Oribasius may be overdue for attention. Details of his career are rarely to hand, but a possible general picture is clear and impressive. In an age fecund with doctors, he achieved fame as a practitioner and teacher of medicine. Prolific in the production of medical textbooks, he also aspired to historiography, emitting a memoir of Julian’s campaigns, the loss of which is to be lamented.

By no means was he confined to medicine and letters. Oribasius was very close to Julian. He accompanied the young Caesar to Gaul; it was Oribasius who may have brought back (if any man ever did) that renowned last message from Delphi; and the doctor stood at the death-bed of his emperor in 363. Indeed, according to a couple of enigmatic statements by his friend and admiring biographer Eunapius, it was Oribasius who put Julian on the throne.

Whatever the truth of that, Julian was consistent in his desire to have Oribasius ever with him, from Gaul to the East, as doctor, diplomat, and confidant. There may have been one formal proof of favour: some sources (not the best) report that Julian made Oribasius a quaestor at Constantinople.

The successors of Julian had their eye on this prop and ornament of the reign. Oribasius was deprived of his property, and forced into exile. He was eventually recalled from the courts of the barbarians, where he had brilliantly repeated his successes with Julian, though he was not at first given back his property. The resourceful Oribasius resolved his material difficulties by marrying a lady of rank and fortune. And to those who have, shall more be given. The later emperors restored the doctor’s fortune. We take our leave of him sometime after 396, still going strong at the time when Eunapius composed his adulatory biography, with his prosperity undimmed and his four children all alive.

Oribasius emulates Galen in more than medical expertise. In scientific and literary versatility, in the pursuit of a place in the sunshine of imperial favour, and in the arts of survival, the traditions of the Second Sophistic can be seen to have continued from the relatively calm world of the Antonines to the dangers and instabilities of the fourth century.  

With one major difference, of course. Galen and company did not have to reckon with the ‘conflict’ between pagan and Christian. The succession of

1. Confirmed by references to Alaric’s invasion of Greece at VS 482.
2. For the Second Sophistic, within the limits of Philostratus’ VS, see G. W. Bowersock, Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire (Oxford, 1969).
Commodus to his father, and the sanguinary triumph of Septimius Severus after the end of the Antonine dynasty, did not involve intellectuals of position in the same sort of Christian 'backlash' as did the reaction against Julian after 363. But here too, Oribasius was lucky – or provident. The admiration of Eunapius and the favour of Julian certify that the doctor was not a Christian. However, one of his children was. A son, Eustathius, is known to us. Not only was he the dedicatee of one of the paternal textbooks, but also the recipient of two of Basil's extant letters. And a career can be discerned; Eustathius was archiatrus, perhaps archiatrus sacri palatii in the East in 373-4. Although the hostilities between pagan and Christian have often been exaggerated, it is fair to suggest that a Christian son of position could well have been a blessing to a pagan father so strongly identified with Julian. Above all at the court of Theodosius, especially after the defeat of Eugenius. About all of which, more anon.

Modern views of Oribasius are few and disparate. H. O. Schröder went competently through the sources and the medical texts in his PW article. Bidez' account is almost more Eunapian than Eunapius in terms of rapturous superficiality: ‘Aux moments décisifs de la vie du prince, il eut sur lui une influence prépondérante, quoique discrète, et il dut pénétrer mieux que personne celui dont il était le médecin et le confident. Il écrivit un journal de ce qu'il observait dans son intimité, et ce sont les notes de ce journal que l'on retrouve dans les indications d'Eunape, parfois si précieuses’. Contrast the verdict of E. A. Thompson: ‘Oribasius was obviously a charlatan, and the hypomnema which he gave to Eunapius cannot have been of fundamental value’. The medical writings were lauded by Allbutt for 'their sane and rational method, learning and discernment'. Finally, the sources and basic facts are set out in the notice of Oribasius in PLRE, though some of what is there said is open to debate.

Oribasius was a native of Pergamum. Thus Eunapius, twice in the VS and
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3. By itself, Eunapius' approbation would not be entirely conclusive, since he is capable of praising Christians such as Prohaeresius in the VS; cf. his commendation of Sebastian (fr. 47).
4. Ep. 151 (AD 373); Ep. 189 (AD 374–5).
5. For the suggestion, see the notice of Eustathius in PLRE, although I have modified its 'probably' to a more cautious 'perhaps'.
10. Notably on Oribasius' quaestorship and the nature of his hypomnema; his possible involvement in the business of the last Delphic Oracle is excluded from the notice, which may or may not be a pity.
in one of the extant fragments of his historical narratives.\textsuperscript{11} This has to be preferred to the assertions of Philostorgius and the \textit{Suda} that he derived from Sardis.\textsuperscript{12} Eunapius was well placed to have the truth. He was closely acquainted with Oribasius, and the doctor was alive at the time of writing the \textit{VS} for consultation, had there been any doubt about the matter in his biographer's mind. Moreover, Eunapius himself came from Sardis, and would not have missed the chance, had there been one, to claim the admired Oribasius for his own birthplace. One might subjoin the possibility that one of Oribasius' incentives for devoting so much of his time to the study and abridgement of Galen's works was a desire to extol and immortalise the writings of a fellow Pergamene, and also to profit from association thereby.

The names and attainments of Oribasius' parents are not recorded by Eunapius, who says only that both were of good family.\textsuperscript{13} Perhaps he had no information beyond that. If so, one will have to conclude that they formed a topic on which Oribasius was circumspect, since he could have furnished his biographer with any details he desired. Speculation is frustrated by the inconsistency of Eunapius in reporting such items in the \textit{VS}.

Nor have we any firm dates for the medical man's career. He was a pupil of Zeno of Cyprus, and his two most illustrious \textit{confrères} were Magnus of Nisibis and Ionicus of Sardis. These items of knowledge permit some inconclusive chronological guide lines. Zeno survived into the lifetime of Julian the sophist, who expired c. 340.\textsuperscript{14} Thanks to the correspondence of Libanius,\textsuperscript{15} Magnus can be located in Alexandria between 364 and 388; he died at a time when Palladas\textsuperscript{16} was active in lampooning his contemporaries. Ionicus of Sardis died not long before the composition of the \textit{VS}.\textsuperscript{17}

Two other clues may be placed in conjunction. As noted earlier, Oribasius was alive at least up to the time of Alaric's invasion of Greece. Eunapius stresses the fact, evincing no surprise that it should be so. No intuition, in other words, that Oribasius was particularly old. Again, this proves nothing, since Eunapius has no fixed policy on the publication of such details as age. Certainly, his expressed wish of long life to Oribasius implies nothing; it is politeness to utter such hopes on behalf of old men as well as young ones.

The other clue may be more rewarding. Eunapius avers within the confines of a sentence that Oribasius was famous from his youth and that Julian picked him out to be his physician as soon as he became Caesar. Youthful prodigies are hardly uncommon in ancient biographies. Yet Eunapius' wording suggests

15. \textit{Ep.} 1208 (AD 364); \textit{Ep.} 843 (AD 388).
17. \textit{VS} 499.
that Oribasius appealed to Julian in 355 as a coming man rather than an established sage. It is pertinent to recall that the new Caesar was himself only twenty-three in 355. If it is true that Julian had been carefully preparing his bid for power long before 360–1, the gathering in of promising newcomers to his side will not surprise. 18

Thus, Oribasius should perhaps be seen as a young man in 355. That makes it unsurprising, other things being equal, that he should have survived poverty and exile after Julian’s demise, and be alive and well in the last years of the fourth century. The presence of an epigram in the *Anthology* 19 on the death of Oribasius, stressing his relationship with Julian, may best be mentioned in this context. Also, there is no mention of any published work by Oribasius in the two extant allusions to him by Julian 20 which span the period 358/9–361.

There is no more that can be done towards establishing chronological termini for Oribasius. Something on his training and professional accomplishments will not be out of place at this juncture. In Zeno of Cyprus, Oribasius had one of the best teachers of the age. That is, if the judgement of Eunapius can be believed. Not only in medicine, but oratory too. It hardly needs saying that Galen will have dominated the curriculum. There is a hint of this in the fact that Magnus of Nisibis, one of Oribasius’ fellow students, penned an epigram 21 upon the great doctor. As earlier adumbrated, a student from Pergamum had special cause to be interested in the works of Galen. And it was not just a matter of medicine. Galen had been a polymath, equally at home in the study of philosophy or the Atticist controversies of his time. Much of this rubbed off on to Oribasius. The epigram on his death pays tribute to his versatile erudition, whilst Eunapius concludes his encomium with the claim that all philosophers must profit from conversation with his hero.

But Oribasius was influenced by more than a famous teacher and a long-dead sage. There was a fellow pupil who impressed him mightily. Not Magnus of Nisibis, that facile but insubstantial chatterbox, whom Oribasius far surpassed, but Ionicus of Sardis. 22 This fellow appears to have been the class swot, with the added advantage of a father who was a famous physician in his own right. Ionicus was particularly interested in the practical side of medicine. He was adept at anatomy, pharmacy, amputation, dissection, and post-operative bandaging and treatment in general. As though this were not enough, Ionicus was versed in philosophy, divination, oratory, and poetry. Oribasius greatly admired this latter-day Galen. In years to come, he was to attempt a branch of learning not essayed by either Galen or Ionicus—historiography. That ambition
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20. *Ep.* 14 (to Oribasius) ; *Ep. ad Ath.* 277C.
22. *VS* 499 (the only source for Ionicus).
was shared by one who studied medicine and philosophy also: namely, his own future biographer, Eunapius of Sardis.

The quality of Oribasius' medical writings is beyond the scope and competence of this paper. But they are far from irrelevant to any attempt to reconstruct his career or understand his attractions for Julian – and perhaps others.23 One can read his extant works in the Corpus Medicorum Graecorum. For present purposes, however, one will turn to the bibliography of Oribasius furnished by Photius. From this area the historian may leave not unrewarded. Photius attests four volumes of medical writings, and seven further volumes on unspecified topics.24 Note at once (the matter will be reverted to in due season) that there is no mention of the memoir on Julian's Persian campaign. The medical texts in cause are:

1. An epitome of Galen, required by and dedicated to Julian.
2. An epitome of various medical writers in seventy books, required by and dedicated to Julian.
3. An abridged version of the previous item, with special attention to the subject of easy remedies, and eschewing the topic of surgery. In all, nine books, dedicated to Eustathius.
4. Four books on topics very similar to the foregoing, required by and dedicated to Eunapius.

The influence of both Galen and Ionicus is patent. In view of his own success in the profession, Eustathius may be presumed to have profited from his father's teachings. Certainly Eunapius did, to judge from his coy bragging over how he protected Chrysanthius from the blood-letting zeal of that sophist's physicians.25 It is clear that Oribasius preferred the practical to the theoretical. The first sentence of the Libri ad Eunapium26 refers to the importance of knowing what to do on journeys or in remote areas or otherwise removed from medical assistance. Is this a fruit of Oribasius' own travels in Gaul and the East with Julian? Or had he already developed these concerns from his reading of Galen – a supremely practical man – and his familiarity with Ionicus, and thus attracted the attention of Julian in 355?

As has been earlier seen, Eunapius asserts that Julian was captivated by the fame of Oribasius, young though the latter apparently was. That is quite credible. Julian's own nature, enthusiasms, and prospective need of a physician might all attract him towards Oribasius.

Yet the biographer may be playing something down. He rushes on to say that Oribasius ἀποέπη ταῖς ἀλλαὶς ἀρεταῖς ὀστε καὶ βασιλέω

23. See later for this.
24. Cf. the bibliography in the Suda.
25. VS 505, laying claim to a considerable knowledge of medicine.
τον Ἰουλιανὸν ἀπέδειξε. What might that mean? Wright bravely tackled the matter in her Loeb edition, suggesting that Eunapius is merely saying that "the physician, by his virtuous teachings, had fitted Julian for the position". This interpretation is not to be ruled out. The trouble is, as Wright points out, Eunapius in his account of Maximus explicitly claims that Oribasius and a certain Euhemerus were accomplices in the plot to overthrow Constantius and place Julian on the throne.

There would seem to be flagrant inconsistency here. Not that that need surprise in a writer of Eunapius' stamp. Yet the matter may be better explained. In the second of our two passages, the biographer refers his readers to the fuller account furnished in his work on Julian. It is notable that the same cross-reference recurs in the Life of Oribasius. But in this passage, Eunapius seems concerned to play down the image of Oribasius the politician. It could be that he is now deferring to the wishes of Oribasius. At the time when Eunapius was composing the VS, no one would have wanted to be remembered as the man who elevated Julian. Hence the new way of expressing a connection that could not be expunged but might be toned down.

It will be suggested later that Oribasius might have been involved in other plots, the failure of which would make the need to diminish his political role yet more urgent. Setting this aside, a question persists: why do the two versions co-exist in the VS? It could simply be the result of Eunapius' deficiencies as a writer and organiser of materials. Or the phenomenon might lend support to the notion of two editions of the VS, both discernible in our version. Granted this, and even not granted this, a similar rewriting of Oribasius' role in the two versions of Eunapius' historical work attested by Photius is likely.

For Eunapius was in something of a dilemma. On the one hand, his admiration for both Julian and Oribasius led him to make as much as possible out of their relationship. That he was exaggerating when he wrote that Oribasius was Julian's closest companion will be believed by many. After all, apart from the letter addressed to Oribasius, Julian's extant writings never mention the doctor by name. And the absence of Oribasius from the works of Libanius and Ammianus could be indicative.

27. 338.
28. Since Eunapius had a weakness for using ἀποδείκνυτι thus; see, e.g., frs. 4, 39, 42. A full conspectus of references is given in J. C. Vollebregt, Symbola in novam Eunapii Vitae editionem (Amsterdam, 1929), 39.
29. VS 476, employing τοῦτος τος of the concert of Oribasius and Euhemerus.
31. See W. R. Chalmers, 'The Ναὸς έδοσις of Eunapius' Histories', CQ (N.S.) 3 (1953), 165–70.
32. Fr. 8.
33. Ep. ad Ath. 277C employs a periphrasis. Oribasius could, of course, have been mentioned in Julian's lost memoir of his Gallic campaigns.
On the other hand, it was becoming harder to express one's real feelings in the last years of the fourth century. Dangerous, indeed, to purvey one's favourite distortions in some cases. According to Photius, Eunapius had to purge his original historical narratives of their bitterest anti-Christian passages. The suggested reduction of Oribasius' rôle from king-maker to a mere beacon of virtue fits this gloomy context. Oribasius' own memoir may have pointed the way he wished the biographer to go.

For whatever reasons, and to whatever degree, Oribasius was incontestably gathered in by Julian in 355, to remain with him as one of his close companions until the emperor's death. Another fragment of Eunapius discloses a relationship in which Oribasius can rebuke Julian with impunity for a display of temper. The epigram on Oribasius adduced earlier emphasises the connection in the first of its two couplets. Both John Lydus and Philostorgius record the presence of Oribasius at Julian's death-bed.

Whether or not Julian made him a quaestor at Constantinople is debatable. The sources for this are not the best, though PLRE is misleading in restricting the claim to the Suda. Such an appointment might have been sought or unsought, deserved or not; it was hardly the summit of ambition. Medical men in offices of state are not uncommon in the fourth century.

Not one of the above details is to be found in the VS. One assumes their presence in at least the first version of the historical narratives of Eunapius. The biographical notice concentrates on the post-Julianic career of Oribasius, his unjust sufferings and eventual restoration. Such an emphasis carries a political message that is too plain to require exegesis.

The rôle played by Oribasius in Julian's seizure of power is hard to seek. In 358/9, the letter written to the doctor from Paris talks of mutual dreams for the future. That might imply some plotting in concert, but the sentiment is too vague and natural to be conclusive of anything. In Ep. ad Ath. 277C, Julian confirms his friendship with Oribasius, but does not evince any greater regard for the doctor than for his faithful quartet of domestics of 355 and thereafter, all unnamed and probably subsuming Eutherius, that follower so warmly approved of by Ammianus.

Only Eunapius formally connects Oribasius with the movement to raise Julian to power. The biographer asseverates that it was Oribasius of Pergamum and Euhemerus of Libya who were responsible for the fall of Constantius. This fascinates, but does not help. Apart from the lack of concomitant detail, no other source mentions Euhemerus of Libya.

34. Bibl., Cod. 77.
35. Fr. 24.
36. Lydus, De mensibus 4. 118; Philostorgius, HE 7. 15.
37. Oribasius is called quaestor in Artemii Passio 35 (=Philostorgius, HE 7. 77), and Cedrenus 1. 532 (Bekker).
38. E.g., Arcadius, doctor and comes (in the title of Himerius, Or. 34); Ausonius (the poet's father); Caesarius of Cappadocia, probably comes thesaurorum in Bithynia in 368.
There are those who have sought to remedy this deficiency. In his translation of Julian, *Ep. ad Ath. 277A*, Bidez inserted the name of Euhemerus, though it will not be discovered in the Greek. And with equal facility, Piganiol bracketed Euhemerus with Eutherius and, without advancing any reason, dubbed him 'chambellan'.

There is no manuscript variant on the name. Had there not been the addition of Libyan origins in Eunapius’ account, one might have been tempted to see Euhemerus as an error for Eutherius. But the latter is known to derive from Armenia.

It is hard to believe that Eunapius would have invented or confused the name of Oribasius’ alleged accomplice. Not with the doctor still alive. Euhemerus may have featured in the lost works of Eunapius and Julian; and perhaps in the memoir of Oribasius himself. Even so, his absence from Ammianus and Zosimus is signal. Perhaps there were reasons for his suppression, personal or political, that we cannot guess at.

What is known of the events in which Julian was proclaimed does not suggest a simple troika of the Caesar, his doctor, and a mysterious Libyan. Indeed, a fragment of Eunapius’ fuller account seems to say that there were seven conspicuous individuals involved. As we have seen, Julian himself, though naming no names, pays tribute to at least four loyal friends in addition to Oribasius. One of these was Eutherius. This interesting character was high in the confidence of Julian, whose *praepositus sacri cubiculi* he was from 356 to 360. He was twice sent as envoy in the negotiations between Julian and Constantius, to Milan in 356/7 and Caesarea in Cappadocia in 360. After these important missions, far eclipsing anything we know to have been entrusted to Oribasius, he attempted to retire. But Julian could not long do without him; Eutherius was recalled late in 361. Finally, he retired again, and lived out his days at Rome, venerable and venerated.

Clearly a key figure in the entourage of Julian. And it is signal that he was left alone, albeit a known pagan and firmly linked with Julian’s toppling of Constantius. It may be that he was better protected than Oribasius. Or was it that the latter was exiled for reasons other than complicity with Julian which Eunapius obliterates? We shall see.

According to Julian’s own version, his proclamation by the troops was preluded by the circulation of an anonymous *libellus* addressed to the Petulantes and Celts; it extolled himself and denounced Constantius. In the account
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41. Fr. 14. 5.
42. See his notice in *PLRE*, 314–5.
43. How, one wonders, did Eunapius treat him (if at all) in his account of Julian? For that matter, did Oribasius admit him into his memoir? His absence from the *VS*, of course, has no significance.
44. *Ep. ad Ath. 283B.*
of Zosimus, various tribunes distribute anonymous pamphlets. The historian reports no names, which may or may not imply that there were none in Eunapius and his other sources.

Anyone can write an anonymous pamphlet. It would be congenial to see the fine hand of Oribasius at work. But that is only a guess. There are other obvious candidates, not excluding Julian himself.

Next, we have briefly to reckon with that wretched business of the last Delphic Oracle. There are sources in which Oribasius, described as quaestor, is Julian's sacred ambassador. On the usual view, this would have him at Delphi in late 362. Oribasius would obviously have been a suitable choice for the mission.

I have no intention of adding much to the mass of secondary literature on this last message from Apollo. Suffice it to say on the general issue that the decline of Delphi is something of a commonplace from Strabo (9. 3. 4–8) to Julian (In Gal. 198C). Bowra saw the sound and iteration of λάλος as evidence of some Christian waxing ironic. But the phrase λάλον ὑδωρ is literary (it can be seen in Anacreontea 11. 7), and the epithet occurs in the Delphic response to the Nicaeans cited by Eusebius (PE 5. 16) from Porphyry. The following lines of Prudentius (Liber Apotheosis 437–9) show how standardised the phraseologies had become:

Delphica damnatis tacuerunt sortibus antra,
non triposas cortina regit, non spumat anhelus
fata Sybillinis fanaticus edita libris.

Finally, for Julian, the last non-Christian emperor, to receive the last oracle from Delphi may strike one as a suspiciously tidy pendant to the tale of the first princeps Augustus hearing the news from Apollo of Christ's birth and the oracle's fated eclipse.

If Oribasius was the person who brought the dolorous news to Julian, is it conceivable that the famous tale is a fabrication? For the doctor was alive until the end of the fourth century, and perhaps longer, able and surely willing to give the lie to any fake. Yet the simple observation is not conclusive; the invention and circulation of a forged oracle could have taken place during his years of exile. By the time of his return, it might have been too ingrained in men's minds to be refuted.
Alternatively, the oracle was a later invention, and Oribasius' name simply inserted into the general story as a suitable one, famous enough to catch the eye and memory. Of prime importance in all this is the fact that Eunapius makes no mention of a last oracle in the VS at all. Indeed, there is not a word about Delphi in the biographies. Of course, had Oribasius been involved, Eunapius might have suppressed the item as part of a desire, earlier suggested, to minimise the connection between Julian and Oribasius. One might perhaps have thought that Apollo's final pronouncement was a subject too painful for the ardent Eunapius to recall. However, he takes a morose pleasure in describing the dream of Antoninus from which the destruction of the Serapeum was foretold. Thus, unless the previous alternative be accepted, the silence of Eunapius may be reckoned an argument against the genuineness of the story.

Eunapius is not one of the sources which has Oribasius at Julian's deathbed. It was the right place for a physician to be, obviously. If true, one again wonders why such an affecting item is excluded from the VS. And again one can only invoke the suggestions already advanced to account for such omissions. In the context of Oribasius and forged oracles and the like, it is natural to think of Julian's supposed last words conceding the victory to Christ. Was there anything about that in his memoir?

To which document we now advert. It is sometimes described as a memoir on Julian's Persian campaign. This was certainly a major ingredient. However, there is no warrant for so circumscribing its content. Eunapius (fr. 8) describes the memoir as retailing all the events pertaining to Julian at which Oribasius was present. Hence, it will have stretched back to 355.

It has also been too easily said that the memoir was drawn up for the private use of Eunapius. But the biographer simply says that Oribasius sent it to him to back up his insistence that Eunapius undertake a full account of Julian's career. To be sure, one would not have thought that Eunapius would need too much urging towards that particular task! It may only be that he received a draft or advance copy, intended both as courtesy and aid. A dedication to Eunapius could be supposed, since Oribasius at some stage favoured the biographer with some prefatory remarks in one of his medical treatises.

Even if the document had begun life as a private aid, it could eventually have been more widely circulated. There is the view, for instance, that Oribasius was used by Zosimus to correct Eunapius. If credible, the notion imports piquancy. For should we not have expected Eunapius to revere and exploit
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49. VS 471.
50. See note 36 above.
51. E.g., in the notice of Oribasius in PLRE.
52. PLRE again.
with maximum care the memoir of his admired Oribasius? Especially as the
doctor was alive at the time of its use in the composition of the Eunapian
account of Julian.
Eunapius' notice of Oribasius in the VS comes to life with his indignant
account of the doctor's exile. At no stage does he furnish a name, proper or
topographical.\footnote{Too much ought not to be made of this; Eunapius is always reluctant to mention the
names of post-Julianic emperors in the VS.} Oribasius is the victim of 'the emperors after Julian'; he is
exiled to 'the most savage barbarians'; with resilience and luck, he achieves a
godlike status for his medical skills 'at the courts of the barbarians'; his
eventual recall and the restoration of his property is credited to 'the later
emperors'. Excluded also, though the biographer must have known it, is the
name of Oribasius' wife.

Why was Oribasius singled out, whereas a Eutherius was left untouched?
That question, already adumbrated, cannot be answered. But we can speculate
without undue fancy. Valentinian conducted some sort of purge of Julian's
supporters, in the cause of elevating his own military backers.\footnote{On this, see J. F. Matthews, \textit{Western Aristocracies and the Imperial Court: A.D. 364–425} (Oxford, 1975), 35.} Oribasius
could have gone in that.

Indeed, this is very likely. For two of Eunapius' other sophists were in
similar trouble at this time: Maximus of Ephesus and Priscus of Thesprotia.
The former was soon back in favour, only to get himself into worse trouble
with Valens in 371, as a consequence of which he was liquidated by the sanguini­
ary Festus. The course of Priscus' fortunes was more akin to those of Oribasius;
his was allowed back to Greece, and survived until c. 395.\footnote{See their notices in \textit{PLRE} for sources and details.}

Oribasius was not unique in his vicissitudes. But Eunapius is unwilling to
give any reason for his exile beyond the vague (and plausible) statement that
the doctor had some jealous enemies. One is tempted towards the notion that
the biographer is hiding something.

Could this something be complicity with the abortive coup of Procopius\footnote{\textit{PLRE}, 742–3, has a detailed account of Procopius.} of 365–6? That unfortunate aspirant to power was related to Julian. His
career can be traced from 358, which means that he and Oribasius were rising
together throughout Julian's time. His movement was encouraged by at least
one intellectual, the Cynic Heraclius; Eunapius (fr. 31) is our witness to that.

Procopius might well have seemed a congenial alternative to Valens and
Valentinian in the eyes of Oribasius. And to follow his cause was easy to
justify; for Procopius had been promised the throne by Julian. No common
usurper, then, but a cheated designate. In turn, if Oribasius really had been an
instrument in Julian's own success, he must have seemed a valuable prospect
to Procopius.
This is all conjecture. Piganiol put part of it down as a fact, saying without qualification that the outcome of Procopius’ defeat was ‘Oribase banni chez les Goths’. It may be pertinent to recall, in support of the notion, that Libanius was accused of supporting Procopius, and had to keep such a silence as to leave no speeches for the reign of Valens and a lengthy gap in his correspondence.

So Oribasius may so far have one success and on failure to his name as a king-maker. It is just possible that he made one more effort in the years 392–4. Photius reports that he had seen another work ascribed to Oribasius, in the same number of books and on the same topics as the Libri ad Eunapium. It contained an identical dedication – except that it was addressed to Eugenius instead of Eunapius.

It was the patriarch’s opinion that either the name of the dedicatee had been altered, or that he was faced with a spurious production. Could it be that the Eugenius in question is the shortlived Augustus of 392–4, Flavius Eugenius?

There is at least a case for assuming that Oribasius would have found Eugenius more to his taste than Theodosius; this proposition is not altered by the possibility that the latter was the emperor who restored the doctor to his former fortune. Eugenius was formerly a teacher of Latin grammar and rhetoric. No Julian in religious matters, he will still have been more congenial to a pagan philosopher and doctor than Theodosius. It is worth noting that the contents of the treatise were geared in part to coping with the country, with travel, and with the lack of doctors. Precisely what Eugenius needed for his campaigns.

Nothing will be gained by protracting such conjecture. Other Eugenii, known and unknown, could be adduced as claimants. One thinks easily of the father of Themistius, of the philosopher who corresponded with Julian, or of the eunuch cubicularius of Valens who was expelled from the planace and who gave money to Procopius. Let the possibility be advanced for the consideration and criticism of others.

Finally, the recall of Oribasius. In speaking of the three stages – exile, recall, restoration of property – Eunapius speaks only with vagueness and ambiguity of ‘the emperors’. He may not always mean a season when there were two ruling together. It is not very likely that the ephemeral Jovian is in question. Rather is Theodosius at the other end of the period to the point. A character such as Oribasius might have been brought back as part of the policy of exploiting ‘Hellenic’ easterners as high officials and ornaments of the régime.  

---

59. Or. 1. 146, 156–78. Libanius also faced the fashionable charges of magic and soothsaying; Oribasius will have been vulnerable to these, given his credentials as pagan, doctor, and philosopher.
60. Schröder, e.g., in his PW article (col. 804) preferred the latter explanation.
61. For Eugenius, see his notice in PLRE, and Matthews, op. cit., 238.
62. See PLRE for the trio who follow.
63. Matthews, op. cit., 115, is very good on this matter.
It needs to be subjoined that Eunapius' account is too vague for us to know whether the recall and the restoration of property took place under the same emperors or not.

There is no call for elaborate summary. This paper has set out and examined all that is known about the doctor, and has pressed legitimate speculation to its limits. Oribasius of Pergamum is a character of definite fascination and possible importance. Any man credited with putting Julian on the throne clamours for attention. One would give a good deal to have his memoir on that emperor's deeds, whatever its scope. It is a matter of some regret that his connections and attainments were precisely the sort to attract the inept enthusiasm of Eunapius of Sardis. Yet that is not quite fair. For it may be that what we do not know about Oribasius is exactly that which the doctor and his biographer eventually wanted us not to know.
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