

DID EUSTATHIUS COMPOSE A COMMENTARY
ON OPPIAN'S *HALIEUTICA*?

In his Homeric commentaries Eustathius betrays his fondness for the *Halieutica* of Oppian of Cilician Corycus by his ornamental (unnecessary) quotation from the work (633. 27'), his etymologizing of Oppian's name (483. 44 and 679. 40), and, above all, by the terms in which he refers to the poet (633. 27 ὁ Κίλιξ σοφός, 994. 21 παρὰ τῷ γλυκντάτῳ Ὀππιανῷ). Eustathius was not only himself thoroughly familiar with this popular Byzantine school book,² but assumed a like familiarity in his readers, as is evidenced by the fact that he repeatedly quotes from it without identifying the author.³ Furthermore, he read the *Halieutica* with the aid of scholia, on which he once drew in his *Homerica* (1332. 15: schol. *H.* 4. 590).⁴

A hitherto neglected piece of evidence raises the possibility that Eustathius may not merely have admired, but actually have written a commentary on the *Halieutica*. This consists in the fourth A-scholium⁵ on *Halieutica* 1. 477:

Εἰλείθναι: αἱ γένναι· ἄλλως δὲ κατὰ μῦθον δαίμονές εἰσιν Εἰλείθναι
τελοῦσαι εἰς τοκετὸν καὶ ποιοῦσαι τὸ κνοφορούμενον ἐλεύθειν εἰς φῶς, ὅθεν
καὶ Εἰλείθναι παρὰ τὸ ἐλεύθειν λέγονται, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ὀμήρῳ γέγραπται.

The reference ὡς ἐν τῷ Ὀμήρῳ γέγραπται has been misunderstood. The editor of the A-scholia, W. C. Bussemaker, added the note "II. A 270 et saepius alibi."⁶ However, the ὡς-clause evidently refers to the preceding etymology (. . . Εἰλείθναι παρὰ τὸ ἐλεύθειν λέγονται),⁷ which is neither stated nor implied in this or any other Homeric text. In fact, as can be seen by comparison of similar cross-references in other Byzantine philological writings, the words ἐν τῷ Ὀμήρῳ are ambiguous: they may either refer to the Homeric text itself or be a short way of referring to a work of Homeric exegesis.⁸ Now, as it happens, no extant Homeric scholium etymologizes Εἰλείθναι from ἐλεύθειν. For this doctrine we must turn to Eustathius' Homeric commentary (843. 60):

θνηγότερες δὲ Ἦρας γαμηλίων μυθικῶς αἱ μογοστόκοι Εἰλείθναι ὡς ἐπιστα-
τοῦσαι τόκοις καὶ ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν τὰ ἔμβρυα εἰς φῶς ἐλεύθειν μόγους ταῖς τικτού-

1. πῖνας γάρ, ἐξ οὗ καὶ πινாகίσκον, οὐ μόνον σκευὸς δεξιὸν εἰς τὸ πίνειν "κατὰ ἀτρεκέες ὄνομα" εἶποι ἂν ὁ Κίλιξ σοφός (*H.* 1. 316), ἤγουν κατὰ ἐτυμολογίαν. . . .

2. *Halieutica* as a schoolbook: evidence cited by R. Keydell, s.v. "Oppianos," *RE* 35 (1939): 703; popularity in general: cf. H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, vol. 2 (Munich, 1978), p. 115.

3. E.g., 84. 5 γαληναίη τε γέννηται (*H.* 1. 460), 265. 16 ἀτερπέα δ' αὖλον ἔκυρσαν (*H.* 1. 34), 346. 6 Τυφασίων ἀλαλήων (*H.* 3. 25; also cited 1650. 50, where the poet is named), 1332. 15 αὐτόροφον (*H.* 1. 22).

4. Cf. in general M. van der Valk (ed.), *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri "Iliadem" pertinentes*, 3 vols. (Leyden, 1971-79), 1:XC1, 2:L.

5. Cf. the classification of the scholia by F. Fajen, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den "Halieutika" des Oppian* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1969), pp. 32-33. I agree with his conclusion that the A-scholia are not by John Tzetzes himself, although they make use inter alia of some of his material.

6. *Scholia et paraphrases in Nicandrum et Oppianum* (Paris, 1849), ad loc.

7. If the reference were merely to the occurrence of Εἰλείθναι in Homer, one would have expected ἡ δὲ λέξις καὶ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ or the like (cf. schol. *H.* 2. 370; Eust. ad Dion. Per. 680).

8. Examples of compendious reference to the literary work commented on instead of the commentary itself: Eust. *Hom.* 1190. 4, 1415. 59, 1465. 53, 1479. 53, 1520. 19, 1859. 18, idem ad Dion. Per. 109, 144, 205, 428, 458, 461, 498, 723, 919, 994, 1107; see also Pfeiffer on Callim. frag. dub. 812.

σαις ἐκ τῶν ὁδυνῶν ἐπάγουσαι, ὡς εἰ καὶ βέλη ἔπεμπον. . . . λέγονται δὲ
Εἰλεῖθναι παρὰ τὸ ἐλεύθειν, ὡς εἴρηται.

If the reference of our scholium is to this passage, the cross-reference is likely to derive from Eustathius himself: probably only Eustathius could have referred to the work in this oblique fashion (ὡς ἐν τῷ Ὅμηρῳ γέγραπται) without sacrificing intelligibility.⁹ If these assumptions are correct, it would follow that Eustathius wrote a commentary on the *Halieutica* known to us only through this excerpt.¹⁰

A. R. DYCK
University of California,
Los Angeles

9. Note, too, that the form corresponds to that of Eustathian cross-references; cf. the material collected in F. Kuhn, "Quo ordine et quibus temporibus Eustathius commentarios suos composuerit," *Commentationes in honorem Guilelmi Studemundi* (Strassbourg, 1889), pp. 249–57.

10. An excerptor incorporating material from Eustathius' commentary in the scholia on the *Halieutica* would have merely copied the cross-reference in the form in which he found it (for similar instances of copying of cross-references in their original form by Byzantine excerptors, see below and section 2 of the introduction in my forthcoming edition of *Epimerismi ad "Iliadis" A pertinentes*). Schol. A ad Opp. *H.* 2. 319 (ἰστέον ὅτι . . .) bears a different relation to Eustathius: it has been lifted from Eust. *Hom.* 61. 36, as is betrayed by the unaltered reference καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐν τῇ [τῇ Bussemaker: τῷ cod.] γ' ῥαψωδίᾳ λεχθήσεται, which refers to Γ 23, rather than to a passage of the *Halieutica*. Finally, cf. Eustathius' commentary on Aristophanes inferred by W. J. W. Koster and D. Holwerda, "De Eustathio, Tzetza, Moschopulo, Planude Aristophanis commentatoribus," *Mnemosyne* 7 (1954): 136–56, and his commentary on Philostratus inferred by Van der Valk from *Hom.* 236. 33 (*Commentarii*, 1:CVIII).