argued here for Himerius' career, that would imply that Cervonius was proconsul of Achaëa in 353/54.

Calliopius (*Or.* 39). *Consularis* (sc. of Macedonia), present when Himerius delivered the speech in Thessalonica during the winter of 361/62 (title). As *consularis* he dedicated an altar at Thessalonica "under the most pious and restorer of cults, the lord and conqueror of every barbarian nation, Claudius Julianus, the all-powerful and only sovereign of the inhabited world."⁵⁰

Salutius (*Or.* 42). Prefect (i.e., praetorian prefect): therefore, Salutius Secundus, the praetorian prefect of Julian. Himerius presumably pre-

46. "Possibly in 358," according to *PLRE* 1:56. Clauss, *Magister*, p. 145, suggests 355–56.

47. On the necessity of distinguishing the two, see A. F. Norman, "The Illyrian Prefecture of Anatolius," *RhM* 100 (1957): 253–59. His conclusions are disputed by V. Neri, "Le prefetture del pretorio in Occidente nel periodo 346–350 d.C.," *RSA* 4 (1974): 89–113.

48. So *PLRE* 1:40; Dagron, *Naissance*, p. 221.

49. As G. Wernsdorf supposed, in his edition of Himerius (Göttingen, 1790).

50. D. Feissel, *Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de Macédoine du III^e au VI^e siècle*, BCH Supp. 8 (Paris, 1983), p. 247, no. 86 bis.

sented this *διάλεξις* or *θεωρία* when he arrived at court in 362. It is significant that Himerius speaks of success in military commands: Salutius was not (as is often supposed) a civilian praetorian prefect of the East, but a prefect of the old type who accompanied the emperor wherever he went and acted as his deputy.⁵¹

Basilius (*Or.* 46 and 47). Proconsul and son of Basilius (*Or.* 46, heading), a westerner and pagan: Himerius speaks of a report that when it senses the approach of Dionysus, the land flows with honey and milk (*Or.* 46. 6).⁵² Four men, whose lives span the fourth century, are relevant to the identification of Himerius' addressee:

- (1) Valerius Maximus *signo* Basilius, *praefectus urbi* from 319 to 323;
- (2) Valerius Maximus, consul in 327 and attested as praetorian prefect between 327 and 337;⁵³
- (3) Maximus, appointed *praefectus urbi* at Rome by Julian late in 361 (Amm. Marc. 21. 12. 24; *AE* 1904, 33 [362]; *CIL* 6. 31401; Symm. *Rel.* 34. 5);
- (4) Basilius, *praefectus urbi* at Rome in 395 (*CTh* 7. 24. 1).

Himerius probably addressed his two speeches to the last-named, even though there are problems in establishing the identification securely.⁵⁴

Himerius seems to say that the proconsul's father had been ordinary consul (*Or.* 46. 8)—which could be taken as proof that the *praefectus urbi* of 319–23 is identical with the consul of 327.⁵⁵ But there are extremely strong grounds for rejecting the identification of prefect and consul, and the fact that the proconsul's father was still alive and in the West at the time of the speeches (*Or.* 46. 11) makes it highly unlikely that he is either the *praefectus urbi* of 319–23 or the consul of 327.

Himerius alludes to an official post of the proconsul's father, in a passage whose manuscript text has been improved by a papyrus of the fifth century (*Or.* 46. 10):

You come to the Greeks bringing us, not golden arms, but a certain golden Justice and Right, these assessors of your father (τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς παρέδρους),⁵⁶ which received you in their bosom at your birth and reared you from your cradle, not with

51. Ammianus styles him "praefectus Salutius praesens" (23. 5. 6). It is highly unfortunate that modern studies of the praetorian prefecture in the fourth century have paid insufficient attention to Ammianus' careful distinction between such prefects (cf. 14. 1. 10, on Thalassius) and regional prefects.

52. On this notion (dropped in Jewish writing, despite its biblical authority, because of its pagan associations), see J. D. M. Derrett, "Whatever Happened to the Land Flowing with Milk and Honey?" *Fig. Chr.* 38 (1984): 178–84.

53. For these two men, and on the necessity of distinguishing between them, see T. D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, Mass., 1982), pp. 103, 117–18, 132. Observe, however, that the deleted name on *ILT* 814 is now known to be Valerius Felix, otherwise attested as praetorian prefect of Africa from 333 to 336: see the parallel text from Antioch published in G. Dagron and D. Feissel, "Inscriptions inédites du Musée d'Antioche," *T&MByz* 9 (1984): 421–31.

54. Groag, *Reichsbeamten*, pp. 51–54.

55. *PLRE* 1:149 makes Basilius the son of the consul of 327, "who was in turn presumably a relative of Valerius Maximus Basilius": the two are held to be identical by A. Chastagnol, *Les fastes de la préfecture de Rome au Bas-Empire* (Paris, 1962), p. 73.

56. Colonna prints Duebner's supplement τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς <τῶν θ>εῶν παρέδρους: the correct reading is established by *POsl.* inv. 1478, line 89 (fifth century): cf. Eitrem and Amundsen, "Fragments," p. 28.

any bees' honeycombs, but with lawfulness and words, by which the nature of a soul is nourished and watered.

The honorific epigrams of the later Roman Empire often laud Dike and Themis as the assessors of officials (their statues often stood outside the judgment chamber), whether provincial governors, *vicarii*, or praetorian prefects.⁵⁷ The proconsul's father had clearly held high office. Himerius salutes Basilius as the son of a distinguished father (*Or.* 46. 8). In the crucial phrase, the transmitted reading is ὁ πατὴρ ὑπάτου βλάστημα, which ought to mean "offspring of a father who has been consul." No ordinary consul is available as the proconsul's father, once the identity of Valerius Maximus, consul in 327, with the *praefectus urbi* of 319–23 is denied—as appears to be necessary on other grounds. Can the phrase be translated "offspring of a most noble father"?⁵⁸ It seems unlikely in a context referring to Roman officials. But, on prosopographical grounds, it is reasonable enough to identify the proconsul as the son of a *praefectus urbi*. If that is correct, then an easy emendation to the text resolves the historical difficulty. Read ὑπάρχου in place of ὑπάτου, and translate the invocation as follows: "O child of a divine man! O offspring of a father who has been prefect! You who have received the scepter of your paternal virtue." If the proconsul in Himerius is the Basilius who was *praefectus urbi* in 395, then Maximus, *praefectus urbi* in 361–62, was his father and possessed the *signum* Basilius: presumably, therefore, he was a Valerius Maximus *signo* Basilius like his presumed father, who had been *praefectus urbi* from 319 to 323. The date of Himerius' speech must be later than 364, probably considerably later: what is known about the usual ages of proconsuls and *praefecti urbi* points to a date in the 370s. Basilius was *comes sacrarum largitionum* in 382/83.⁵⁹

Hermogenes (*Or.* 48). Also attested as proconsul at Corinth (*IG* 4. 209 [undated]), Hermogenes is the subject of the longest and most elaborate speech to survive intact. Himerius gives a high-flown and ornate account of Hermogenes' career before his proconsulate. First, he served at the court of a tyrannical ruler. Himerius defines Hermogenes' post as follows (*Or.* 48. 16):

Being at the imperial court in his earliest youth, he was deemed worthy of such great trust that he was considered the only worthwhile guardian of secrets. And on the one hand he performed this service on their behalf to the gods (ὑπὲρ ἐκείνων τοῖς θεοῖς), while on the other he transported the divine utterances to the one who sent him. He became an expounder of the best laws and customs, always wishing to mollify the purpose of the ruler, just as they say Pythagoras of Samos did, when he attended Phalaris in Sicily.⁶⁰

57. L. Robert, *Hellenica*, vol. 4 (Paris, 1948), esp. pp. 24–25, 99–105. For the pairing of Dike and Themis as personified qualities, Robert aptly adduces Himer. *Or.* 38. 9, 48. 6.

58. As suggested implicitly by Groag, *Reichsbeamten*, p. 52, n. 2.

59. *PLRE* 1:149.

60. Pythagoras is brought into contact with Phalaris only in very late texts, such as Iamb. *VP* 32; *Epist. Phalaridis* 23, 56, 74 (R. Hercher, ed., *Epistolographi Graeci* [Paris, 1873], pp. 413–14, 422, 428). In contrast, Phalaris finds no mention in Porphyry's *Vita Pythagorae*.

Hermogenes, however, showed himself superior to Pythagoras because, whereas the latter despaired and left Sicily, Hermogenes “spoke out in conversations to such effect that he made the ruler’s rule milder, by narrating ancient myths and stories from poetry and history” (*Or.* 48. 19). Next, when he reached manhood, Hermogenes retired to study philosophy (*Or.* 48. 20–28). Then he went to Constantinople in order to volunteer his services to “an emperor with profound respect for the law and noble by nature, with whom it was possible to use his preparation in knowledge” (*Or.* 48. 28). The emperor welcomed Hermogenes and at once made him an adviser, thereby enabling him to confer benefits widely (*Or.* 48. 30):

What laws ventured by him were not generous? What men in peril did not escape danger through him? What men deserving office failed to obtain it through him? What men with a request for anything did not take refuge with him? For standing as an intermediary between the emperor and those under his rule, he provided him with the needs of his subjects, and them with his commands—just as the myths say that Hermes is the messenger of Zeus and reports his will to gods and men while learning theirs.

Finally, “god and time” made Hermogenes ruler of Greece (*Or.* 48. 31), though only after he had been to the Danube (*Or.* 48. 36).

Reconstructions of Hermogenes’ career have proceeded from identifying the tyrannical ruler whom he first served as Licinius and the emperor who gave him a post in Constantinople as Constantine.⁶¹ But what Himerius says about the cruel ruler evokes the Caesar Gallus rather than Licinius. Hermogenes was a *notarius* entrusted with taking messages from the emperor whom he served to another who, at the time Himerius was writing, was both dead and commonly styled *divus*: the generalizing plural “to the gods” means “to a deified emperor”—and has nothing to do with the consultation of oracles.⁶² The dead emperor could as easily be Constantius as Constantine himself. Moreover, the emperor who welcomed Hermogenes to Constantinople resembles the philosophical Julian more than Constantine: the analogies with antiquity that Himerius draws (particularly that of Alcibiades and Socrates) discountenance the idea of a youthful Hermogenes counseling an elderly Constantine at the end of his life.

What was Hermogenes’ post in Constantinople? Himerius’ description might suggest that he was *quaestor sacri palatii*.⁶³ But Jovius held that

61. Seeck, *Briefe*, p. 173; Schenkl, “Himerios,” col. 1622; Groag, *Reichsbeamten*, pp. 36–38; *PLRE* 1:424–25; F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C.–A.D. 337)* (London, 1977), p. 100; cf. id., rev. of R. MacMullen, *Constantine*, in *JRS* 60 (1970): 216. A. Piganiol, *L’empire chrétien* (Paris, 1947), p. 69, even detected the hand of Hermogenes as *quaestor sacri palatii* in Constantine’s legislation. That notion is considered and rejected by F. Amarelli, *Vetustas-innovatio: Un’antitesi apparente nella legislazione di Costantino*, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà giuridica dell’Università di Napoli 162 (Naples, 1978), pp. 100–102.

62. As assumed by A. Alföldi, *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome* (Oxford, 1948), pp. 57, 99; *PLRE* 1:424.

63. Millar, *Emperor*, pp. 100–101.

post under Julian in 361 and early 362 (Amm. Marc. 21. 18. 1, 22. 8. 49)—and doubtless retained it beyond the last attested date of his tenure, 23 March 362 (*CTh* 11. 39. 5). Nor can Hermogenes have held the same post as the sophist Nymphidianus of Smyrna, the brother of the philosopher Maximus: Julian “entrusted the emperor’s tongue to him” by putting him in charge of imperial letters composed in Greek (Eunap. *VP* 18, p. 497). Himerius’ stress on petitions perhaps provides the vital clue: Hermogenes may have been *magister libellorum* under Julian.

Himerius also alludes to Hermogenes’ recent presence on or near the Danube (*Or.* 48. 36). Again, a later date than is usually adopted furnishes a natural explanation: shortly before he came to Greece, Hermogenes may have visited the court of Valens, who was on campaign on the Danube frontier from spring 367 until early 370.⁶⁴

Plocianus (*Or.* 49). The speech is known only from Photius, who calls Plocianus proconsul (*Bibl. cod.* 165, p. 9. 71–72 C.); presumably proconsul of Achaea.

Praetextatus (*Or.* 51). Himerius’ speech to Praetextatus as proconsul of Achaea is known only from Photius’ report of its title (*Bibl. cod.* 165, p. 9. 73–74 C.). Praetextatus was in Constantinople in January 362, having been appointed proconsul of Achaea by Julian, presumably to take office in the spring (Amm. Marc. 22. 7. 6): Himerius, it may be deduced, delivered the speech in Constantinople. Praetextatus was still proconsul of Achaea in September 364 (Zos. 4. 3. 3; cf. *CTh* 9. 16. 7): he was proconsul, therefore, for the triennium 362–65.

Pompeianus (*Or.* 53). The speech is completely lost, but Photius reports that Himerius delivered it in Nicomedia at the behest of Pompeianus, who was governor there (*Bibl. cod.* 165, p. 9. 75–76 C.).

?Strategius Musonianus (*Or.* 62. 6). A speech apparently composed in Constantinople refers to a man named after the Muses and a devotee of culture who happens to be governing at the time (ὄσω καὶ ἄνδρα αὐτῶν [sc. the Muses] ἐπώνυμον καὶ ταῖς ἐκείνων τελεταῖς σκιρτήσαντα ἡγεῖσθαι τῆς πόλεως συμβαίνει). On purely formal grounds, the name could be Musonius.⁶⁵ But neither of the Musonii before whom Himerius delivered speeches (*Or.* 20 and 39) is as attractive a candidate as Strategius Musonianus, who earned his second name (hence perhaps ἐπώνυμον rather than ὁμώνυμον) through cultural activities in the service of Constantine (Amm. Marc. 15. 13. 1–2).⁶⁶ Moreover, Himerius’ language (ἡγεῖσθαι) suggests a proconsul rather than a prefect of the city of Constantinople. Musonianus must have held the post before his proconsulate of Achaea in 352/53.

V

Eunapius never met Himerius, even though he studied in Athens for four or five years (*VP* 10. 1. 1–2, p. 485; 10. 8. 3, p. 493; 14. 1, p. 494).

64. O. Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 n. Chr.* (Stuttgart, 1919), pp. 231–39.

65. For the uncertainty, cf. *PLRE* 1:611, 612.

66. Seeck, “Strategius,” col. 182.

Himerius left Athens in the winter of 361/62 and attached himself to the court of Julian: when Julian was killed in June 363, Himerius continued to reside elsewhere until after his rival Proaeresius was dead (*VP* 14. 1, p. 494). Since Proaeresius died "not many days" after Eunapius departed from Athens (*VP* 10. 8. 4, p. 493), Himerius' absence from the city must have lasted at least five years. The conventional modern chronology assumes that Eunapius arrived in Athens in 361/62, and hence that Proaeresius died in 366/67 or 367/68.⁶⁷ On the other hand, a recent study, which seeks to extract precision out of vague phrases in the *Lives of the Philosophers*, argues that Eunapius arrived in Athens ca. 25 September 364 and left in the spring or summer of 369.⁶⁸ If that conclusion is correct, then Himerius could not have returned to Athens in 368 (as has sometimes been supposed)⁶⁹ but will have stayed away at least until 369.

Eunapius gives a hostile account of Himerius' journey to the court of Julian at Constantinople: he went in order to declaim in the hope that the emperor would regard him with favor because of his dislike for Proaeresius (*VP* 14. 1, p. 494). The headings to the relevant speeches present a different picture, which their text tends to confirm. Himerius was summoned by the emperor, he delivered speeches en route at Thessalonica and at Philippi (*Or.* 39 and 40), the former before Musonius, the *vicarius* of the diocese of Macedonia, and Calliopius, the *consularis* of the province of Macedonia, with a former proconsul of Achaëa also present. When he arrived in Constantinople, Himerius produced a panegyric of the city (*Or.* 41), but only after a significant ceremony, to which its opening words allude (*Or.* 41. 1):

After I have purified my soul to Mithras Helios and have already through the gods' agency been with the emperor who is a friend of the gods, come let me kindle not a lantern, but a speech to the emperor and city. For an Attic law orders initiates to carry a light to Eleusis and handfuls of grain, the tokens of civilized life: for our initiates let a speech serve as the thank-offering, since the same Apollo is also (I think) Helios and speeches are children of Apollo.

The passage has been duly noted by students of Julian's Mithraism, though perhaps not fully exploited.⁷⁰ The occasion and the prominence that Himerius gives to his initiation mark it as a significant event. Himerius was teaching in Athens when Julian studied there briefly in 355,⁷¹ and the young prince will not have missed the opportunity to attend his lectures. Himerius traveled to Constantinople when Julian was about to embark upon a revival of Hellenism: it may without difficulty be surmised that he received an urgent invitation to come to

67. W. Schmid, "Eunapios (2)," *RE* 6 (1907): 1121; W. Ensslin, "Proairesios (1)," *RE* 23 (1957): 32; *PLRE* 1:296, 731; cf. Christ-Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte*, 2^e: 986, 1034.

68. R. Goulet, "Sur la chronologie de la vie et les oeuvres d'Eunape de Sardes," *JHS* 100 (1980): 60-72.

69. F. Schemmel, "Die Hochschule von Athen im IV. und V. Jahrhundert p. Chr. n.," *Neue Jahrbücher* 22 (1908): 494-573, at p. 499.

70. P. Athanassiadi-Fowden, *Julian and Hellenism* (Oxford, 1981), p. 48.

71. Soc. *HE* 4. 26. 6, whence Soz. *HE* 6. 17. 1. Himerius appears in these ecclesiastical histories because he taught the brothers Basil and Gregory, later bishops of Caesarea and Nazianzus.

court similar to that which Julian sent to the philosopher Maximus (*Epist.* 26 Bidez). When Himerius arrived, Julian honored him by initiating him into the mysteries of Mithras. The speech that Himerius then delivered in praise of the emperor and the city of Constantinople stresses that Julian had altered its Christian character by founding shrines and introducing pagan cults (*Or.* 41. 8–15).

VI

After the winter of 361/62, precise evidence for the career of Himerius is lacking for several years. It may well be that Himerius accompanied Julian to Antioch in 362 and remained in the East until the late 360s: the next firm indication of his whereabouts appears to locate him in Constantinople praising the *praefectus urbi* Severus shortly after 366 (*Or.* 24), though he was certainly back in Athens when Hermogenes served as proconsul of Achaëa (*Or.* 48), probably no later than 370/71. At a more speculative level, Himerius' speeches can be held to imply that he passed through Cappadocia and visited Egypt.

Himerius had become a citizen of Athens (*Or.* 7. 2) and had married into one of the leading families of the city: his son, who was enrolled in the council of the Areopagus at the age of two (*Or.* 8. 15),⁷² was a descendant of Plutarch, Minucianus, and Nicagoras, and could also claim Musonius Rufus and Sextus of Chaeronea among his forebears (*Or.* 7. 4, 8. 21). Presumably, therefore, since Himerius will probably have married in the 350s, his wife was a granddaughter of Nicagoras, torchbearer of the mysteries at Eleusis, who had visited the syringes at Thebes in Egypt in 326.⁷³ Nicagoras' father was the rhetor Minucianus, who was active in the 260s: he claims descent from the philosophers Plutarch and Sextus on an extant inscription at Eleusis (*IG* 2². 3814 = *Syll.*³ 845).⁷⁴ Himerius and his wife had two known children: a daughter, who outlived her father; and a son, Rufinus, whose premature death was the occasion of an extant threnody (*Or.* 8).

Rufinus died very young while Himerius was absent from Athens (*Or.* 8. 22): "Receive then these libations, which I pour for you by the River Melas, which . . . has truly now become grim and black for me, and more hateful than Cocytus and Acheron." By the side of which river named Melas was Himerius when news came of his son's death? Possibly the river in Boeotia, since Himerius exclaims that Cithaeron is vanquished by his misfortunes (*Or.* 8. 8)—and some have imagined the sophist living the life of an exile in Boeotia as a result of academic quarrels in Athens.⁷⁵ But there were also rivers with the name Melas in

72. In lines 133–34, read τρίτον οὕτω γεγωνὸς ἔτος . . . ἐξέπληξας, not ἐξέπληξα.

73. J. Baillet, "Constantin et le dadouque d'Eleusis," *CRAI* 1922: 282–96; cf. P. Graindor, "Constantin et le dadouque Nicagoras," *Byzantion* 3 (1926): 209–14.

74. See O. Schissel, "Die Familie des Minukianos: Ein Beitrag zur Personenkunde des neuplatonischen Athen," *Klio* 21 (1927): 361–73; F. Millar, "P. Herennius Dexippus: The Greek World and the Third-Century Invasions," *JRS* 59 (1969): 16–17.

75. Schenkl, "Himerios," col. 1624. His additional argument, that Himerius was close to Athens because he was preparing for Rufinus' arrival (*Or.* 8. 2–3), is clearly invalid.

Thessaly, Thrace, Bithynia, Pamphylia, and Cappadocia.⁷⁶ This last river Melas lay north of Caesarea (Strabo 538/39; Ptol. 5. 6. 7), on or close to the route that Julian and the imperial court took across Asia Minor in the early summer of 362.⁷⁷ It is an attractive, if extremely uncertain, conjecture that Himerius received tidings of his son's death in Cappadocia in May 362.⁷⁸

As for Egypt, the evidence lies in the nuances of Himerius' rhetorical elaborations. An early speech delivered before 352 begins with a reference to the colossus of Memnon at Thebes in Egypt as "making a musical marvel at the dawn of the day," but the words are conventional and Himerius explicitly appeals to hearsay (*Or.* 62. 1). Later in life, however, when he praised Hermogenes, Himerius was able to describe the flooding of the Nile in concrete detail and with an implicit appeal to autopsy (*Or.* 48. 8–9):

When the Egyptians, after sacrificing to Demeter, labor on threshing, then pouring down violently from Ethiopia it suddenly makes the whole of Egypt into a sea. You would see, you would see then also the great wonders in that country: on the same plot of land the same man as sailor and farmer, cattle grazing and shortly afterwards cargo ships, and what was formerly a city in the middle of dry land an island.

And in a speech for the birthday of a friend, which is otherwise undatable, Himerius appears to allude to their presence together in Egypt (*Or.* 44. 5):

You know the loves of the Nile, having been a hearer and again a witness of the wonder; you know too his bedfellow, who is pregnant with and gives birth to a crop of varied fruits. . . . Someone stood looking at the size of the pyramids, and wondered at the Apis who was a foreteller of the future in the guise of a bull. The din of Meroe and the noise of the Cataracts has often detained travelers with wonder. Memnon, that crystalline rock emitting a living sound with inanimate voice, was considered (ἐνομισθη) a god addressing the god Helios.⁷⁹ These are the finest things of Egypt: these adorn your celebration.

The mention of the Apis bull, to which Himerius recurs in one of his speeches to Nicomachus Flavianus (*Or.* 43. 6), suggests that Himerius may have gone to Egypt while Julian was in Antioch: an Apis bull was found in the autumn of 362 (Amm. Marc. 22. 14. 6).

VII

I have argued that Himerius was born ca. 320 at Prusias in Bithynia and studied in Athens, and that his career falls into four distinct stages:

76. For these rivers, see F. Stählin, "Melas 14," *RE* 15 (1931): 439; Oberhummer, "Melas 16," *RE* 15 (1931): 439; W. Ruge, "Melas 19–22," *RE* 15 (1931): 440.

77. For Julian's movements in 362, see Seeck, *Regesten*, pp. 209–11.

78. Schemmel, "Hochschule," p. 499. But *Or.* 8. 2–3 is hard to reconcile with the view that Himerius was traveling at the time, and especially with the view that he was accompanying the imperial court.

79. On the date at which the famous sound ceased to be audible, see G. W. Bowersock, "The Miracle of Memnon," *BASP* 21 (1984): 21–32. The evidence of Himerius confirms the conclusion that the miraculous music had ceased well before the end of the fourth century.

- (1) teaching as a sophist in Constantinople from 343 to 352;
- (2) teaching in Athens from 352 to December 361;
- (3) absent from Athens, first at the court of Julian, then in the East and Asia Minor with a visit to Egypt, from December 361 to ca. 369;
- (4) teaching in Athens again, from ca. 369 until the 380s.

The speeches can be assigned to the various stages of Himerius' career as follows:

- (1) *Or.* 53 (between 344 and 349), 62 (before 352), frag. 1. 6 (?15 March 351);
- (2) *Or.* 7 (not long before December 361), 9, 20 (before 356), 23, 25, 29 (359/60), 31 (359/60), 32 (between 357 and 360), ?33, 38 (?353/54), 50 (359/60);
- (3) *Or.* 3 (possibly 362/63),⁸⁰ 8 (possibly early summer 362), ?10,⁸¹ 24 (between 366 and ca. 369), 39–41 (winter 361/62), 42 (?early 362), 51 (ca. January 362), 52 (either ca. December 361 or late summer 362),⁸²
- (4) *Or.* 12, 36, 43 (all spring 383), 44, 46–47 (between 370 and 380), 48 (ca. 370); either (2) or (4): *Or.* 6, 28, 30, 34, 35, 49, 59, 60, 68 (all apparently delivered in Athens).⁸³

VIII

The general picture that emerges is a disappointing and depressing one of an academic who attempted to achieve political prominence by attaching himself to Julian, then suffered disgrace (though not complete disaster) when Julian failed so spectacularly and the Roman Empire again became officially Christian. Himerius must be imagined pathetically championing the lost cause of the old religion whenever a sympathetic proconsul (like Hermogenes) came to Achaëa. It is significant that his latest datable activity belongs to the spring of 383, when he composed no fewer than three speeches for the younger Nicomachus Flavianus on his way to be proconsul of Asia (*Or.* 12, 36, 43). It will be worth speculating about why Himerius considered the brief visit of Flavianus en route to Asia important enough to celebrate with three separate speeches.

A group of Cretan inscriptions may suggest an answer to the question. Oecumenius Dositheus Asclepiodotus, *consularis* of Crete between 379 and 383 (*I. Cret.* 4. 284), erected at Gortyn a whole series of statues of prominent Roman aristocrats honored by the provincial κοινὸν of Crete or the local βουλὴ of Gortyn, clearly at his instigation. The following names occur on the inscribed bases that have survived:

- (1) Anicius Bassus, proconsul of Campania (*I. Cret.* 4. 314);
- (2) Valerius Severus, *praefectus urbi* at Rome (315);

80. *Or.* 3 is an attack on Epicurus, particularly for denying providence: Himerius may be echoing Julian's disapproval of his philosophy; cf. Julian *Letter to Themistius* 255C, 259B; *Letter to a Priest* 301B.

81. *Or.* 10. 13 may allude to the emperor Julian.

82. It is not clear whether Photius' words (p. 9. 74–75 C.: πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ἰουλιανὸν ἀπαίρειν μέλλων) refer to Himerius' departure from Athens or from Julian's court.

83. Most of the otherwise undatable speeches that are extant either wholly or in substantial fragments should probably also be assigned to Himerius' years in Athens, viz. *Or.* 1, 2, 4, 5, 26, 27, 45, 54, 61, 64–66, 69, 74.

- (3) Agorius Praetextatus, ex-prefect (316);
- (4) Fl(avius) Hypatius, ex-consul and formerly praetorian prefect (317);
- (5) Petronius Probus, ex-consul and formerly praetorian prefect for the third time (318);
- (6) Vettius Probianus (the *nomen* is restored), ex-prefect of the city of Rome (319);
- (7) Anicius Paulinus, ex-proconsul and formerly *praefectus urbi* at Rome (320);
- (8) and (9) similar fragmentary inscriptions honoring an ex-prefect of the city (321) and Anicius Claudius (322).

These dedications form a homogeneous group, and the official titles of the Roman aristocrats all appear to be correct for 382/83.⁸⁴ None of these men had ever visited Crete, though they may have possessed property there. Why then are they so conspicuously honored? The fact that they are all honored at Gortyn suggests that the leading men of Crete felt a need for their patronage. Their fears may have concerned religion: in 384 the pious Cynegius, as praetorian prefect of the East, was to commence a rampage against pagan temples and shrines.⁸⁵ Himerius' speeches to Flavianus and Asclepiodotus' honoring of Roman aristocrats can be construed as evidence of a closing of pagan ranks against the dominant Christian orthodoxy. In a very real sense, Himerius speaks with the voice of dying Hellenism.⁸⁶

After the spring of 383, no more is heard of Himerius. It is reported that he went blind in old age and died of epilepsy, leaving behind a daughter.⁸⁷ He was no longer among the living when Eunapius composed his *Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists* at the very end of the fourth century.

University of Toronto

84. Alan Cameron, "Anicius Claudius (I. Cret. iv. 322)," *ZPE* 57 (1984): 147–48.

85. J. F. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court A.D. 364–425* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 140–42.

86. J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums* (Heidelberg, 1929), p. 168 = *The Last Days of Greco-Roman Paganism*, trans. S. MacCormack (Amsterdam–New York–Oxford, 1978), p. 178: "a professor of upright sentiments, who under Christian emperors composed his face into that expression of sorrow which we already know, who rejoiced ecstatically under Julian, and when the times became worse again contented himself with a gesture of protest."

87. *Suda* I.348 (2:633 Adler); Eunap. *VP* 14. 2, p. 494.