

KATARZYNA PIETRUCZUK
Instytut Filologii Klasycznej
Uniwersytet Warszawski

TZETZES' SOURCE OF INFORMATION ON THE FOUNDATION OF THE ALEXANDRIAN LIBRARY

Keywords: Callimachus' Pinakes, Alexandrian Library, Museum, Tzetzes' Prolegomena de comoedia

Słowa kluczowe: Pinakes Kalimacha, Biblioteka Aleksandryjska, Muzejon, Prolegomena de comoedia Tzetzesa

1.

The present discussion focuses on a celebrated account by John Tzetzes, who is our main source for the beginnings of what was perhaps the most famous library in the history of mankind – the Alexandrian Library. A close, technical scrutiny of a passage that was written more than a thousand years after the events it provides an account of allows me to reflect on the validity of our views on the creation of this institution, around which many myths have evolved. By reassessing these problems we will gain insight into the mechanisms of self-commemoration of the library as an institution of cultural memory.

The second prooemium in Tzetzes' *Prolegomena de comoedia Aristophanis*, which is one of our main sources for the beginnings of the Alexandrian Library, has come down to us in three versions that have conventionally been referred to (since Kaibel's edition¹) as *Pb*, *Ma* and *Mb*. *Pb* was first published by Cramer from *Parisinus Crameri* 2677, and *Ma* and *Mb* were published by Keil from *Ambrosianus C* 222.² *Mb* is the most extensive of these variants; moreover,

¹ Georgius Kaibel, ed., *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, vol. I 1: *Doriensium comoedia, mimi, phlyakes* (Berlin: Weidman, 1899), 17–34.

² John Anthony Cramer, ed., *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis Bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1839–1841), 3–10; Heinrich Keil, "Ioannis Tzetzae scholiorum in Aristophanem prolegomena", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, no. 6 (1848): 108–134, 243–257. These two manuscripts were first collated by Guillaume Studemund, "Duo commentarii de comoedia", *Philologus*, no. 46 (1888): 1–26. For a detailed discussion of the manuscripts and editions, see Wilhelm Johann Wolff Koster, *Scholia in Aristophanem*, vol. I: *Prolegomena de comoedia, Scholia in Achamenses, Equites, Nubes*, fasc. IA (Groningen: Bouma, 1975), XXIX–XXXVIII.

it is the latter variant whose Latin translation was found by Ossann in 1819 in a fifteenth-century ms. containing Plautus' plays (*Vat. Lat.* 11469, fol. 184 verso). This translation is known as *Scholium Plautinum*.³ The text of *Mb* goes as follows:⁴

Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Αἰτωλὸς καὶ Λυκόφρων ὁ Χαλκιδεύς, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ζηνόδοτος ὁ Ἐφέσιος τῶ Φιλαδέλφῳ Πτολεμαίῳ συνωθηθέντες βασιλικῶς ὁ μὲν τὰς τῆς τραγωδίας, Λυκόφρων δὲ τὰς τῆς κωμωδίας βίβλους διώρθωσαν, Ζηνόδοτος δὲ τὰς ὁμηρεῖους καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ποιητῶν. ὁ γὰρ ῥηθεὶς βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος ἐκεῖνος, ἡ φιλοσοφωτάτῃ τῶ ὄντι καὶ θεία ψυχῇ, καλοῦ παντὸς καὶ θεάματος καὶ ἔργου καὶ λόγου τελῶν ἐπιθυμητῆς, ἐπεὶ διὰ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως καὶ γερουσίων ἐτέρων ἀνδρῶν δαπάναις βασιλικαῖς ἀπανταχόθεν τὰς βίβλους εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἤθροισε, δυοὶ βιβλιοθήκας ταύτας ἀπέθετο, ὧν τῆς ἐκτὸς μὲν ἦν ἀριθμὸς τετρακιμῦρια δισχίλια ὀκτακόσια, τῆς δ' ἔσω τῶν ἀνακτόρων καὶ βασιλείου βίβλων μὲν συμμικτῶν ἀριθμὸς τεσσαράκοντα μυριάδες, ἀπλῶν δὲ καὶ ἀμιγῶν βίβλων μυριάδες ἐννέα, ὡς ὁ Καλλιμάχος νεανίσκος ὧν τῆς αὐτῆς ὑστέρως μετὰ τὴν ἀνόρθωσιν τοὺς πίνακας αὐτῶν ἀπεγράψατο. Ἐρατοσθένης δέ, ὁ ἠλικιώτης αὐτοῦ, παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως τὸ τοσοῦτον ἐνεπιστεύθη βιβλιοφυλάκιον. ἀλλὰ τὰ Καλλιμάχου καὶ τὰ Ἐρατοσθένους μετὰ βραχὺν τινα γέγονε χρόνον, ὡς ἔφην, τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν βίβλων καὶ διορθώσεως, κἄν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου.

(John Tzetzes, *Prolegomena de comoedia Aristophanis* 2)

Under the royal patronage of Ptolemy Philadelphus, Alexander of Aetolia edited the books of tragedy, Lycophron of Chalcis those of comedy, and Zenodotus of Ephesus those of Homer and the other poets. That Ptolemy, the king I spoke of, was really the most philosophic and divine soul, and desired everything fine – sights, deeds, and words. Through Demetrius of Phaleron and other counselors, he collected the books at royal expense from all over the world and housed them in Alexandria in two libraries. The public library had 42,800 books; the private library of the court and palace had 400,000 unsorted books, and 90,000 single, sorted books, as was catalogued by Callimachus, a young man of the court, after the books were edited. His contemporary Eratosthenes was entrusted by the king with the important post of librarian. The work of Callimachus and Eratosthenes took place a short time after the collecting and editing of the books (as I said) – even within the lifetime of Ptolemy Philadelphus himself.⁵

Dziatzko proposed to emend the somehow awkward syntax of the sentence that refers to Callimachus' Πίνακες by changing ὑστέρως to ἰστορεῖ ὅς. He found

³ The text is available in Friedrich Wilhelm Ritschl, "Die Alexandrinischen Bibliothek unter den ersten Ptolemäern und die Sammlung der Homerischen Gedichte durch Pisistratus, nach Anleitung eines Plautinischen Scholions", in idem, *Opuscula philologica*, vol. I (Leipzig, 1866), 5–8; see also Friedrich Schmidt, ed., 1922: *Die Pinakes des Kallimachos* (Berlin: E. Ebering, 1922), 9–10 (T 24d), and Wilhelm Johann Wolff Koster, "Scholion Plautinum Plene Editum", *Mnemosyne*, no. 14 (1961): 29.

⁴ The *editor princeps* of *Mb* was Keil, op. cit.; the three versions were printed together by Kaibel, op. cit., 19 (*Pb*), 24–25 (*Ma*), 31 (*Mb*), and by Schmidt, op. cit., 9–10.

⁵ Trans. by S. Levin, in Edward Alexander Parsons, *Alexandrian Library, Glory of the Hellenistic World: Its Rise, Antiquities, and Destructions* (London: The Elsevier Press, 1952), 112, slightly adapted.

ὑστέρωσ redundant when adjacent to μετὰ τὴν ἀνόρθωσιν.⁶ Additionally, Dziatzko wanted to adjust the Greek text to its Latin translation in the *Scholium Plautinum*:

...sicuti refert Callimachus aulicus regius bibliothecarius, qui etiam singulis voluminibus titulos inscripsit.

...according to Callimachus, a man of the court and royal librarian, who also wrote the titles for the several volumes.⁷

This conjecture was accepted by Schmidt and Cantarella, yet Pfeiffer and Fraser rejected it.⁸ Pfeiffer pointed out that ὑστέρωσ, which underscores the order of a sequence of events, is paralleled by the analogous ὕστερον in *Pb*, which is another version of Tzetzes' account:

...ἀμυγῶν δὲ καὶ ἀπλῶν μυριάδες ἑννέα· ὧν τοὺς πίνακας ὕστερον Καλλιμάχος ἀπεγράψατο.⁹

Additionally, Pfeiffer observed that the text as conjectured by Dziatzko “makes Callimachus himself the ultimate source of at least a part of the *Prolegomena*”, which “would enormously enhance the authority of Tzetzes' report”. Since it is Tzetzes' source that I am to investigate, we need to take proper note of Pfeiffer's important remark.

It is worth adding that the text as it stands in the ms. remains, nevertheless, the most probable source for the Latin version, which emphasises that its informant is Callimachus (*sicuti refert Callimachus*) since, according to the Greek text, at least information regarding the number of books that had been stored in the two libraries was available due to a certain work by Callimachus:

...ὡς ὁ Καλλιμάχος νεανίσκος ὧν τῆς αὐλῆς ὑστέρωσ μετὰ τὴν ἀνόρθωσιν τοὺς πίνακας αὐτῶν ἀπεγράψατο.

...as was catalogued by Callimachus, a young man of the court, after the books were edited.

⁶ Karl Dziatzko, “Johannes Tzetzes und das Plautusscholion über die alexandrinischen Bibliotheken”, *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, no. 46 (1891): 350–351.

⁷ Trans. by E.H. Wilkins, in Parsons, op. cit., 108.

⁸ Schmidt, op. cit., 9–10 (T 24), Raffaele Cantarella, ed., *Aristofane, Le commedie*, vol. I (Milan: Istituto Editoriale, 1949), 59 (T 14), Rudolph Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 127–128. However, according to Peter Marshall Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, vols I–III (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), I, 321, II, 474, n. 108, Tzetzes “evidently reaches back ultimately to some Alexandrian sources of the Ptolemaic period”. Cf. Rudolf Blum, *Kallimachos. The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*, trans. Hans Wellisch (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 119, n. 52.

⁹ Pfeiffer, op. cit., 127–128.

Therefore I do not find it necessary to accept Dziatzko's conjecture; however, this does not preclude the possibility that Callimachus was either the direct or at least the ultimate source of the first part of Tzetzes' second prooemium. On the contrary, this is precisely what I aim to argue for in this discussion.

I suggest that if not a trace of Tzetzes' source then at least its shadow can be detected in a certain instance of the *praeteritio* in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* V 203e:

περὶ δὲ βιβλίων πλῆθους καὶ βιβλιοθηκῶν κατασκευῆς καὶ τῆς εἰς τὸ Μουσεῖον συναγωγῆς τί δεῖ καὶ λέγειν, πᾶσι τούτων ὄντων κατὰ μνήμην?

Need I even mention the number of volumes, the building of libraries and the gathering at the Museum, when these things are in everyone's memory?¹⁰

This mention of the libraries in Alexandria closely follows the famous description of the Grand Procession of Ptolemy II Philadelphus in Athenaeus (V 197d–203b) and is in turn immediately followed by a description of the vessels constructed by Ptolemy IV Philopator (V 203e–206c). Both accounts derive, as Athenaeus tells us, from Callixeinus of Rhodes' treatise *On Alexandria* (*FGrHist* 627 F 1–2). In view of this context, one might suspect that when he speaks about the Alexandrian Library and Museum, or rather refuses to speak about them, Athenaeus also has in mind information provided in Callixeinus' work.¹¹ Yet there is no explicit reference to Callixeinus here, although such a reference is prominent in the two other passages. More importantly, Callixeinus clearly postdated Ptolemy Philopator; even if his treatise did indeed contain information about Ptolemy Philadelphus' enterprises to which Athenaeus alludes, he himself must have found it in some earlier source.

It is striking that there is a curious overlap between the information that Athenaeus refuses to provide in this passage because it is commonly known, i.e. information on the number of books in Alexandria, on the foundation of its libraries and on the arrival of scholars at the Museum, and the information that is provided by Tzetzes in the prooemium. It is a reasonable supposition that the entire passage in Tzetzes, up until mentioning Callimachus, which explicitly

¹⁰ Trans. by Michel Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest. A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 362.

¹¹ See Ludwig Preller, *Polemonis Periegetae fragmenta* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1838), 179; note that Preller mentions the Μουσεῖον listed by the *Suda* among Callimachus' works as a predecessor of Callixeinus and Aristonicus (on whom see n. 25 below). Cf. Jonathan Barnes, "Roman Aristotle", in idem and Miriam Griffin, ed., *Philosophia Togata II: Plato and Aristotle at Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 7, who, however, concludes: "Better confess scepticism about Athenaeus' source".

provides precisely the same sort of information that Athenaeus mentions, is based on the same source that Athenaeus is thinking about.

To be certain, the statement that a cultural fact is commonly known does not need to be taken literally if we hear it from an erudite who, elsewhere (Ath. VIII 336e), boasts that he has read more than eight hundred plays of the Middle Comedy. However, Athenaeus' words were probably meant to be understood that information on the beginnings of the Alexandrian Library was easily available to those who wanted to find it. This implies that such information was contained in a work intended for a general audience, perhaps one that was more accessible than Callixenus' rather technical treatise, or it was available in multiple sources.

Furthermore, if the source that Athenaeus silently alludes to was authoritative towards the matter which it treated, it may well have become a source for later accounts dealing with the history of the Alexandrian Library (such as Callixenus' account, if he did indeed discuss the Library). We cannot be certain whether Tzetzes had direct access precisely to that source; there is a possibility, of course, that there was a longer chain of texts between Tzetzes and the authoritative source behind Athenaeus' passage.

2.

Since Tzetzes' numbers of books in the Alexandrian libraries are, as he tells us, derived from Callimachus¹² – to be precise, from the *opus magnum* of Callimachus' librarianship, i.e. Πύνακες – then it is this Alexandrian scholar who inevitably turns up as the most likely source for Athenaeus in the passage being discussed. It is worth noting in this context that the author of the *Deipnosophistae* mentions Callimachus' Πύνακες several times. As a matter of fact, no fewer than nine of the twenty-five testimonies referring to the Πύνακες that have been collected by Pfeiffer derive from Athenaeus' work.¹³

At this point one difficulty needs to be dealt with. From what we know about the structure of the Πύνακες one might infer that there was no room in this work for the information Athenaeus alludes to in the passage quoted above and which

¹² It is worth noting that the total number of books collected in the Library as reported by Tzetzes' source (over 500,000) corresponds to numbers mentioned in the *Letter of Aristeas* (10), in which Demetrius of Phalerum is depicted as telling Ptolemy (some time before the events reported in Tzetzes' account, i.e. at an earlier stage of organising the Library) that there were more than 200,000 books collected in the Library, but in a short period of time the number was expected to reach 500,000. On the *Letter of Aristeas*, see Nina Collins, *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), with full bibliography.

¹³ Fr. 430 Pfeiffer = Ath. XV 669d–e, fr. 433 = Ath. XIII 585b, fr. 434 = Ath. VI 244a, fr. 435 = Ath. XIV 643e, fr. 436 = Ath. epit. I 4e, fr. 437 = Ath. epit. II 70b, fr. 438 = Ath. VI 252c, fr. 439 = Ath. VIII 336d, fr. 440 = Ath. XI 496e–f.

Tzetzes provides – particularly for information on the foundation of the Library and on the arrival of scholars there.¹⁴ Yet would it be inconceivable that Callimachus' catalogue itself was preceded by a sort of introduction that provided such information? Of course, the presence of such a preamble on the origin of the Library would only make sense if we decide that the bulk of the Πίνακες was actually the Library's catalogue, i.e. it reflected the Library's holdings.¹⁵ As it happens, however, scholars disagree as to whether the Πίνακες was conceived as a catalogue or rather as a sort of bibliographical work, which would also have listed writings that were not included in the Library's holdings.¹⁶ A comprehensive discussion of this issue would go beyond the scope of the present article,¹⁷ yet there are reasons to believe that the Πίνακες was firmly rooted in the Library's collection. For one thing, this is implied by the above-quoted passage from Tzetzes:

The public library had 42,800 books; the private library of the court and palace had 400,000 unsorted books, and 90,000 single, sorted books, as was catalogued by Callimachus... [τοὺς πίνακας αὐτῶν ἀπεγράψατο].

Secondly, the Library's founders intended, according to our sources, to collect all Greek literature; therefore the Πίνακες, as the Library's catalogue, would at the same time have served as a comprehensive bibliography of Greek literature. That the aim of providing access to all literature was at some point achieved, still within Callimachus' lifetime, can be inferred from the testimonies on another work of the Callimachean librarianship, i.e. Πίναξ τῶν διδασκάλων, which was

¹⁴ The Πίνακες entries included, in their basic format, information about the author, title, incipit and stichometric data. See Schmidt, op. cit., 21–25 (the edition of fragments) and 46–91, Parsons, op. cit., 204–218; Pfeiffer, op. cit., 127–133; Blum, op. cit., 150–160.

¹⁵ For the fragments of the Πίνακες, see Rudolf Pfeiffer, ed., *Callimachus*, vol. I: *Fragmenta* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949), fr. 429–453, and for a selection, see Markus Asper, ed., trans., *Kallimachos. Werke. Griechisch und deutsch* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2004), fr. 493–499.

¹⁶ E.g. according to Barnes, Πίνακες “quite possibly included works not, or not yet, in that collection, which Callimachus knew about from other sources” (Robert Barnes, “Cloistered Bookworms in the Chicken-Coop of the Muses: The Ancient Library of Alexandria”, in Roy MacLeod, ed., *The Library of Alexandria: Centre of Learning in the Ancient World* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2000), 68); while in Canfora's view “since [scil. Πίνακες] basic idea was to list only those authors ‘eminent’ in the various branches of literature, they represented no more than a selection – albeit a very extensive one – from the complete catalogue (Luciano Canfora, *The Vanished Library: A Wonder of the Ancient World*, transl. Martin Ryle (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 39).

¹⁷ I discuss this issue more at length in Katarzyna Pietruczuk, *Dzieje tekstu Ajschylosa, Sofoklesa i Eurypidesa między Atenami i Aleksandrią* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Sub Lupa, 2014), 188–197, with further bibliography. An English-language version of this book will soon appear in the series *Quaderni di Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* (Rome: Quasar).

focused on Athenian dramatic production.¹⁸ The titles of the plays recorded in this catalogue were accompanied by the annotations on the plays' preservation, which implies that at some stage Callimachus boldly assumed that the plays to which the Library's collection provided no access had altogether been lost. The notion that whatever was missing from the Library's holdings did not exist at all corresponded with the propagandistic agenda of the Πίννακες. It is this aspect of Callimachus' work that provides the rationale for a sort of introductory note on the foundation of the Library.

Furthermore, that the Πίννακες actually required such an introductory note may be inferred from what we know about this work's circulation over the centuries. The already mentioned passage of the *Deiphosophistae* (Ath. VIII 336e) shows that Athenaeus, besides having read plenty of the Middle Comedy, was able to consult Callimachus' Πίννακες as well as the catalogue of the Library of Pergamum. As *Dinarch.* 1 shows, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who lived about two hundred years before Athenaeus, also had had access to the catalogues of both of these great libraries. This suggests, as was already observed by Gardthausen, Fraser and Blum, that these catalogues were published in "book" form.¹⁹ Even though it is rather difficult to imagine that a work consisting of, according to *Suda* (s.v. Καλλιμάχος), one hundred and twenty books circulated in many copies and was affordable to anyone who was interested in it,²⁰ we can make an informed guess that both Dionysius and Athenaeus had access to it in one of the large Roman libraries.²¹ What points to this is the fact that the fragments

¹⁸ These testimonies are provided by fragmentary inscriptions found in Rome, *IG* XIV 1097, 1098 and 1098a (on which see further below), and hypotheses to plays, probably by Aristophanes of Byzantium – hyp. I ad Ar. *Ach.* and hyp. ad Eur. *Phoen.* For a discussion of these sources, see Pietruczuk, op. cit., 201–207, with further bibliography.

¹⁹ Viktor Gardthausen, "Die alexandrinische Bibliothek, ihr Vorbild, Katalog und Betrieb", *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Buchwesen und Schrifttum*, no. 5 (1922): 77, Fraser, op. cit., I, 327, Blum, op. cit., 152.

²⁰ Of course it is much easier to imagine that one was able to obtain a copy of the part of the Πίννακες he or she was particularly interested in (e.g. Dionysius – of the part on orators, Athenaeus – on comic writers and gastronomic works). On Roman libraries, see Clarence Eugene Boyd, *Public Libraries and Literary Culture in Ancient Rome* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1915), George Houston, "Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries in the Roman Empire", in William A. Johnson and Holt N. Parker, ed., *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 233–267, Fabio Tutrone, "Libraries and Intellectual Debate in the Late Republic: The Case of Aristotelean Corpus", in Jason König, Katerina Oikonomopoulou and Greg Woolf, eds, *Ancient Libraries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 152–166, Ewen Bowie, "Libraries for the Caesars", *ibidem*, 237–260, Pier Luigi Tucci, "Flavian Libraries in the City of Rome", *ibidem*, 277–311.

²¹ For Dionysius' and Athenaeus' presence in Rome, see, respectively, Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* I 7, 2 and Ath. XII 537f. On Dionysius' studies in Rome and on the circulation of bulky multi-volume books in Rome in the first century BC, see Daniel Hogg, "Libraries in a Greek Working Life: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a Case Study in Rome", in *Ancient Libraries*, 137–151, whose view that

of the already-mentioned Πίναξ τῶν διδασκάλων were found in Rome. These were originally inscribed on a public building, perhaps a library.²²

The published version of the Πίνακες needed, I argue, to have been prefaced so as to have provided the reader with information on the nature of this work and on whose authority he or she was offered to rely. The information given by Tzetzes in his prooemium and alluded to by Athenaeus is precisely what we might expect to find in such an introduction. As a matter of fact, besides theorising about the existence of such a treatise I am able to point to its possible trace. The author of the entry on Callimachus in the *Suda*, when enumerating Callimachus' works, groups the titles of his works connected with his activity as a librarian:

τῶν δὲ αὐτοῦ βιβλίων ἔστι καὶ ταῦτα: ...Μουσεῖον, Πίνακες τῶν ἐν πάσῃ παιδείᾳ διαλαμπάντων, καὶ ὧν συνέγραψαν, ἐν βιβλίοις κ' καὶ ρ', Πίναξ καὶ ἀναγραφή τῶν κατὰ χρόνους καὶ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένων διδασκάλων, Πίναξ τῶν Δημοκράτους γλωσσῶν καὶ συνταγμάτων...

His books are as follows: ...*Museum*; *Tables of Men Distinguished in Every Branch of Learning, and their Works* (in 120 books); *Table and Description of Didaskaloi in Chronological Order from the Beginning*...²³

The Πίνακες are preceded on this list by a work titled Μουσεῖον, of which no fragments or other testimonies have survived.²⁴ Although the Alexandrian Library

the first book of *Roman Antiquities* was written so as to be published separately from the rest of this work provides a parallel for my view on the circulation of Callimachus' work.

²² *IG XIV 1097* and *1098* were first published by Odericus; see Gasparus Aloysius Odericus, *Dissertationes et adnotationes in aliquot ineditas veterum inscriptiones et numismata: Accedunt inscriptiones et monumenta quae extant in bibliotheca Monachorum Camaldulensium S. Gregorii in monte Coelio explicationibus illustrate* (Rome: Typis Francisci Bizzarrini Komarek, sumptibus Venantii Monaldini, 1765), 360 and idem, *De marmorea didascalica in urbe reperta* (Rome: Typis Francisci Bizzarrini Komarek, sumptibus Venantii Monaldini, 1777); 1098a was recognised as a part of the same inscription as 1098 by Alfred Körte, "Inchriftliches zur Geschichte der attischen Komödie", *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, no. 60 (1905), 425–447. For the history of their discovery, see William Anthony Dittmer, *The Fragments of Athenian Comic Didascalicae Found in Rome (IG XIV 1097, 1098, 1098a)*, (diss. Leiden, 1923), 2–5, and Luigi Moretti "Sulle didascalie del teatro antico rinvenute a Roma", *Athenaeum*, no. 38 (1960): 263–265. Their edition is provided by Adolf Wilhelm, *Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen* (Vienna: Sonderschriften des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien, VI, 1906). On Callimachus' Πίναξ τῶν διδασκάλων, see also Blum, op. cit., 137–142.

²³ Trans. by Malcolm Heath at *Suda On Line: Byzantine Lexicography* (<http://www.stoa.org/sol/>), slightly altered.

²⁴ From the passage under discussion one might get the impression that the titles of Callimachus' works as listed in the *Suda* are alphabetically arranged, but, first, besides this passage this may hold true only for a relatively small part of this list, containing four titles of the lost *carmina minora* (Ἄργους οἰκιμῶς, Ἀρκαδία, Γλαῦκος, Ἐλπίδες) and, secondly, generic clusters seem to emerge as principal units of organisation, hence the fact that Μουσεῖον directly precedes the three titles of Πίνακες is all the more significant.

and Museum were separate entities,²⁵ these two institutions were obviously connected at least by the people who worked for them. It is not far-fetched, I believe, to assume that the work which bore the title of Μουσείον dealt with the history of this institution and that it contained the sort of information Tzetzes' prooemium provides.²⁶ The position that this title occupies on the list in the *Suda* confirms my supposition that the Μουσείον was published together with the Πίνακες and served as an introduction whose existence I have postulated above. It is very probable, I believe, that Callimachus' intention to publish the Πίνακες motivated his interest in describing the beginnings of the Alexandrian Library. At the same time the Μουσείον, apart from playing the role of an introduction to the Πίνακες, may have started circulating as an independent work that soon became popular as the main and, so to speak, official source for the history of the Alexandrian Library. Athenaeus' statement that the basic facts about the Alexandrian Library are known to everyone, though perhaps slightly exaggerated, confirms that this knowledge was within everyone's reach.

If the ultimate source for Tzetzes is Callimachus, then the question arises about the extent of the material in Tzetzes that is based on Callimachus. That the passage which reaches back to such an authoritative source ends where Tzetzes mentions that the numbers are presented according to Callimachus' count can be inferred not only from the basic likelihood that the reference to the source was intended to mark the end of the passage based on that source but also from several inaccuracies that scholars have pointed out in the text by Tzetzes.²⁷ For one thing, what Tzetzes says about Eratosthenes' role in the Alexandrian Library under Ptolemy II Philadelphus cannot have been based on Callimachus' account, since Eratosthenes was brought to Alexandria by Ptolemy III Euergetes, which means that his appointment as librarian at the

²⁵ On both institutions, see e.g. Parsons, *op. cit.*, 83–105, Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, 96–104, Fraser, *op. cit.*, 312–325, Blum, *op. cit.*, 97–104.

²⁶ We know of one more ancient treatise on the history of the Museum, namely Aristonicus of Alexandria's Περὶ τοῦ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Μουσείου from the first century BC (see Phot., *Bibl.* 161, 104b 38). It seems probable that Aristonicus used Callimachus' work on the same matter for information on this institution's beginnings and, at the same time, we cannot exclude that either Athenaeus or Tzetzes knew Aristonicus' treatise. However, the lack of any mention of Aristonicus in *Deipnosophistae*, together with Athenaeus' frequent use of Callimachus' work as a source, makes it more probable that it is Callimachus' treatise, not Aristonicus', that Athenaeus alludes to at V 203e.

²⁷ The chronological inaccuracies in Tzetzes' account were discussed by Parsons, *op. cit.*, 109–115. These are: (1) complete omission of the role of Ptolemy I and placing Demetrius' work in the Library under the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (this is in conflict with Diog. Laert. V 78, who attests that Demetrius was exiled by Ptolemy II, apparently soon after 283 BC); (2) dating Eratosthenes' work in the Library to the reign of the same king. These inaccuracies may result from the fact that the account related by Tzetzes suffered from various abbreviations made in the long process of transmission of his sources.

Alexandrian Library took place either after Callimachus' death, *c.* 240 BC, or shortly before it. This confusion suggests that Tzetzes (or his source) used other sources besides Callimachus.

To conclude, I believe that Callimachus' introduction to the Πίνακες, titled Μουσεῖον, was the ultimate source for the first part of Tzetzes' passage on the Alexandrian Library, thus future editors of Callimachus' grammatical fragments should turn their attention to this important testimony.

S u m m a r y

The present discussion aims to suggest that the introduction to the published version of Callimachus' *Pinakes* was a possible source of information on the origin of the Alexandrian Library as provided by Tzetzes in the second prooemium in his *Prolegomena de comoedia Aristophanis*, and that the same source was alluded to by Athenaeus (V 203e).

ŹRÓDŁO INFORMACJI TZETZESA O ZAŁOŻENIU BIBLIOTEKI ALEKSANDRYJSKIEJ

S t r e s z c z e n i e

W artykule wskazuje się, że źródłem informacji o założeniu Muzejonu i Biblioteki Aleksandryjskiej w słynnym przekazie Tzetesa na ten temat z *Prolegomena de comoedia* może być pismo Kallimacha, pełniące funkcję wprowadzenia do jego *Pinakes* – katalogu Biblioteki Aleksandryjskiej, i że aluzję do tego samego źródła znajdujemy u Atenajosa (V 203e).