

FRAGMENT 53 OF CALLISTHENES AND THE
TEXT OF *ILIAD* 2. 850–55

The only evidence for substantial Greek knowledge of, and hence possible contact with, any of the coasts of the Black Sea during the eighth century B.C. is provided by the Paphlagonian entry in the catalogue of Troy's allies (*Il.* 2. 850–55). Particular significance in this connection attaches to lines 853–55, since they seemingly supply precise data about the coast of Paphlagonia at a time when non-Greek populations still occupied the sites of the later cities of Cromna, Sesamus, and Cyturus.¹ Recent scholars, however, especially those writing in English,² contend that lines 853–55 are late Hellenistic interpolations and thus of no value in reconstructing the history of the Greek penetration of the Black Sea. The purpose of this note is to point out that evidence furnished by fragment 53 of Callisthenes renders such a position untenable.

The condemnation of these three lines dates from the publication of T. W. Allen's book, *The Homeric Catalogue of Ships* (Oxford, 1921).³ Allen based his attack on a statement by Strabo to the effect that Apollodorus of Athens, following the views of Eratosthenes, had maintained that Homer was ignorant of the coasts of the Black Sea, since he would otherwise have mentioned them.⁴ Since 853–55 explicitly mention places and features of the Paphlagonian coast, Allen concluded that these lines cannot have been in the texts of the *Iliad* used by Eratosthenes and Apollodorus. On the other hand, since Strabo accepted them as Homeric,⁵ they had clearly entered the text by his time: that is, the interpolation probably occurred some time between the publication of Apollodorus' *Περὶ τοῦ νεῶν καταλόγου* in the second century B.C. and Strabo's *Geography* in the early first century after Christ. Finally, Allen rounded out his case by suggesting that the interpolator took the three lines in question from the catalogue of Trojan allies in the *Cypria*.

The fact that the *Cypria* contained no such catalogue obviously weakens Allen's theory somewhat, by depriving it of one of its most attractive features, an identifiable source for the interpolated lines.⁶ A still more serious difficulty is provided by the echoing of 855 in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes.⁷ Apparently, either Apollonius used the same source as Allen's hypothetical inter-

Acknowledgment should be made to Professors T. S. Brown and M. H. Chambers of UCLA and Professor A. R. Baca of California State University at Northridge for their criticism of earlier versions of this paper.

1. D. B. Monro and T. W. Allen, eds., *Homer: "Iliad,"* 3d ed. (Oxford, 1920), *Il.* 2. 853–55: [*sc.* 'Εγεῖρων] οἱ δ' αὖ Κίττωνον ἔχον καὶ Σήσαμον ἀμφενέμοντο / ἀμφὶ τε Παρθένιον ποταμὸν κλυτὰ δώματα ναῖον / Κρωμῶνάν τ' Ἀλγυαλὸν τε καὶ ὕληλους Ἐρυθρίους.

2. E.g., G. M. Bolling, *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford, 1925), pp. 77–78; D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1959), p. 147; H. Thomas and F. H. Stubbings, "Lands and Peoples in Homer," in *A Companion to Homer*, A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings, eds. (London, 1962), pp. 283–310, at 304, 309, n. 1; and R. Hope Simpson and J. F. Lazenby, *The Catalogue of the Ships in Homer's "Iliad"* (Oxford, 1970), p. 182, n. 3. Among continental scholars only V. Burr, *NΕΩΝ ΚΑΤΑΛΟΓΟΣ: Untersuchung zum homerischen Schiffskatalog*, *Klio*, Beiheft 49 (Leipzig, 1944), p. 149, appears to accept this position.

3. Pp. 156–59.

4. H. L. Jones, ed. and trans., *Strabo: "The Geography,"* Loeb Classical Library, 8 vols. (London, 1917–32), 12. 3. 26 = Apollodorus *FGrHist* 244 F 157b.

5. Strabo 12. 3. 10.

6. E. Bethe, *Homer: Dichtung und Sage*, vol. 2² (Stuttgart, 1929), p. 216.

7. H. Fränkel, ed., *Apollonius Rhodius: "Argonautica,"* (Oxford, 1961), 2. 941–42: Σήσαμον αἰπεινούς τε παρεξέοντι Ἐρυθρίους, / Κρωβιάλον Κρωμῶνάν τε καὶ ὕληντα Κίττωνον.

polator, or copies of the *Iliad* containing 855 (at least) were already in circulation during the third century B.C. Nevertheless, Allen's initial inference remains valid. The most natural interpretation of the passage of Strabo cited by Allen is that Eratosthenes and Apollodorus both used texts of the *Iliad* that omitted 853–55. By itself, however, this fact does not suffice to prove that these lines were interpolated in the Hellenistic period, since there is another equally satisfactory explanation not considered by Allen that would account both for Eratosthenes' and Apollodorus' ignorance of these three lines and for Apollonius' knowledge of 855: Eratosthenes and Apollodorus could have accepted the judgment of an editor of the *Iliad* who rejected these lines as un-Homeric despite their being found in pre-Hellenistic texts of the *Iliad*.⁸ Probability, moreover, supports this latter suggestion, since it is difficult to believe that such an interpolation could have been made without being noticed, let alone have won universal acceptance, as late as the second or first centuries B.C.⁹ Fortunately, there is no need to rely on mere probability, since fragment 53 of Callisthenes provides the evidence necessary to decide the question.

According to Strabo, Καλλισθένης δὲ καὶ ἔγραφε τὰ ἔπη ταῦτα εἰς τὸν Διάκοσμον, μετὰ τὸ Κρώμναν τ' Αἰγιαλὸν τε καὶ ὑψηλοὺς Ἐρυθίους

τιθεῖς

Καύκωνας δ' αὐτ' ἤγε Πολυκλῆος υἱὸς ἀμύμων,
οἳ περὶ Παρθένιον ποταμὸν κλυτὰ δώματα ἔναιον·

παρήκει γὰρ ἀφ' Ἡρακλείας καὶ Μαριανδυνῶν μέχρι Λευκοσύρων, οὓς καὶ ἡμεῖς Καππάδοκας προσαγορεύομεν, τό τε τῶν Καυκῶνων γένος τὸ περὶ Τίειον μέχρι Παρθενίου καὶ τὸ τῶν Ἐνετῶν τὸ συνεχὲς μετὰ τὸν Παρθένιον τῶν ἐχόντων τὸ Κύτωρον, καὶ νῦν δ' ἔτι Καυκωνίτας εἶναι τινας περὶ τὸν Παρθένιον.¹⁰

Although Callisthenes' lines appeared in some Hellenistic copies of the *Iliad*¹¹ and were even accepted as Homeric by Apollodorus,¹² they early disappeared from the text, surviving henceforth only as curiosities in the scholarly literature about Homer.¹³ Today, of course, no scholar doubts their spuriousness, and it is probably this unanimity that accounts for the tendency to ignore the implications of fragment 53 as a whole for the textual history of the Paphlagonian entry. Of particular importance in this regard is Strabo's statement that Callisthenes added his lines after Κρώμναν τ' Αἰγιαλὸν τε καὶ ὑψηλοὺς Ἐρυθίους, that is, after the present line 855. If Allen's reconstruction of the development of the text were correct, Callisthenes should have placed his lines after 852. By itself, therefore, Strabo's report of

8. They would have found such a text acceptable because of their belief that Greeks did not sail the Black Sea before the beginnings of colonization (Apollodorus *FGrHist* 244 F 157a = Strabo 7. 3. 6; cf. Strabo 1. 3. 2), a process which began much later than the eleventh-century date Eratosthenes (*FGrHist* 241 F 9) assigned to Homer or the tenth-century date favored by Apollodorus (*FGrHist* 244 F 63).

9. This is made all the more difficult to believe by Strabo's reference (12. 3. 10) to the controversy among Homerists as to whether or not line 855 should be emended to read Κρώμναν Κωβιτῶν τε, a reading of which, as the lines of Apollonius quoted in n. 7 indicate, a variant was already known as early as the third century B.C.

10. Strabo 12. 3. 5 = Callisthenes *FGrHist* 124 F 53.

11. Bolling, *Interpolation in Homer*, p. 78.

12. Apollodorus *FGrHist* 244 F 170 = Strabo 14. 5. 23. Allen, *Homeric Catalogue*, p. 159, noted this.

13. For the scholia see Bolling, *Interpolation in Homer*, pp. 77–78. In addition to Strabo, Eustathius (G. Stallbaum, ed., *Commentarii ad Homerum "Iliadem" et "Odysseam"*, 7 vols. in 4 [Leipzig, 1825–30, repr. 1960], 1:294 and 4:162) also knows of the lines.

Callisthenes' placement of his lines is sufficient to prove that 855 at least was in the latter's text of the *Iliad*. But there is more. Not only is the second of the Callisthenic lines itself only a variant of 854 but, more importantly, Callisthenes' description of the Eneti as τὸ τῶν Ἑνετῶν . . . τῶν ἔχόντων τὸ Κύτωρον in his explanation of his proposed reading clearly reflects a text in which both 852 and 853 were present.¹⁴ There can, therefore, be no doubt that the text of the *Iliad* used by Callisthenes contained the Paphlagonian entry in the same form as does ours. One final point. Fragment 53 almost certainly comes from Callisthenes' history of Alexander, a work intended for as broad a reading public as possible.¹⁵ Inclusion of a textual discussion of the sort contained in fragment 53 in such a work presupposes that Callisthenes expected it to be intelligible to his audience. In other words, the text of the *Iliad* he wished to modify cannot have been an unusual one, but instead one that was in general circulation during the fourth century B.C.¹⁶ It is thus clear that lines 853–55 were not added to the *Iliad* during the Hellenistic period, but rather deleted from it during the third century B.C. by some editor, most likely Zenodotus.¹⁷ Accordingly, since there are neither textual nor historical grounds for rejecting these lines,¹⁸ historians in the future may not justify their failure to consider the implications of 853–55 in their reconstructions of the process of Greek penetration of the Black Sea simply by referring to Allen's discussion.

STANLEY M. BURSTEIN

California State University at Los Angeles

14. That Strabo adhered closely to Callisthenes' wording in 12. 3. 5 is revealed by his appending to the latter's mention of the Leucosyrians the gloss οὗς καὶ ἡμεῖς Καππάδοκας προσαγοροῦμεν.

15. L. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great* (New York, 1960), pp. 43–44.

16. Further evidence pointing to the general inclusion of these lines in copies of the *Iliad* before 300 B.C. is provided by a Cromnian inscription, published by E. Kalinka, "Aus Bithynien und Umgegend," *JOAI*, Beibl. 28 (1933): 44–111, at 60, no. 6, and discussed by L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes* (Paris, 1937), pp. 262–65, which reads "Ὀμηρος / Κρομνεύς. The claim is obviously based on the mention of Cromna in 855, and, although the inscription is undated, the tradition is most likely to have arisen before ca. 300 B.C. when Cromna became part of the new city of Amastris (Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F 4. 9; Strabo 12. 2. 10) and lost its independent identity.

17. Two facts point to Zenodotus' edition as the one that omitted 853–55: (1) the use of such a text by both Eratosthenes and Apollodorus; and (2) Apollodorus' approval of Zenodotus' reading Ἑνετῆς instead of Ἑνετῶν in line 852 (Apollodorus *FGrHist* 244 F 171 = Strabo 12. 3. 24–25).

18. Only proof that the Greeks could not have sailed the Black Sea in the eighth century B.C. would suffice to impeach these lines. Rhys Carpenter's attempt ("The Greek Penetration of the Black Sea," *AJA* 52 [1948]: 1–10) to provide such proof, by showing that the Greeks could not have overcome the problems of sailing through the Bosphorus before the invention of the pentaconter ca. 700 B.C., has been refuted by B. W. Labaree, "How the Greeks Sailed into the Black Sea," *AJA* 61 (1957): 29–33 and A. J. Graham, "The Date of the Greek Penetration of the Black Sea," *BICS* 5 (1958): 25–42, at 26–31.

A NOTE ON JULIUS CAESAR'S GREAT-GRANDFATHER

Some time ago, in an article on "The Lex Annalis under Caesar," I ventured to offer a stemma for the patrician Iulii of the Republican period.¹ In it the great-grandfather of the dictator Caesar was identified as Sex. Iulius Caesar, the consul of 157. Further reflection suggests that this detail needs to be corrected. The basis for deducing a different identification is given by the action of Augustus in naming his adoptive sons *Gaius* and *Lucius* Iulius Caesar (*PIR*² I 216, 222).

1. *Phoenix* 25 (1971): 246 ff. (at 264).