

Homer as a Blueprint for Speechwriters: Eustathius' Commentaries and Rhetoric

René Nünlist

A STRONG AND PERVASIVE INTEREST in rhetoric has long been recognised as one of the major characteristics of Eustathius' commentaries on the Homeric epics. Half a century ago, the modern champion of Eustathian studies, Marchinus van der Valk, stated that “the foremost aim of Eustathius' Commentary was rhetorical.”¹ He subsequently devoted a considerable part of the prefaces to his monumental edition to illustrating his claim. Almost thirty densely written pages² collect an impressive list of rhetorical σχήματα that caught Eustathius' attention and were discussed by him (γοργότης, καταφορά, περιβολή, ἐπιμονή, προέκθεσις, etc.). The corresponding footnotes mention dozens of relevant passages and show where Eustathius follows the authoritative handbooks of rhetoric such as Hermogenes'. Van der Valk nevertheless maintains that this recurrent emphasis on rhetoric is mostly Eustathius' own doing.³ The picture can be expanded by adding an aspect which van der Valk does not dwell on. By referring to the section of the preface in which Eustathius identifies the purpose of his commentary (esp. 2.22–35), van der Valk rightly concludes that Eustathius intended his young readers to learn how to become prose writers or, in the par-

¹ *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* I (Leiden 1963) 4 n.20.

² *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes* I (Leiden 1971) xcii–c, II (1976) li–lxx.

³ *Eustathii Commentarii* I xciii. In other words, in these parts of his commentary he depends much less on his ancient predecessors (scholia, Strabo, Athenaeus, etc.) than elsewhere.

lance of the day, orators.⁴ But he hardly even mentions that Eustathius is quite willing to be taken at his word and thus actively contributes to his educational goal. For in addition to frequently discussing the rhetorical σχήματα that have been mentioned already, the commentaries on both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* regularly instruct the reader and would-be orator in very practical terms.⁵ It is the purpose of this paper to document and discuss this type of practical instruction.

It will be best to begin with an example that has been chosen almost randomly from the large pool. The relevant note reads:

(1) ὅτι ὁ θαρρῶν ἰκετεῦσαι καὶ πείσαι τινα εἴποι ἄν καιρίως τὸ “καί μιν γονάσομαι καὶ μιν πείσεσθαι οἴω” (Eust. 129.25–26, on *Il.* 1.427, spoken by Thetis to Achilles).

<The passage is noteworthy,> because he who is confident to entreat and persuade someone would opportunely say “and I will take him by the knees and I think I can persuade him.”⁶

In the Homeric passage in question Thetis informs Achilles of her confidence that she will succeed in persuading Zeus to help him (1.414–427). Eustathius’ note, however, shows little interest in the specific context and instead takes the final line of Thetis’ speech to a general level, as the substantival participle (ὁ θαρρῶν) shows. Whoever finds himself in a position similar to Thetis’ and feels confident that his plea will be successful might profitably use or quote her words. The structure and the wording of text (1) are typical of these notes and occur frequently. Even though there is a certain variety among the

⁴ “Eustathius enim, qui commentarium praecipue conscripserat in usum iuventutis ... id ipsum studebat, ut discipuli discerent oratione soluta scribere, vel ut tunc temporis dicebant, rhetores fieri”: van der Valk, *Eustathii Commentarii* I xcii.

⁵ This recurrent feature is dealt with in a different section of van der Valk’s preface in the briefest possible way (*Eustathii Commentarii* I lx): “Praeterea saepius ad usum legentium aetatis suae versus Homericos ut exempla adhibet (sc. Eustathius).”

⁶ Here and in the following translation of the Homeric quotations follows Latimore. The translations of the surrounding commentary are my own.

individual examples, which will be illustrated shortly, their common denominator is generalisation, often by means of substantival participles and similar expressions.⁷ The Homeric passage, which is usually quoted verbatim and often introduced by means of the definite article τό, is taken as an example of what one would say under such circumstances.⁸

The expression εἶποι ἄν, in particular, is reminiscent of an exercise that can be found in the relevant progymnasmata literature under the rubric ἠθοποιία (or προσωποποιία).⁹ In this exercise the student is expected to reproduce τίνας ἄν εἶποι λόγους (“what words would say”) So-and-so to So-and-so under such-and-such circumstances, for example, when Theon illustrates the definition of what he calls προσωποποιία (*Progymn.* 8, p.70 Patillon = 115.14–17 Spengel): οἶον τίνας ἄν εἶποι λόγους ἀνὴρ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα μέλλων ἀποδημεῖν, ἢ στρατηγὸς τοῖς στρατιώταις παρορμῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς κινδύνους κτλ. (“For example, What words would a man say to his wife when leaving on a journey? Or a general to his soldiers in time of

⁷ These include generalising sentences with τις, generic nouns such as ἀνὴρ, γυνή, γέρον, νεανίας, etc. or place-holders such as ὁ δεῖνα, ὃ οὗτος, etc. A recurrent expression identifies the circumstances of the utterance by means of ἐπί + gen. as in text (2).

⁸ The fact that the Homeric passage is usually quoted in full is of course related to Eustathius’ intention that the readers of his commentaries need not have a text of Homer at their disposal (2.40, cf. also 1380.12). Scholia, by contrast, tend to quote the first few words of the relevant line only, in order to help the readers find or remember it (R. Nünlist, *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* [Cambridge 2009] 9). The envisaged independence of his commentaries also accounts for the fact that Eustathius sometimes expressly identifies the speaker and addressee of the Homeric passage (e.g. 1481.1).

⁹ The differences among the authors of progymnasmata (for instance, which term they use for this exercise or whether they differentiate distinct sub-types, on which see e.g. G. A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* [Atlanta 2003] 47; C. A. Gibson, *Libanius’s Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric* [Atlanta 2008] 355) is of little importance in the present context because they all use the phrase εἶποι ἄν.

danger?” etc., transl. Kennedy). The use of the phrase τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους is standard in these exercises, as Eustathius himself points out elsewhere. In fact, the relevant note argues that Homer’s τις-speeches paved the way for ἠθοποιία.¹⁰

There are at least three basic differences between the progymnastic exercise of ἠθοποιία and Eustathius’ notes of the type discussed in this paper. First, the progymnasmata tend to think of entire speeches or substantial sections, whereas Eustathius has in mind much smaller units, which can, obviously, contribute to an entire speech.¹¹ Second, the progymnasmata envisage that the students find their own words that are suitable to the character in question, while in Eustathius the students are implicitly encouraged to ‘pepper’ their speeches with appropriate quotations from the Greek poet *par excellence*. Third, the progymnasmata are normally oriented towards particular moments of crisis, especially well-known situations of Greek myth (Medea killing her children, Menelaus learning of Agamemnon’s death, etc.). Eustathius, on the other hand, is thinking of all kinds of circumstances in which the Homeric

¹⁰ Eust. 908.5–7 (on *Il.* 12.317): ὅρα δὲ ... καὶ ὅτι τὸ τῆς ἠθοποιίας γνώρισμα, τὸ “τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους ὁ δεῖνα;” πολλαχοῦ παραδιδόντες τοῖς μετ’ αὐτὸν Ὅμηρος, ἔφη κἀνταῦθα τὸ “ὄδὲ τις εἴπη” (“Note also that handing down to his successors the token of *ēthopoia*, ‘what words would So-and-so say?’, here too Homer said ‘Thus someone would say’”). Cf. also his generalising note on another τις-speech (218.45–219.3, on *Il.* 2.271–273): ὅτι ἔθος ἔχει ὁ ποιητὴς καὶ ἠθοποιίας παρενσπεῖρειν τῇ ποιήσει καὶ αὐτὰς πῆ μὲν ἀπὸ τινος ὀρισμένου προσώπου γυμνάζων, ποίους ἂν εἴποι λόγους τότε ἢ ἐκεῖνο τὸ πρόσωπον, πῆ δὲ ἐπὶ πλήθους ἀορίστως (“<The passage is noteworthy,> because it is customary for Homer also to insert speeches into his poem, now presenting them as if spoken by a definite person—what words would this or that person say?—now as if spoken by an indefinite mass”). In addition to using the relevant phrase, the note reflects the same distinction between definite and indefinite speakers as in Hermogenes (*Progymn.* p.20.19 Rabe), cf. Eust. 573.38–40.

¹¹ Nicolaus (p.17 Felten) makes the distinction that progymnasmata are either parts (μέρη) or wholes and parts (ὅλα καὶ μέρη) and assigns several exercises (not, however, that of ἠθοποιία) to either category. As a general rule, Eustathius’ examples are too short to qualify as a ‘part’.

words might usefully be spoken. Thus the thematic range of his suggestions and their applicability is very large indeed.¹² These differences notwithstanding, there is a certain correspondence between the exercise of ἠθοποιία and Eustathius' notes, in that the latter can help the student fulfil the requirements of the former. Eustathius, as it were, mines the Homeric epics for passages that can be reused when composing a speech. By doing so, he implicitly praises Homer for being the true master of ἠθοποιία.

Needless to say, ἠθοποιία is not the only rhetorical exercise reflected in Eustathius' commentaries. An illuminating example is his note on *Il.* 1.113–115 (61.11–12). It explains that Agamemnon's rude comparison of Chryseis with Clytaemestra served as a starting-point (ἀφορμή) for those who composed the fictitious speech in which Clytaemestra brought charges against her husband. Eustathius appears to have in mind a rhetorical declamation.¹³

The analogy with the progymnasmata also helps explain an alternative expression that Eustathius frequently uses for the type of note under consideration, as in the following example:

¹² Taken together, the first and third difference probably account for a fourth: Eustathius' notes do not seem to reflect a classification that is common in the progymnasmata, according to which an ἠθοποιία shows ἦθος (character) or πάθος (emotion) or both (e.g. Nicolaus p.64 F.). A similar 'gap' may point to a fifth difference. Theon (*Progymn.* 8, p.70 P. = 115.22 Sp.) and Nicolaus (p.67 F.) argue that the exercise of ἠθοποιία also contributes to letter writing in character (Kennedy, *Progymnasmata* 47–48 n.149), a point which Eustathius' commentaries do not address. As to Eustathius' own letters, none of the 126 references to the Homeric epics that F. Kolovou, *Die Briefe des Eustathios von Thessalonike* (Munich/Leipzig 2006), lists in her index (163–166) is comparable to the phenomenon discussed in this article.

¹³ Eustathius' term in this passage, πλασματογράφος, is described in rhetorical texts (Doxapatres p.136.19–137.1 Rabe) as a person who, unlike a real rhetor such as Demosthenes, does not deliver his speeches in the courtroom, as, for instance, Libanius in his declamations (μελέται, cf. Anon. in Arist. *Rhet.* p.122 Rabe).

(2) ὅτι ἐπὶ μεγάλης ἔριδος οἰκείον λεχθῆναι πρὸς τοὺς ἐρίζοντας τὸ “ἦ δὴ λoίγια ἔργα τάδ’ ἔσεται οὐδέ τ’ ἀνεκτά, εἴπερ ἐριδαίνετε ᾧδε” (Eust. 153.14–15, on *Il.* 1.573–574, spoken by Hephaestus to Zeus and Hera).

<The passage is noteworthy,> because, on the occasion of a big row, it is appropriate for the words “This will be a disastrous matter and not enduring if you two are to quarrel thus” to be spoken to the quarreling parties.

As in text (1), the words that in Homer are spoken by an exasperated Hephaestus to his bickering parents are generalised. It is appropriate (οἰκείον) to speak them on such an occasion (ἐπί + gen.) to the quarrelers. Tellingly, the second line of the quotation leaves out the words ἐνεκα θνητῶν (“for the sake of mortals”), which would destroy the general applicability.¹⁴ The idea of appropriateness or suitability reminds one, again, of the progymnasmata, for example, in Theon’s definition of προσωποποιία (*Progymn.* 8, p.70 P. = 115.12–14 Sp.): προσωποποιία ἐστὶ προσώπου παρεισαγωγὴ διατιθεμένου λόγουσ οἰκείουσ ἑαυτῷ τε καὶ τοῖσ ὑποκειμένοισ πράγμασιν ἀναμφισβητήτωσ (“Personification is the introduction of a person to whom words are attributed that are suitable to the speaker and have an indisputable application to the subject discussed”, transl. Kennedy). The suitability of the chosen words is a decisive characteristic of this exercise.

The wording of texts (1) and, to a lesser degree, (2) accounts for a large number of relevant notes in Eustathius’ commentaries.¹⁵ There are, however, several alternatives which help

¹⁴ Consequently, line 517 (εἴπερ ἐριδαίνετε ᾧδε) does not properly scan. The problem recurs in texts (3), (5), (9), and (13). Other (minor) departures from the Homeric original, such as the ones documented in texts (4), (7), (8), and (12) are probably accidental, even though they too affect the scansion. For a balanced assessment of Eustathius’ less than perfect treatment of metre see van der Valk, *Eustathii Commentarii* I cxxxii–cxxxiv.

¹⁵ Parallels for εἴποι ᾧν and οἰκείον λεχθῆναι (or εἰπεῖν) can easily be obtained by means of the TLG: Eust. 67.7, 71.16, 77.20, etc. An interesting variant is εἴποισ ᾧν because it directly addresses the reader of the commentary (e.g. 147.3, 577.40).

him diversify his diction. Closer examination shows many of these alternatives to be variants of either (1) or (2).

Thus the optative aorist εἴποι can be replaced by the indicative future, resulting in the phrase ἐρεῖ ἄν.

(3) ὅτι ἐφ' οἷς τις παραχωρεῖ δυσαραεστούμενος μὲν, ἄκων δὲ ὑπενδιδούς, καλῶς ἄν ἐρεῖ τὸ τῆς Ἥρας, ἤγουν τὸ “ἔρδε, ἀτὰρ οὐ πάντες ἐπαινέομεν ἄλλοι.” ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ τοῦ Διός· “ἔρξον, ὅπως ἐθέλεις, μὴ τοῦτό γε νεῖκος ὀπίσσω σοὶ καὶ ἐμοὶ μέγ' ἔρισμα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισι γένηται” (Eust. 441.32–35, on *Il.* 4.29 and 37–38, from the dialogue between Zeus and Hera).¹⁶

<The passage is noteworthy,> because, if someone gives way with annoyance and yields against his will, he would nicely utter Hera's words, that is, “Do it then, but not all the rest of us will approve you.” Likewise what Zeus says too: “Do as you please then. Never let this quarrel hereafter be between you and me a bitterness for both of us.”

The first quotation (*Il.* 4.29) again leaves out a crucial and specific word (θεοί), in order both to increase its general applicability and to be rid of pagan polytheism (on which see below).

Next, the subjunctive aorist εἴπη ἄν can substitute for the optative aorist.

(4) ὅτι ὁ ζητῶν ἀπὸ τινος ἢ κατάνευσιν ἀληθῆ ἢ ἀνάνευσιν καλῶς ἄν εἴπη τὸ “νημερτὲς δὴ (Hom. μὲν δὴ) μοι ὑπόσχεο καὶ κατάνευσον ἢ ἀπόειπε” (Eust. 143.11–12, on *Il.* 1.514, spoken by Thetis to Zeus).¹⁷

<The passage is noteworthy,> because he who is seeking another's real approval or denial would nicely say “Bend your head and promise me to accomplish this thing, or else refuse it.”

Or εἴποι ἄν can be replaced by a verb of speaking that derives from a different root, for example, ῥηθείη ἄν or λεχθείη ἄν.

(5) τῶν δὲ τοῦ ῥηθέντος χωρίου νοημάτων τὸ “εἰ μὲν δὴ ἀντίβιον πειραθείης, οὐκ ἄν τοι χραίσμη βιός” ῥηθείη ἄν παρὰ τινος

¹⁶ For ἐρεῖ ἄν cf. Eust. 70.17, 86.25, 189.20, etc.

¹⁷ For εἴπη ἄν cf. Eust. 31.28, 36.32, 89.19, etc.

πρὸς τὸν πόρρωθεν λειδοροῦντα ἢ ἄλλως κακουργοῦντα (Eust. 851.22–25, on *Il.* 11.386–387, spoken by Diomedes to Paris).¹⁸

Of the thoughts <spoken> in the mentioned passage, “If you were to make trial of me in strong combat, your bow would do no good at all” would be spoken by someone to the one who utters reproaches from a distance or is otherwise vicious.

The quotation is again made more general by dropping a specific expression (σὺν τεύχεσι, “with weapons”) which locates it on the battlefield and is incompatible with the notion of purely verbal abuse. The bow of line 387 thus becomes a metaphorical weapon.

Instead of phrases like εἴποι ἄν other possibilities are words which imply the act of speaking, as in the next two examples.

(6) ὅτι ὁ εὐλαβῶς σκώπτων προοιμιάσαιτο ἄν ποτε πρὸς τὸν ἀκροατὴν οὕτω “ξεῖνε φίλε, εἰ καὶ μοι νεμεσήσεται ὅτι κεν εἴπω;” (Eust. 1406.60, on *Od.* 1.158, spoken by Telemachus to Mentos/Athena).

<The passage is noteworthy,> because he who is mocking with caution would address the following opening to his addressee: “Dear stranger, would you be scandalised at what I say to you?”

(7) ὅτι ὁ ἀπειλησάμενός τινι μέγα τι μέγας ὢν καὶ αὐτὸς εὐλόγως ἄν ἐπαγάγοι τὸ “ὄφρ’ εὖ εἶδης, ὅσον φέρτερός εἰμι σέθεν, στυγῆ δὲ καὶ ἄλλος ἴσον ἐμοὶ φάσθαι καὶ ὁμοιωθῆναι (Hom. -θήμεναι) ἄντην” (Eust. 78.10–11, on *Il.* 1.185–187, spoken by Agamemnon to Achilles).

<The passage is noteworthy,> because he who, being a powerful man himself, has made a powerful threat to someone would add with good reason “That you may learn well how much greater I am than you, and another man may shrink back from likening himself to me and contending against me.”

Essentially the same idea as ῥηθείη ἄν (text 5) can also be expressed by means of a simple indicative future (without ἄν). Examples include ῥηθήσεται and (ἐπι)λεχθήσεται.

¹⁸ For ῥηθείη ἄν cf. Eust. 377.28–29, 783.44–45, etc., for λεχθείη ἄν 161.5–6, 441.19–21, etc.

(8) ἔτι ἰστέον καί, ὅτι τὸ “αἰεὶ τοι κραδίη πέλεκυς ὡς ἐστὶν ἀτειρής” καὶ τὸ “αἰεὶ τοι ἐν (Hom. ὡς σοὶ ἐνὶ) στήθεσσι ἀτάρβητος,” ἤτοι ἄφοβος, “νόος ἐστὶ” πρὸς ἀνδρεῖον καὶ ὑπομενετικὸν ἄνδρα ῥηθήσεται (Eust. 384.24–25, on *Il.* 3.60 and 63, spoken by Paris to Hector).¹⁹

N.b. also, “Your heart forever is weariless, like an axe-blade” and “Always (Homer: just so) is the heart in your breast unshakable,” that is, fearless, will be spoken to a courageous and patient man.

It is, however, important to note that ῥηθήσεται and λεχθήσεται are much more commonly used by Eustathius for cross-references within his commentary, which is a healthy reminder that practically all the expressions discussed in this article can be used for other purposes as well.

A comparatively rare variant of this group inverts the perspective and makes the addressee of the utterance the grammatical subject of the sentence.

(9) ὅτι ὁ ἀποδημήσων ἀποδημίαν οὐκ ἀγαθὴν ἀκούσῃ ἂν πρὸς τοῦ φιλοῦντος τοιαῦτα. “τίπτε δέ τοι, φίλε τέκνον, ἐνὶ φρεσὶ τοῦτο νόημα ἔπλετο. πῆ δ’ ἐθέλεις ἰέναι πολλὴν ἐπὶ γαίαν; ἀλλὰ μὲν’ αὖθ’ ἐπὶ σοῖσι καθήμενος· οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ κακὰ πάσχειν οὐδ’ ἀλάλησθαι.” (Eust. 1450.46–48, on *Od.* 2.363–370, with lines 365–368 omitted, spoken by Euryclea to Telemachus).²⁰

<The passage is noteworthy,> because he who is about to leave on a problematic journey may hear something like this from the one who loves him: “Why, my beloved child, has this intention come into your mind? Why do you wish to wander over much country? But stay here and guard your possessions. It is not right for you to suffer hardships and wander.”

The final line of the quotation (*Od.* 2.370) omits the phrase πόντον ἐπ’ ἀτρώγετον (“on the roaring sea”) and thus becomes

¹⁹ For ῥηθήσεται cf. e.g. Eust. 554.8, 672.55–56, for (ἐπι)λεχθήσεται e.g. 428.10, 1505.30, also ἐπιφωνηθήσεται e.g. 554.27–28, 1519.4.

²⁰ Cf. ἀκούσοι ἄν (e.g. Eust. 105.18, 1469.55).

applicable to any type of imminent journey.

Turning to the principle of suitability (text 2), the same idea can also be expressed by means of the verb ἀρμόζω. The actual examples show the same syntactical variety as in the texts quoted above.

(10) ὅτι τὸ “δαιμόνιε φθίσει σε τὸ σὸν μένος,” ὃ Ἀνδρομάχη πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα φησί, ἀρμόζει παντὶ θρασυνομένῳ ὑπὲρ τὸ δέον (Eust. 650.61–62, on *Il.* 6.407, spoken by Andromache to Hector).²¹

<The passage is noteworthy,> because “Dearest, your own great strength will be your death,” which Andromache addresses to her husband, fits whoever is excessively bold.”

Instead of οἰκεῖον (εἰπεῖν), as in text (2), Eustathius also uses phrases such as καλὸν εἰπεῖν or πρέπει εἰπεῖν (“it is apt to say”).

(11) εἰ δὲ καὶ δῶρά τις λαμβάνων ἔκ τινος οὐ πράνεται, καλὸν εἰπεῖν τὸ “κεῖνός γ’ οὐκ ἐθέλει σβέσαι χόλον, ἀλλ’ ἔτι μᾶλλον πιμπλάνεται μένος, σὲ δ’ ἀναίνεται ἡδὲ σὰ δῶρα” (Eust. 783.4–5, on *Il.* 9.678–679, spoken by Odysseus to Agamemnon with reference to Achilles).²²

If someone does not become milder, even though he is receiving gifts from another, it is apt to say “That man will not quench his anger, but still more than ever is filled with rage. He refuses you and refuses your presents.”

Or Eustathius simply uses the expression δύναται εἰπεῖν (or λέγειν).

(12) ὅτι ὁ θυμούμενος κατὰ τινος πολυπράγμονος μὲν, ἀδυνάτου δὲ βλάψαι, δύναται Ὀμηρικῶς εἰπεῖν τὸ “δαιμονίη ἀεὶ μὲν

²¹ For ἀρμόζει cf. e.g. Eust. 969.10–11, 1408.18 (ἀρμόττει), for ἀρμόσει e.g. 99.25, 142.23–24, 442.13–15, for ἀρμόσοι ἄν e.g. 697.41, 1014.54, cf. also the compound προσαρμόζειν, e.g. 489.10.

²² For καλὸν εἰπεῖν cf. Eust. 380.40–41, 434.17–20, 529.32, etc., for πρέπει εἰπεῖν e.g. 1425.34–35; cf. also εἰκὸς εἰπεῖν (e.g. 1505.45) or προσφυσὲς εἰπεῖν (e.g. 1874.22). Positive expressions like καλὸν can be substituted by forms of *litotes* such as οὐκ ἀπάδον (e.g. 1498.10).

οἶεαι” τουτέστι νοεῖς “οὐδέ σε λήθω· πρῆξιαι δ’ ἔμπης” ἦγουν ὅμως “οὐ τι δυνήσεται, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ θυμοῦ μᾶλλον ἐμοὶ ἔσεται· τὸ δέ τοι (Hom. τοι καὶ) ῥίγιον ἔσται. εἰ δ’ οὕτω τοῦτ’ ἔστιν, ἐμοὶ μέλλει φίλον εἶναι” (Eust. 149.21–24, on *Il.* 1.561–564, spoken by Zeus to Hera).²³

<The passage is noteworthy,> because he who is angry with a busybody who can do no harm can say with Homer “Dear lady, I never escape you, you are always full of suspicion (glossed). Yet (glossed) thus you can accomplish nothing surely, but be more distant from my heart than ever, and it will be the worse for you. If what you say is true, then that is the way I wish it.”

Interestingly, the (as usual generalising) note does not comment on the fact that the vocative *δαίμονή* (*Il.* 1.561) strictly speaking requires the addressee to be female.

The generalising tendency of the notes under consideration is also responsible for a third group of examples, which describe the specific nature of the quoted *λόγος* (for instance, with adjectives ending in *-ικός*).

(13) ὅτι λόγος στρατηγικὸς ἀπειλητικὸς πρὸς ἐχθρὸν καὶ ἐγερτήριος εἰς μάχην τὸ “παντοίης ἀρετῆς μιμνήσκεο· νῦν σε μάλα χρὴ αἰχμητὴν τ’ ἔμεναι καὶ θαρσαλέον πολεμιστὴν. οὐ τοι ἔτ’ ἔσθ’ ὑπάλυξις, ἄφαρ δέ σε θεὸς (Hom. Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη) ἔγχει ἐμῷ δαμάα. νῦν δ’ ἀθρόα πάντ’ ἀποτίσεις κήδε’ ἐμῶν ἐτάρων, οὓς ἔκτανες ἔγχεϊ θύων” (Eust. 1269.12–15, on *Il.* 22.268–272, spoken by Achilles to Hector).²⁴

<The passage is noteworthy,> because it is a general’s speech, threatening an enemy and urging him to fight, <to say> “Remember every valour of yours, for now the need comes hardest upon you to be a spearman and a bold warrior. There shall be no more escape for you, but God (Homer: Pallas Athene) will kill you soon by my spear. You will pay in a lump for all those sorrows of my companions you killed in your spear’s fury.”

²³ For *δύναται εἰπεῖν* cf. Eust. 1013.43–47, 1244.21–22, 1290.14–15, etc.; cf. also phrases like *ἔχοι ἄν τις εἰπεῖν* (e.g. 1490.33).

²⁴ Cf. e.g. *ἀνδρικός λόγος* (Eust. 1207.1), *ἐκφοβητικός λ.* (669.35), *εὐκτικός λ.* (1473.21), *παραμυθητικός λ.* (1559.47), *ποιμενικός λ.* (1832.41).

For the clergyman and future bishop the quotation cannot stand in a contemporary context unless the pagan divinity is replaced by the Christian god.²⁵

Almost all the examples seen so far assume that the readers take over the Homeric quotation more or less literally. Excepting text (13), modification only takes the form of omission, as in texts (2), (3), (5), and (9). Eustathius, however, also addresses the possibility that the readers actively adapt the Homeric text to their needs. A key term here is the verb *παρωδέω* ('to imitate', the result not being an exact duplicate).²⁶

(14) τοῦτο (sc. ἀλλ' ἔτι που ζωὸς κατερύκεται εὐρέϊ πόντῳ, *Od.* 1.197, of Odysseus) δέ τις παρωδήσας ἐν τῷ τέλει ἀστείως ἐπὶ προσώπου ἀξιολόγου ἐρεῖ "ἀλλ' ἔτι που ζωὸς κατερύκεται εὐρέϊ κόσμῳ" οἶονεὶ λέγων ὅτι ὁ δεῖνα μόνος ἐναπέμεινε τῷ κόσμῳ. (Eust. 1410.26, on *Od.* 1.197, spoken by Mentēs/Athena to Telemachus).

By imitatingly modifying this line (sc. "But, still alive, he is held back in the wide sea") at the end someone will wittily say about a noteworthy person "But, still alive, he is held back in the extravagant adornment," as if saying that So-and-so alone was still busy with the adornment.

By changing the final word in *Od.* 1.197 from *πόντῳ* to *κόσμῳ* the speaker turns the Homeric quotation into a witty joke about a prominent latecomer at a party or the like. A combination of the ideas expressed in texts (13) and (14) can be found in a note on *Od.* 4.667–668 (Eust. 1513.23) which suggests that readers imitatingly modify (*παρωδέω*) Antinous' curse against Telemachus in that they replace 'Zeus' by 'God'.

²⁵ Eustathius regularly practices this type of *interpretatio Christiana*. The relevant passages from his commentary on the *Iliad* (incl. van der Valk's general remarks in his prefaces) are usefully collected in H. M. Keizer, *Indices in Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarios ad Homeri Iliadem* (Leiden 1995) 478.

²⁶ On the meaning of *παρωδέω* see van der Valk, *Eustathii Commentarii* II xxix with n.3. Unlike its modern derivative, the word in itself does not have a facetious connotation; cf. e.g. schol. A *Il.* 19.94a *Ariston*.

The extensive quotations offered here pursue several goals. In addition to documenting the various expressions used by Eustathius, the quotations also try to show *en détail* how he sometimes adapts the Homeric text to his needs by means of slight alterations, mostly omissions (texts 2, 3, 5, 9). Another goal is to give a sense of the wide thematic range that these notes cover. Looking at the picture at large, there are no obvious gaps. One could almost say that, according to Eustathius, Homer has something in store for every conceivable situation, which is also supported by another striking feature of these notes: their sheer frequency. Thus the commentaries on *Iliad* 1 and *Odyssey* 1 alone contain some 40 examples each.²⁷ And TLG searches for the expressions listed above, which make no pretence to comprehensiveness, show that such notes are generally frequent and spread over the text of both commentaries.²⁸

Yet another important characteristic is, as seen, the generalising nature of these notes. In addition to the points already made, it is worth mentioning that neither the gender nor, perhaps more importantly, the divine status of Homeric speakers such as Thetis or Hera creates a problem for the orator who wants to reuse parts of their speeches (texts 1, 3, 4). In a way, this is surprising because many Byzantine readers will have recognised the Homeric passage and remembered the original circumstances under which it was spoken by whom and to whom. It seems nevertheless unproblematic that some of the relevant utterances originate with pagan divinities (texts 1–4, 12), as long as these are not expressly mentioned (texts 3, 13). More generally, Eustathius does not seem to fear that knowledge of the original context might induce readers to consider specific examples as a form of *mise en abyme*. For instance, it

²⁷ *Iliad* 1: Eust. 31.28, 36.32, 59.24, 67.7, 70.17, 71.16, 72.16, 74.30, etc.; *Odyssey* 1: 1388.29, 1389.23, 1389.50, 1390.64, 1392.2, 1393.2, 1393.42, etc.

²⁸ Not surprisingly, they tend to be more frequent in the commentary on those Homeric books which have a higher proportion of speech.

does not seem to matter that the suggestion in text (6) is hardly appropriate to the underlying Homeric scene. Eustathius does not expect his readers to cling to the Homeric original at all costs.

The next question is whether the suggested method could not be frowned upon as a form of insufficient originality or even plagiarism. To answer this question it is worth looking at the way Eustathius copes with verbatim repetition within the Homeric epics themselves. Even though he often follows the Hellenistic critics and praises Homer for his variety (e.g. ποικιλία), verbatim repetition is not in itself a problem for him.²⁹ In the present context the following note is particularly revealing:

(15) ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἕως μὲν τῆς τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος ἀπειλῆς αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους ξηροὺς ἔθετο τοὺς στίχους ὁ ποιητὴς παλιλλογῶν, οὐς ἐν τοῖς φθάσασιν ἔγραψε, διδάσκων, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις μυρίοις, ὅτι ἐν πολλοῖς ἔξεστι τῷ ῥητορεύοντι ἀνεπιλήπτως αὐτολογεῖν καὶ μὴ τὰ καλῶς ῥηθέντα παρακινεῖν μηδὲ κόπους ἑαυτῷ παρέχειν ἐν κενοῖς μηδενὸς κατεπείγοντος μηδὲ μελετῶν ἀγωνιῶν εἰσαεῖ (Eust. 120.20–24, on *Il.* 1.370–379).

N.b., down to Agamemnon's threat (i.e., *Il.* 1.370–379) the poet put, in the form of a verbatim repetition, exactly the same verses that he wrote before (sc. 1.13–16, 22–25), thereby teaching, as in countless other places too, that in many cases the orator can safely repeat the same words and need not alter what is well said, nor give himself trouble in vain, with nothing urging him, nor labour to be anxious forever.

The wording of the note shows that Homer's 'lesson' addresses not just poets but a wider audience, which includes orators. If something is well said, there is no need wasting one's time in order to find a suitable alternative (a superfluous exercise, which the note itself illustrates tongue-in-cheek). It is perfectly in order to reuse felicitous lines, which also provides the justification for Eustathius' readers to insert Homeric quotations

²⁹ On ποικιλία in Eustathius see van der Valk, *Eustathii Commentarii* II lvi–lvii.

and adaptations into their speeches.

Given the large number of Homeric passages that Eustathius singles out as possible models for speechwriters, the question might arise whether he envisages his readers to write something like a cento; this, however, is not the case. The section of his preface that identifies the possible users of his commentary mentions, among others, the one who wishes conveniently to produce *παραπλοκαί* (insertion of poetical quotations in prose).³⁰ Against this backdrop, it makes perfect sense that Eustathius repeatedly singles out words and expressions that are poetical and thus not suited to prose.³¹ In a particularly revealing passage, he contrasts the two registers:

(16) τὸ δὲ ‘σφεδανόν’ ποιητικὴ μὲν λέξις καὶ ἥς οὐ χρήζει πεζὸς λόγος, εἰ μὴ ἄρα κατὰ παραπλοκὴν ἔπους (Eust. 1064.64, on *Il.* 16.372).

The word *sphedanon* (vehemently, eagerly) is poetic and not made use of in prose, excepting the insertion of hexametric poetry.

The combined evidence clearly points to the composition of prose speeches which are interspersed with quotations (or, as seen, adaptations) from poetry. The relevant Homeric passages are, in Eustathius’ words, “useful for the insertion of poetical quotations in prose” (*χρήσιμά εἰσιν εἰς λόγου πεζοῦ παραπλοκήν*).³² Homer thus becomes something of a quarry for would-be orators, with Eustathius’ commentaries identifying which line is appropriate to which context. The primary target

³⁰ Eust. 2.28 (with van der Valk’s note), cf. the references in Keizer, *Indices Index III s.v. παραπλοκή*; for the *Odyssey* 1741.35, 1762.20, 1784.15. The metrical problems discussed in n.14 do not favour the general idea of a cento either. For Eustathius’ views on the cento (*κέντρον*) see van der Valk’s note on 1099.51.

³¹ Van der Valk, *Eustathii Commentarii* I xcii.

³² Eust. 1273.48, sim. 1741.36. The notion of usefulness recurs when Eustathius declares particular Homeric speeches or utterances useful for something (*ὁ λόγος χρήσιμος*, 240.31, 439.9, 638.5–6, etc.; cf. *χρήσιμον κριθείη ἂν τῷ τεχνικῶς γράφοντι*, 1717.2).

audience are, as seen, young students.³³

It is less clear how Eustathius imagined the practicalities of this process. From today's perspective, it looks like a perfect case for a thematic index. In the absence of this and similar tools of reference, one wonders how readers were expected to find the Homeric passage that suited their needs. Given the extraordinary size of Eustathius' commentaries, it seems hard to imagine that they would simply remember.³⁴ Incidentally, a similar difficulty arises from the countless but mostly unspecific cross-references within and between his commentaries.

While this general problem still awaits a satisfactory solution, the present article will have shown that Eustathius time and again calls his readers' attention to Homeric passages that are suitable to creative reuse in their own speeches. The relevant notes contribute in a substantial way to his educational agenda, of which rhetoric is arguably the most important component. In addition to identifying the numerous tropes and figures used by Homer (a feature that Eustathius shares with various ancient handbooks of rhetoric), he also singles out a remarkably large number of particular passages that the students can reuse when they develop their own rhetorical skills by modelling them after Homer's. The specific wording of several notes is indicative of a partial similarity to progymnastic exercises. What is different, however, is that the particular circumstances of these utterances, as envisaged by Eustathius, are often less 'dramatic' and overall both more general and multifaceted than in the progymnasmata. Indeed, the general applicability of these

³³ Cf. n.4 above and Eust. 1956.4: Ὀμήρου δὲ καὶ ταῦτα δεξιότης τόπους τινὰς πολλαχοῦ παραδιδόντος τεχνικῶς ψόγων τε καὶ ἐπαίνων τοῖς ὀμιληταῖς ("This, too, is Homer's dexterity: artfully to provide the students with numerous passages of blame and praise").

³⁴ The respective length is 820,814 (*Il.*) and 566,007 (*Od.*) words: L. Berkowitz and K. A. Squitier, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: Canon of Greek Authors and Works*³ (New York/Oxford 1990) 166. For comparison: the epics themselves measure 115,477 (*Il.*) and 87,765 (*Od.*) words (i.e., the commentaries are 7.1 and 6.4 times longer).

utterances is a crucial factor, and Eustathius enhances it by means of a ‘decontextualisation’ which can include the omission or even modification of specifics that otherwise might reduce the ‘reusability’ of the relevant passages (not least in a Christian context). All in all, the type of note discussed in this paper is a feature of Eustathius’ commentaries on Homer that is pervasive, important, and original.³⁵

April, 2012

Institut für Altertumskunde
Albertus-Magnus-Pl.
D-50923 Cologne, Germany
rene.nuenlist@uni-koeln.de

³⁵ It is a great pleasure to thank Craig Gibson for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this paper.