

Eustathius and Callimachus

M. van der Valk

IN HIS HOMERIC COMMENTARIES Eustathius more than once—in fact 49 times—refers to passages of Callimachus' works. In most instances we can state that Eustathius derived these quotations from his intermediate sources, where they are still to be found.¹ Hence it is assumed that Eustathius was not acquainted at first hand with those works of Callimachus that are now lost to us.² Now Pfeiffer has demonstrated that in the twelfth century Michael Choniates, a pupil of Eustathius, was still able to consult directly works of Callimachus now lost.³ It is tempting to think *id quod licuit bovi, licuisse Iovi*—that Eustathius also had access to Callimachus' works. At issue especially is the poet's most celebrated work, the *Aetia*.

If then we might assume that Eustathius had Callimachus' *Aetia* in his library, one might be surprised that he does not adduce this work more often. We should examine therefore Eustathius' practice as revealed in his Commentaries. He had at his disposal a vast range of texts with which he was acquainted to a greater or lesser extent.⁴ Now in fact some authors he adduces only rarely, though to all appearances he knew them very well. Thus he quotes Lycophron time and again, whereas the well-known *Argonautica* of Apollonius he cites only once.⁵ Likewise Eustathius was intimately acquainted with Xenophon, but he quotes from his works quite rarely.

¹ I may mention the Homeric scholia, Athenaeus, Suetonius, Heraclides of Miletus, Aristophanes of Byzantium, Herennius Philo, Ammonius.

² This was the view taken by Wilamowitz. In his edition of Callimachus the most competent critic says, "De Eustathio certum iudicium proferre non audeo": R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus II* (Oxford 1953) xxxii; at n.2 he rightly un.masks some quotations by Eustathius as deriving from intermediate sources.

³ Pfeiffer (*supra* n.2) xxxii f; see also A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*³ (Bern 1971) 805. For the passages preserved by Michael Choniates see Pfeiffer 135 s.v. On Choniates see e.g. *Tusculum Lexikon griechischer und lateinischer Autoren*³ (Darmstadt 1902) 530f.

⁴ See H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika* (Berlin 1950) 1: "Eustathius stand eine vorzügliche Bibliothek zur Verfügung, und ein staunenswertes Gedächtnis hielt ihm die Früchte seiner vielseitigen Belesenheit zur Verfügung." On this point see also M. van der Valk, *Eustathii Commentarii I* (Leiden 1971) 1–li.

⁵ See Valk (*supra* n.4) 1. Eust. 101.17 quotes Apollonius (1.64), but here he is indebted to the Homeric scholia.

To gain some notion of Eustathius' working method we should look to Callimachus' hymns, which have survived for us and which without question Eustathius knew directly. In his Commentaries he mentions three passages.⁶ Once (1665.47) he refers in general to the fifth hymn with regard to the blinding of Teiresias (*Hymn.* 5.57–64, 70–72). Again, the first line of the sixth hymn he quotes three times (1208.37, 1488.60, 1627.49f). Finally, he quotes an entire line (55) from the first hymn (1687.40). I believe that this limited scope of his citations can be explained. The learned scholar in the course of his extensive readings read Callimachus' hymns, possibly cursorily. He retained the episode of Teiresias, and he was likewise struck by the curious invocation of the *kalathos* of *Hymn.* 6.1, which occurred, moreover, in the first line, the position in a poem most likely to be remembered. The third instance, comprising an entire line, occurred in the first hymn. It is obvious here that Eustathius was quoting from memory, for he wrongly gives *ταχὰ μὲν ἠέξεν* whereas Callimachus had written *καλὰ μὲν ἠέξεν*. For his memorization of an entire line, and from the first book, we may compare his treatment of Nonnus.⁷ Eustathius quotes Nonnus only rarely, and his quotations come exclusively from the first book of the *Dionysiaca*. It is surely understandable that an author as prolific as Eustathius, who had read innumerable authors, sometimes read or knew accurately only the first part, the beginning of a book.

With these characteristics and peculiarities of Eustathius in mind, we may assess the origin of several passages of Callimachus' *Aetia* quoted by Eustathius. At 1317.18f he adduces a passage from the beginning of the poem (fr.1.26 and 28 Pf.), which he also mentions in his commentary on Pindar.⁸ Eustathius' comment on Homer concerns the chariot race in *Iliad* 23, and in fact the details of that race make for apt comparison with the Callimachean passage, as Eustathius saw:

ὡς ἂν ὁ Καλλίμαχος εἶποι δραμόντος “ἐτέρων ἔχνια μὴ καθ’
ὀμά,” εἰ καὶ “στεινότερην” ἤλασεν, ὡς εἰκός, καθὰ καὶ αὐτὸ
ἐκέλευς (Callimachus) ἔφη.

Eustathius in this instance gives no indication of the source of his quotation. This is not unusual, of course, and so one might think that we must content ourselves with the notice “e fonte ignoto.”

⁶ At 331.3–6 Eustathius quotes an epigram (6) of Callimachus: but he derived it from his immediate source Strabo.

⁷ On this point see Valk (*supra* n.4) xcii.

⁸ A. Drachmann, *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina* III (Leipzig 1927) 295.21.

Nevertheless, taking into account the characteristics noted above, I may offer the following line of argument. (1) Eustathius' pupil could still consult Callimachus' *Aetia* directly. (2) That Eustathius quotes only from the first book of Nonnus is all the more suggestive here in that, unlike *Dionysiaca* I, the opening part of the *Aetia* is of extraordinary interest, especially for a scholarly reader, for here Callimachus expounded his views on poetry. And the image offered at fr. 1.26–28 is likely to have engaged the interest of such a reader even if he had read the passage only once. (3) The scholiasts to *Iliad* 23 did not themselves refer to the Callimachus passage. This I believe is understandable, for these scholia are meant to explain the difficulties of the Homeric text, and the Callimachean passage is of no use for interpreting that text. With Eustathius the matter is otherwise: the learned author repeatedly adduces passages from the ancient writers that can be paralleled with the Homeric passages in question or might in some way remind one of them. Any reader of Eustathius will know that he virtually ransacks ancient literature for such citations. Hence it would be in keeping with his usual practice if in this instance he adduced a parallel which he had read in the famous proem of the *Aetia* and which had stuck in his mind because of its original pronouncements on poetry. I would deduce that Eustathius himself is responsible for the citation.

This conclusion is supported, moreover, by a second instance. At 870.6 and 1299.37 Eustathius says: καὶ “θῆρ οὐατόεις” παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ ὁ ὄνος (see fr.1.31 Pf., θηρὶ μὲν οὐατόεντι πανείκελον ὀγκήσαιτο). In this passage too Eustathius' source is at first glance not evident.⁹ The following points, however, suggest his first-hand knowledge. (1) In Callimachus' *Aetia* the quotation is to be found only a few lines after the passage discussed above, which we tried to show Eustathius knew directly. In fact it is part of the same exposition by the poet. (2) Eustathius elsewhere likes to adduce passages from ancient authors which describe animals in characteristic or interesting ways.¹⁰ Again, the situation is in my opinion clear. In reading the proem of the *Aetia* Eustathius' attention was arrested by the characteristic and striking denomination of the ass, and hence he remembered this in particular.

⁹ Thus in *Eustathii Commentarii* II (Leiden 1976) 279 I offered the notice “e fonte ignoto.”

¹⁰ Instances taken from Oppian may be mentioned in illustration. Eust. 255.20 observes that in Oppian the word ἔθνεα (*Hal.* 1.1) is used also of fishes. Eust. 1843.33 remarks that in Oppian (*Hal.* 5.18) the elephant is indicated by the circumlocution Ἴνδὸς θῆρ κελαινόρρινος.

In his Commentary on Dionysius Periegetes 1.467 (= I 188.12–14 Bernhardt) Eustathius, while discussing the shape of Sicily, says that Lycophron (1.966) called it “*τρίδειρον*” καὶ ὁ Πίνδαρος “*τριγλώχινα*.” Now in the same proem of the *Aetia* under discussion Callimachus says (fr.1.36 Pf.) *τριγλώχιν ὀλοῶ νῆσος ἐπ’ Ἐγκελάδω*. In the extant poems of Pindar, however, this epithet of Sicily does not occur. Moreover, in commenting on Pindar *Ol.* 4.11 the scholiast aptly adduces the line from Callimachus’ *Aetia*. Therefore it is unlikely that the epithet in question occurred somewhere in Pindar’s lost works, for the scholiast would then have referred to that passage. Hence the solution proposed by Pfeiffer (*ad loc.*), and followed by Snell (*ad Pind.* fr.322), would seem to be attractive, that Eustathius in reality derived his notice from the Pindaric scholia, but confused matters. But in light of the Callimachean passages treated above, and of the working methods of Eustathius, another solution appears more likely and entirely sufficient. Eustathius, I have argued, knew the proem of Callimachus’ *Aetia* directly. The uncommon epithet ‘three-barbed’ for Sicily, a striking and original phrase, would not be lost on the commentator, who was particularly alert to such usages. Hence he retained it, and it came to mind when he composed his remarks on Dionysius’ description of Sicily. He adduced the passage from memory, as often, and made a mistake that is understandable in the circumstances.¹¹ The scholar who had written a commentary on Pindar lapsed into the error that he had read the passage in Pindar. In fact, at *Pythian* 1.16ff Pindar offers the image of Typhoeus weighted down by Sicily as punishment: *Σικελία τ’ αὐτοῦ πιέζει στέρνα*. A few instances among many may be adduced to demonstrate this peculiarity of Eustathius. Thus twice (250.30, 1717.38) he avers that the saying *πολυτελέστατον ἀνάλωμα ὁ καιρός*, which in reality goes back to Theophrastus and which Eustathius owes to Diogenes Laertius (5.40), derives from Xenophon. Another notice that he derived from Diogenes (6.2.53) he wrongly states comes from Homer (519.32). No less than four times¹² he offers a faulty quotation from Sophocles (*Ant.* 291f), which moreover he seems to have confused with Lycophron 776. All these instances tend to show that the learned commentator relied on his extensive memory for quotations and was doomed sometimes to fall into errors of attribution.

At 522.15 Eustathius mentions first a well-known saying of Hesiod (*Op.* 265) and then adds a similar line from Callimachus (fr.2.5 Pf.):

¹¹ Notwithstanding his stupendous memory, Eustathius was prone to errors of this sort: for several examples see Valk (*supra* n.4) lvi–lvii.

¹² 824.32 (see my *Commentarii ad loc.*), 1313.32, 1536.49, 1653.5.

τοῦ εἰπόντος, ὡς ὁ τεύχων ἐτέρω κακὸν ἐῶ ἥπατι τεύχει. This line is to be found in the section of the *Aetia* which immediately follows the proem, and which still treats of introductory matters, namely Callimachus' dream about his calling. Two arguments, in my view, show Eustathius' access to the passage. If as I have argued Eustathius had read the proem directly, then it is understandable that he would not have stopped there but read on into the section that is closely akin to it, pertaining to the same topic. Second, Eustathius was intimately acquainted with Hesiod, whom he quotes repeatedly in his Commentaries; in reading this part of the *Aetia* he could not but be struck by the resemblance and relation of this line to its model in Hesiod. Hence his recollection was reinforced by his sensitivity to the original manner in which Callimachus presented the same point as the familiar Hesiod.

From these observations we may conclude that Eustathius had read directly the first part of the *Aetia*, where Callimachus gives his general views on poetry. In a compass of about 100 lines no less than four passages have attracted Eustathius' interest, to be memorized and quoted by him. At other places as well in his Homeric Commentaries he gives a few quotations from Callimachus: as in those studied above, he does not state his source, but of these it is certain that most, and possibly all, he derived from secondary sources rather than direct reading. After his fourth quotation from the opening part of the *Aetia* (p.9 Pf.) he quotes no subsequent line of which the source is unknown to us and which therefore might be attributed to Eustathius himself.¹³ The conclusion is obvious, for if Eustathius had continued to read the *Aetia* in the same way in which he had studied its opening, he would surely have adduced passages from the remainder that stirred his interest.

The first of the subsequent quotations whose source is uncertain is fr.203 Pf., Μοῦσαι καλαὶ κάπολλον, οἷς ἐγὼ σπένδω. Eustathius quotes this line no less than four times, so that his interest in it is evident.¹⁴ The line clearly attracted Eustathius for its grammatical interest, as deviating from normal usage. Although the line is also given by Suidas M 1293 and by schol. Soph. OC 1621, Eustathius is alone in attributing it to Callimachus. It occurred, however, not in the *Aetia* but in Callimachus' iambic poems. Now it is inconceivable that Eustathius was acquainted with the iambic works, for though he

¹³ There are seven such quotations which can be traced with certainty to intermediate sources.

¹⁴ 781.51, 985.54, 1372.2, 1778.27 (the second and third omitted by Pfeiffer *ad loc.*).

had a special predilection for anecdotes, he nowhere relates or alludes to any of the stories that abound in Callimachus' iambus. An intermediate source must lie behind the quotation.

Again, at 629.55 Eustathius quotes Callimachus (fr.544 Pf.), his immediate source being unknown. According to the Laurentine codex, Eustathius gives the false reading Ἀντιλόχου instead of Callimachus' Ἀρχιλόχου. If he had read the text of Callimachus directly, we should expect that his attention would be drawn to the name of Archilochus, who is here called a drunkard, and that he would have retained it correctly, for elsewhere he severely condemns that poet.¹⁵ At 1599.25 Eustathius provides sole testimony for a phrase from Callimachus, θηλύτατον πεδίον (fr.548 Pf.); here too his source is unknown. There can be little doubt, however, that Eustathius here is dependent on a *scholium deperditum* on *Od.* 8.324. It is well known that Eustathius sometimes preserves Homeric scholia which do not survive in the extant Homer codices themselves. Here Eustathius says of the notice κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς, and he very commonly indicates Homeric scholia by the phrase οἱ παλαιοί.¹⁶

Apart from the *Aetia*, the *Hekale* was the best known poem of Callimachus. Pfeiffer's list (*supra* n.3) of passages of Callimachus known to Michael Choniates shows three references to the *Aetia*, all others to the *Hekale*. Now Eustathius (84.5 and 475.1) says that the word ἀκτὴ was rendered by ἀκταίη παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ (fr.230 Pf.). His authority is unstated; but his reference clearly is to the first line of the *Hekale*, and I would conclude that he derived it from direct reading. On the other hand, I believe his reading of the *Hekale* was very restricted, indeed probably limited to the first line itself. For consider two other fragments from the poem, 266 and 267: πολυπτῶκές τε Μελαιναί and γίνεό μοι τέκταινα βίου. Although Eustathius mentions the word πολυπτῶξ (484.4, not cited by Pfeiffer) and τέκταινα (1129.20 and 1599.47), he expressly derives them from other sources: evidently did not know that the terms were used by Callimachus in the *Hekale*.

We may consider finally Callimachus fr.546 Pf., κρήνη λευκὸν ὕδωρ ἀνέβαλλεν: we have it only from Eustathius (1404.38), who does not reveal his source. Here a definite conclusion is probably impossible. But, first, it is curious that an intermediate source, such as a lexicon or the like, would mention a line which did not present

¹⁵ Cf. Valk (*supra* n.4) cxix, where I observed, "necnon Archilochum Hipponactemque severe perstrinxit."

¹⁶ See M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad I* (Leyden 1963) 8 n.31 and 187ff.

any difficulty. Second, it is clear that Eustathius was himself interested in the compounds of βάλλω (1404.35–1406.47). Hence it is possible that his own interest was raised on reading this line in Callimachus. If that is so, the line will have occurred in the *Hekale* (as some critics have suggested: see Pfeiffer *ad loc.*); and in view of what we have seen, I surmise that it occurred at the beginning of the poem. As to the other passages of Callimachus whose immediate origin is unstated, after weighing the evidence in each case I do not feel that any can be confidently attributed to Eustathius' own reading of the poet.¹⁷

PAPENDRECHT, THE NETHERLANDS
January, 1984

¹⁷ I have wavered especially over fr.640 Pf. (adduced by Eustathius at 743.6, 937.56f, 985.22, and 1684.39), ἀνάγνωστον μηδὲν ἔχοιμι κακόν. It is a striking saying that might have aroused Eustathius' interest, the more so because it is easy to understand. Moreover, it offers a glaring error (ἀνάγνωστον for ἄγνωστον), which does not occur in our other authorities for this fragment: this surprised Pfeiffer (*ad loc.*), who wondered which grammatical source may have been the cause of the error. As we have seen, however, Eustathius himself was prone to such errors: see Valk (*supra* n.4) lvi–lvii for an instance showing that if Eustathius committed an error once, he consistently repeated it. Hence it is possible that here too he is repeating an inaccuracy of his own making, that he here read Callimachus directly. As to Callimachus fr.547 and 549, I think here Eustathius used an intermediate source.