



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## Some Notes on the Edition of Tzetzes' Ilias-Exegesis

Sluiter, I.

### Citation

Sluiter, I. (1992). Some Notes on the Edition of Tzetzes' Ilias-Exegesis. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/1244>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)  
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)  
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/1244>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

## SOME NOTES ON THE EDITION OF TZETZES' ILIAS-EXEGESIS

BY

INEKE SLUITER<sup>1)</sup>

In 1981, Anastasios Lolos published Johannes Tzetzes' notes on *Iliad* A 97-609<sup>2)</sup> in anticipation of his complete edition of Tzetzes' *Ilias-Exegesis*, which to the best of my knowledge has not appeared yet. The book received some attention, and much detailed criticism has been put forward, especially in two articles by Iakov<sup>3)</sup>. Undoubtedly Lolos deserves credit for disclosing this text for us. But it is very difficult to extricate his critical principles from the exceedingly brief introduction and it is a fact that the text as it stands is often unintelligible, although the editor shows no signs of alarm<sup>4)</sup>. In the following I will make some additions to the exten-

1) Research for this article has been made possible by a fellowship of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences. I would like to thank Professors D.M. Schenkeveld and C.J. Ruijgh and the members of the 'Amsterdamse Hellenistenclub' for their helpful criticism of an earlier draft of this paper.

2) *Der Unbekannte Teil der Ilias-Exegesis des Johannes Tzetzes: (A 97-609)*, Königstein/Ts. Parts of this text were published earlier, see G. Hermann, *Draconis Stratonicensis liber de metris poeticis, Ioannis Tzetzae Exegesis in Homeri Iliadem* (Leipzig 1812) and L. Bachmann, *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem* (Leipzig 1835).

3) Reviews by Hermant, *Byzantion* 53 (1983), 383-5; Bodson, *AC* 52 (1983), 289-90; Coulic, *LEC* 52 (1984), 172; Snipes, *CR* 36 (1986), 179-80 (none of them containing any detailed criticism). Extensive criticism and proposals for correction in D.I. Iakov, *Προκαταρκτικές προτάσεις για την έκδοση της Εξήγησης του Τζέτζη*, *ΕΕThess.* [= 'Επιστημονική Ἐπετηρίδα τῆς φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Ἀριστοτελείου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης] 22 (1984), 143-89 [Iakov 1984]; D.I. Iakov, *Propositions préliminaires à l'édition de l'Εξήγησης de Tzetzes*, II, *Hellenica* [= 'Ελληνικά. Φιλολ., ιστορ. καὶ λαογρ. Περιοδικὸν Σύγγραμμα τῆς Ἑταιρείας Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν, Thessaloniki, Bas. Sophias 2] 36 (1985), 27-77 [Iakov 1985]. Unfortunately, I have been unable to find M. Papat homopoulos, *Pour une nouvelle édition de l'Exégèse à l'Iliade de Jean Tzetzes*, *Dodone* 16 (1987) no. 2 (Philol.), 193-204 (see *l'Année philologique* 1988, no. 2733).

4) In fact I think a new collation of the MS will eventually be imperative. Prof S.R. Slings collated p. 11-13 of Lolos' edition with the photograph provided on p. 216 and 217 and found a great many divergences from the report by Lolos.

sive list of emendations proposed by Iakov. A list of small corrections follows at the end. Quotations are by page and line of Lolos' edition.

16,6 f. (A 105 προσέειπε) ἔειπε· αὕξησίς ἐστιν τοῦ ε καὶ οὐ διάλυσις. εἰ γὰρ ἦν διάλυσις, ἰῶτα ἂν ἐγράφετο τὸ ἔειπε (*fort.* ἔιπε). Cf. for a similar distinction, this time between πλεονασμός and ἀφαίρεσις, Apoll. Dyscolus *Adv.*, *Gramm. Gr.* II i 147,11 f. with the commentary *a.l.* by Schneider. Tzetzes makes a distinction between αὕησις and διάλυσις. Διάλυσις (*dihæresis*) of the diphthong would have yielded trisyllabic ἔιπε from εἶπε. Because Tzetzes reads ἔειπε, he concludes that the first ε must be an αὕησις. In this context it is virtually impossible to make out with certainty whether Tzetzes considered the ε as an augment (which he might well, considering the fact that the form εἶπεν has no recognizable augment when opposed to subjunctive εἴπη, for instance), or as a pleonastic addition, the ε duplicating the one contained in the first syllable of εἶπεν. Apollonius Dyscolus regards the first ε in ἔειπεν (and in ἐώρων or ἔηκεν) as pleonastic, on the ground that the word still begins with a vowel after removal of the ε (as against φῆ or βῆ, where the ε belongs to the original, complete forms; in those cases its removal constitutes the *pathos* of *aphaeresis*). Although Apollonius does not use the term αὕησις in this context, his argument tells strongly in favour of the interpretation of αὕησις as 'pleonastic addition' in Tzetzes<sup>5</sup>). And although αὕησις is the normal *terminus technicus* for augment too, there is no reason why it could not be used in a laxer sense as well<sup>6</sup>). However, it seems that the whole point of the exact reference of αὕησις is quite secondary to Tzetzes, who is not arguing about the status of the ε, but rather about the fact that it cannot have originated in a resolution of the diphthong ει.

5) The closest linguistic parallel from Apollonius is *Pron.*, *Gramm. Gr.* II i 65,25 f. (reporting the position of Trypho): πῶς οὐχὶ κατὰ τόνδε τὸν λόγον ἡ ἐμέο καὶ σέο ἑλλείπουσι τῷ ι, ἀπὸ τῆς ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ αὕξηθῆσαι. Here, the point is that genitives with a diphthong in *dihæresi* are mostly compensated in length (e.g. the *dihæresis* of Πριάμου yields Πριάμοιο rather than \*Πριάμοο). But ἐμέο and ἐμοῦ are equal. Therefore Trypho argued that the original form must have been ἐμεῖο rather than ἐμέο, because ἐμεῖο has four χρόνοι whereas ἐμοῦ has only three).

6) V.B. Botas, *Diccionario de Terminología gramatical griega* (Salamanca 1985), s.v. αὕησις does not mention this possibility.

21,17 ff. (A 117-8: βούλομ' ἐγὼ λαὸν σῶν ἔμμεναι ἢ ἀπολέσθαι·/ αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ γέρας αὐτίχ' ἐτοιμάσας· κτλ.) ἢ ἀπολέσθαι· παρὰ ἀπολέσθαι· οὐ γάρ, ὥς τινές φασιν, ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπολέσθαι· ὁ αὐτὰρ (l. αὐτὰρ) καὶ ἀτὰρ (l. ἀτὰρ) προτάσσονται καὶ ὑποτάσσονται, καὶ οὐχ, ὥς τινές φασιν, ὁ μὲν αὐτὰρ (l. -άρ) προτάσσεται, ὁ δὲ ἀτὰρ (l. -άρ) ὑποτάσσεται. The ed. failed to see that two separate lemmata are fused here, the first concerning A 117, the second, starting from ὁ αὐτὰρ, A 118<sup>7</sup>). The first remark reflects the discussion about the precise function of ἢ in A 117: Is it an instance of so-called ἢ διασαφητικός, roughly equivalent to μᾶλλον ἢ<sup>8</sup>) Or do we have to do with ἢ παραδιαζευκτικός? In that case it can be paraphrased by means of καί, since it does not introduce an absolute disjunction, but rather another possibility. See for this discussion Apoll. Dyscolus *Coni.*, *Gram. Gr.* II i 221,16 ff. Tzetzes decides in favour of the first solution and glosses by means of παρὰ, see LSJ *s.v.* C I 7: παρὰ is used here like *quam* after a comparative in Latin, 'in comparison with'. Read and punctuate as follows: παρὰ <τὸ> ἀπολέσθαι· οὐ γάρ ... ἐστὶ "καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπολέσθαι" (where καί is meant as a clue to the solution "ἢ παραδιαζευκτικός"). The second remark concerns the *protaxis* and *hypotaxis* of αὐτὰρ and ἀτὰρ. *Protaxis* refers to initial position in a complete sentence or a position in the first colon when one is dealing with set combinations of 'conjunctions' like ἦτοι ... ἦ, μὲν ... δέ (cf. Apoll. Dyscolus *Synt.*, *Gramm. Gr.* II ii 437,6 ὁ ἦτοι προτακτικός καὶ οὐδέποτε ὑποτακτικός, cf. *Coni.*, *Gramm. Gr.* II i 220,24 ff.: ἦ and ἡέ are both προτακτικοί and ὑποτακτικοί; ὁ δὲ ἦτοι μόνως προτακτικός). Tzetzes alludes to the theory that αὐτὰρ is sentence-initial, whereas ἀτὰρ would be equivalent to δέ, and would thus come in the second of two λόγοι combining into one new one. I have not been able to identify the source of this theory. Usually, αὐτὰρ and ἀτὰρ are lumped together as complete synonyms, and this is in fact the upshot of Tzetzes' discussion. Cf. *Etym. M.* 172,16 ff. and e.g. *Scholia in Dion. Thrac.* 285,5 ff.

22,19 ff. (A 120) ἄλλῃ· τὰ εἰς ἡ καθαρὰ ἐπιρρήματα προσγεγραμμένα (l. προσγεγραμμένον I.S.) ἔχει τὸ ἰῶτα· πάντῃ ἄλλῃ

7) See for a list of similar cases, Iakov 1985, 67 ff.

8) See *On ἢ διασαφητικός and propositions containing ΜΑΛΛΟΝ/ΗΤΤΟΝ*, *Mnemosyne* 41 (1988), 46-66.

καὶ τὰ ὅμοια πλὴν τοῦ, νή, νή δὴ καὶ δηλαδή. Read: πλὴν τοῦ νή, ἥδη καὶ δηλαδή or πλὴν τοῦ νή, νυνδὴ καὶ δηλαδή, cf. Herodian, *Gramm. Gr.* III i 489,6 ff. The use of καθαρά is a bit disturbing here. Normally, τὰ εἰς ἡ καθαρά ἐπιρρήματα should mean: 'adverbs ending in vowel + η', which is clearly inappropriate here. A syllable or a letter is called καθαρός if it is preceded by a vowel. If an η is καθαρός, it is automatically syllable-initial, since two vowels are separated by syllable-boundary. In theory, a καθαρός syllable could consist of just one vowel, which is neither preceded nor followed by any consonants. I suppose Tzetzes might accordingly have reinterpreted the term to mean 'adverbs ending in η, not followed by any consonants', but I have no parallel to offer. Otherwise, we have to assume some deeper-lying corruption. Cf. Herodian, *Gramm. Gr.* III i 489,10 ff.<sup>9</sup>).

23,6 ff. (A 121 s.v. Ἀχιλλεύς; the question is the spelling, either with one or two lambdas): οἱ Αἰολεῖς δὲ μόνον τὰ τοιαῦτα διπλασιοῦσιν· ὅπως λέγοντες δὲ ἔνναι, περραμός, Ἀχιλλεύς, κενὸς καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, ὅθε καὶ τὸ κεννότατος, στεννότατος, ξεννότατος, μεταγραφὴ Αἰολικὴ καὶ μετὰ δύο ν ἐκφερόμενα. οἱ δὲ νῦν γραμματικοὶ μεθ' ἑνὸς ταῦτα ν γράφοντες ψυχροὺς τοὺς κανόνας ἀποδιδόασιν. Tzetzes returns to the same problem below, 40,11 ff., esp. 15. Read: οἱ Αἰολεῖς δὲ μόνον τὰ τοιαῦτα διπλασιοῦσιν, ὅπ<π>ως λέγοντες [δὲ] <καὶ> ἔννη, περραμός, Ἀχιλλεύς, κεν<ν>ός καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, ὅθε<ν> καὶ τὸ κεννότατος, στεννότατος, ξεννότατος, μεταγραφὴ Αἰολικὴ (l. μεταγραφῇ Αἰολικῇ) καὶ μετὰ δύο ν ἐκφερόμενα κτλ. For the 'κανόνες', cf. Greg. Cor. *Dial.* p. 610 S.; *Etym. M.* 582,44 ff.; Tzetzes' Scholia in *Anecd. Oxon.* Cramer 3,356,18. A different opinion is stated by Choerob. in *Anecd. Oxon.* Cramer 2,242; cf. Hdn. *Gramm. Gr.* III ii 302. See further Schwyzler I 683,4. Ἔννη (adduced also by Greg. Cor. and *Etym. M.* 582,49) is thought to represent the name of the city on Sicily by Greg. Cor. The *Etym. M.* derives it correctly from νῶ = νήθω. It is the imperfect (3 sing.) of νῶ 'to spin' (stem νη-). The *Etym. M.* mentions Herodian as the author of this view<sup>10</sup>). For

9) On the strength of *ibid.* 489,1 f. maybe καθαρά should be emended to βαρύνοντα.

10) Prof. Ruijgh points out that ἔ-ννη (-νν- < -sn-) need not be specifically Aeolic, cf. Ion.-Att. ἔ-ρρεον (-ρρ- < -sr-).

πέρραμος (= βασιλεύς Hsch. or Aeol. for Πρίαμος), see *Etym. M.* 665,39.

27,16 ff. (A 140) μεταφρασόμεθα· μεταβουλευσόμεθα Αἰολικῶς, ἀπὸ τοῦ φρήν, φρενός· οἱ γὰρ Αἰολεῖς ἀντὶ τοῦ εα λέγουσι φράνας τὰς φρένας· λέγοντες δὲ τὸ φρασόμεθα μετὰ τοῦ σθ ἀρχαῖσμός ἐστιν. Here the ed. has unnecessarily complicated matters by inverting the MS order τὸ δὲ to δὲ τό in the last line and by punctuating between φρένας and λέγοντες. Read: μεταφρασόμε<σ>θα· μεταβουλευσόμεθα Αἰολικῶς, ἀπὸ τοῦ φρήν, φρενός· οἱ γὰρ Αἰολεῖς ἀντὶ τοῦ ε α λέγουσι, φράνας τὰς φρένας λέγοντες. τὸ δὲ φρασόμε<σ>θα μετὰ τοῦ σθ ἀρχαῖσμός ἐστιν. For the Aeolic change of ε into α, cf. 41,20 f. Αἰολικῶς ... τροπῇ τοῦ ε εἰς α. Maybe this canon was meant to cover the archaic dative plural φρασί for φρεσί. This dative occurs e.g. in Pindar. But he is no model of Aeolic for ancient grammarians. In principle both dative φρασί and accusative φράνας are theoretically possible for Aeolic, although the accusative form is completely unattested<sup>11</sup>). I have not found the example φράνας-φρένας elsewhere.

27,28 f. (A 141 on the etymology νῦν < νέον): οἱ Αἰολεῖς καὶ Δωριεῖς τὸ ο υ λέγουσιν· ὀνυμάζει τὸ ὀνομάζει: Iakov 1984, 181 wrongly reads ὀνομάζειν for ὀνυμάζει, thus obscuring the point of the example which is meant precisely to illustrate the Aeolic use of υ instead of ο. Besides, the correct Aeolic form would be ὀνυμάσσαι, Doric ὀνυμάξαι. Since corruption of ξ to ζ is easier, I propose ὀνυμάζει τὸ ὀνομάσαι. Cf. Greg. Cor. *Dial.* 584 S.

31,25 f. (A 151 s.v. ἀνδράσιν; a note on the five meanings of ἀνὴρ): τὸν τῇ φύσει ἄνδρα, πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν γυναικὸς τὸν σύζυγον· (follow three more meanings). Punctuate: τὸν τῇ φύσει ἄνδρα πρὸς ἀντιδ. γυναικός· τὸν σύζυγον. Cf. *Etym. M.* 107,39 (Iakov 1985, 69).

40,11 ff. (A 186; once more on the Aeolic habit of doubling consonants, cf. ad 23,6 ff.): ὅσπον· Αἰολικόν· οἱ γὰρ Αἰολεῖς διπλασιάζουσι τὰ σύμφωνα ... οἶον ... ἔλλαβεν ... ὅσπον ... ξέννος, στέννος ... ὅθεν καὶ τὸ στεννότατος καὶ ξεννότατος καὶ κεννότατος Αἰολικῶς μικρὸν γράφεται, κοινῶς δὲ καὶ Ἀττικῶς μεθ' ἑνὸς νη μεγάλου γράφεται· καὶ νῦν πάντες

11) Φρασί is, of course, the 'regular' form. The gen. plur. must originally have been \*φρανῶν (< \*p<sup>h</sup>rn-ōm, cf. \*φραν- in forms like εὐφραίνω < \*-φραν-γω). For zero phase in acc. plur., cf. \*τρίνς (with τρέ(γ)-ες, τριῶν, τρισί). P.c. from Prof. Ruijgh.

πλὴν ἐμοῦ τῇ μωριᾷ (1. μωρᾷ) συνηθεία ὑποπεπτῶκασι. Read: ... μεθ' ἐνὸς ν (or: νυ) μέγα[λου] γράφεται. Tzetzes points out that either one spells with one *ny* and *omega*, or with double *ny* and *omikron*. Implicitly he rejects the *canones* provided by Choeroboscus (*Gramm. Gr.* IV ii 76) which are here identified with the μωρὰ συνήθεια. Choeroboscus considered *κενότερος* and *στενότερος* exceptions to the rule requiring -ότερος after a short syllable. He explains this exception by giving as original forms *κεινός* and *στεινός*. Cf. *Etym. M.* 275,50 (where see also the annotations for Moschopoulos' defense of -ότατος). Tzetzes apparently finds fault with the spelling *κενότατος* and takes *κενώτατος* to be the correct form. He adds, though not very explicitly, that the form in -ότατος fits Aeolic only, because there the double consonants invalidate the basic rule. Of course, *o* and *ω* were pronounced the same way in Tzetzes' day.

44,5 f. (A 194; on the allegorical interpretations of the goddess Athena and her epithets. Athena is explained as an allegorical symbol for the thick air (ἄηρ) close to the earth, and for the moon (σελήνη), 44,1-2; Tzetzes then proceeds to explain her epithet *παρθένος*: *παρθένος δὲ λέγεται, ὡ μὴ φθειρόμενη (sic) μήτε ὁ ἄηρ μήτε ἡ σελήνη*: Read: ὡς μὴ φθειρόμενοι κτλ.

45,29 ff. Another highly allegorical passage: Tzetzes is explaining A 194-5, where Athena is sent down by Hera to calm Achilles. White-armed Hera stands for Achilles' soul, envisaging pure ('white') action. Athena stands for Achilles' rational capacities. Thus, what happens is that Achilles' pure soul stimulates his rational capacities (λογιστικόν) to stop his anger: ἡ γοῦν ψυχὴ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως ... ἀρίστην καὶ λευκὴν πράξιν ὑποθεμένη τὸ παῦσαι αὐτὸν τῆς ὀργῆς <διὰ *addidi*> τῆς ἐκείνου φρονήσεως τοῦτο πεποίηκε. For the addition, cf. 45,26 ff.: τὸ λογιστικὸν αὐτῆς καὶ τὴν φρόνησιν ἐκίνησεν παραπεῖσαι αὐτὸν παυθῆναι τῆς ὀργῆς.

47,5 f. (A 197 ξανθῆς δὲ κόμης ἔλε Πηλεΐωνα) οἱ γὰρ ξανθοκόμοι (ξανθοκόμοι Iakov 1985, 44) ὀξύχοιοι, ὡς ὑπερυπτυμένον (1. ὑπερωπτημένον I.S.) ἔχοντες τὸ αἷμα καὶ τὴν χολήν. Cf. for the concept of ὑπερωπτημένη χολή (from ὑπεροπτάω, 'overheat') Gal. *Nat. Fac.* 16, 512 Kühn. See further Iakov 1984, 161 *a.l.*

47,22 ff. (A 198 οἷω φαινόμενη. Tzetzes reports that according to some only Achilles and Socrates had visions of their particular δαίμονες. He says that what Socrates calls his δαιμόνιον is in fact a

manifestation of the prognostic faculty of his own soul): κατὰ γὰρ τὸν Πορφύριον ὁ κατὰ τὰς πολιτικὰς καὶ πρακτικὰς ἀρετὰς ἐνεργῶν σπουδαίως καλεῖται· ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὰς ψυχικὰς, ἥτοι καθαιρούσας ψυχὴν, δαιμόνιος καὶ δαίμων [sic] ἀγαθός· ὁ δὲ τὴν νοερὰν τῆς ψυχῆς ἔχων ἐνέργειαν, θεός· ὁ δὲ τὰς ἐν τῷ μόνῳ ὑπερτερούσας τῶν ψυχικῶν, πατήρ. Tzetzes refers to Porphyry's *Sententiae ad intelligibilia ducentes* 32,90 ff. (ed. E. Lamberz); a quick comparison eliminates most of the problems of our passage. Porphyry's text runs: διὸ καὶ ὁ μὲν κατὰ τὰς πρακτικὰς (sc. ἀρετὰς) ἐνεργῶν σπουδαῖος ἦν ἄνθρωπος, ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὰς καθαρτικὰς δαιμόνιος ἄνθρωπος ἦ καὶ δαίμων ἀγαθός, ὁ δὲ κατὰ μόνας τὰς πρὸς τὸν νοῦν θεός, ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὰς παραδειγματικὰς θεῶν πατήρ. Accordingly, emend the Tzetzes-passage as follows: ὁ κατὰ τὰς πολιτικὰς καὶ πρακτικὰς ἀρετὰς ἐνεργῶν σπουδαῖος καλεῖται· ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὰς ψυχικὰς, ἥτοι καθαιρούσας ψυχὴν, δαιμόνιος καὶ δαίμων ἀγαθός· ὁ δὲ τὴν νοερὰν τῆς ψυχῆς ἔχων ἐνέργειαν, θεός· ὁ δὲ <κατὰ<sup>12</sup>> > τὰς ἐν τῷ [μο]νῷ ὑπερτερούσας τῶν ψυχικῶν, <θεῶν> πατήρ. Cf. for the last part of the sentence Porph. *ibid.* 32,63 ff.: Τέταρτον δὲ εἶδος ἀρετῶν τὸ τῶν παραδειγματικῶν, αἵπερ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ νῷ, κρείττους οὔσαι τῶν ψυχικῶν καὶ τούτων παραδείγματα, ὧν αἱ τῆς ψυχῆς ἦσαν ὁμοιώματα. Porphyry is here describing the two pairs of virtues, the highest belonging to the νοῦς, the lower ones to the ψυχή. Tzetzes has taken over ἐν τῷ νῷ, while glossing κρείττους οὔσαι with the synonymous ὑπερτερούσας. It is possible that we should also supply μόνῃ before τὴν νοερὰν τῆς ψυχῆς ... ἐνέργειαν on the strength of Porphyry's κατὰ μόνας τὰς πρὸς τὸν νοῦν, in the first passage quoted. One can easily imagine that this word, once it had dropped out, got inserted in the wrong place (namely after τῷ νῷ); afterwards, ἐν τῷ νῷ μόνῳ was changed into ἐν τῷ μόνῳ by haplography. See on this passage also Iakov 1984, 161.

**48,26 f.** (A 200) Etymologies are provided for Athena's second name, 'Pallas': It is suggested that this name derives from πάλλω. Athena 'brandishes', or 'shakes' the heart of Dionysus, after he was torn into pieces by the Titans, and she brings it to Zeus: τὴν καρδίαν

12 The change of construction complicates matters somewhat. Tzetzes may either have returned to the construction of 47,23 ff. (ὁ κατὰ x ἐνεργῶν y καλεῖται), or we should mentally supply ὁ δὲ τὰς ἐν τῷ νῷ <sc. ἐνεργείας (or, preferably, ἀρετὰς) ἔχων>.

τοῦ Διονύσου παλλομένην κινητὴν (l. κινεῖ τὴν I.S.) καὶ κινουῶσαν τῶν πινόντων τὰς ψυχάς. Subject of κινεῖ is Athena.

49,23 ff. (A 201) ἔπεα πτερόεντα· διὰ τὸ πλῆξιν ἀέρος εἶναι τὴν φωνήν, καὶ τοὺς λόγους πτερόεντας αὐτοὺς κατωνόμασεν· ὃν γὰρ τρόπον τέμνει τὸν ἀέρα, τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ λόγοι. ἢ διὰ τὸ δίκην πτεροῦ πανταχοῦ περιίπτασθαι τὰς γραφάς καὶ τοὺς λόγους μᾶλλον δὲ τοὺς ἀπλῶς λόγους καὶ κρείττω πτεροῦ. ἰδοὺ γάρ φημι τυχὸν ἀπελεύσομαι νῦν ἐν Αἰθιοπίᾳ· ὁ μὲν λόγος ἰδοὺ ὑπερεπέτασε τὰ πτερὰ καὶ πρὸς Αἰθιοπίαν περιπολεῖ, πολλαῖς δὲ ἡμέραις καὶ τὰ ταχύτατα πτερωτὰ μόλις εἰς Αἰθιοπίαν ἀφίκοντο. Something went wrong with the punctuation and some of the constituents seem to have been interchanged. I propose: ἔπεα πτερόεντα· διὰ ... τὴν φωνήν, καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοὺς πτερόεντας κατωνόμασεν<sup>13</sup>). ὃν γὰρ ... τοὺς λόγους· μᾶλλον δέ <φημι> τοὺς ἀπλοῦς λόγους καὶ κρείττω πτεροῦ· (simple words are even better things than wings:) ἰδοὺ γάρ φημι τυχὸν ἀπελεύσομαι νῦν πρὸς Αἰθιοπίαν. ὁ μὲν λόγος ἰδοὺ ὑπερεπέτασε τὰ πτερὰ καὶ ἐν Αἰθιοπίᾳ περιπολεῖ, κτλ. Notice that τοὺς ἀπλοῦς λόγους forms one half of a double opposition. On the one hand 'simple words' are better than γραφαί, on the other they surpass even physical wings in 'wingedness' and agility. The general idea is that λόγος, as the verbal expression of a mental process, can find instantaneous, if imaginary, fulfilment. The λόγος spreads its wings and is wherever it likes immediately. The passage is reminiscent of Hom. *Il.* O 80 ff.: ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἀΐξῃ νόος ἀνέρος, ὅς τ' ἐπὶ πολλὴν / γαῖαν ἐληλουθὼς φρεσὶ πευκαλίμῃσι νοήσῃ / ἔνθ' εἶην ἢ ἐνθα', μενοινήσῃ τε πολλά, / ὥς κραιπνῶς μεμαυῖα διέπτατο πότνια Ἥρη<sup>14</sup>). See Leaf *a.l.* for references.

54,9 ff. (A 216-9) See the separate note in this same volume ('Tzetzes on a Mini-Thesis ...').

58,11 ff. (A 227; on the meaning of λόχον): πᾶς γὰρ τακτικὸς συγγραφεὺς καὶ ἐτέρας τέχνης λογικῆς, ἢ ἀλόγου συγγεγραφῶς συγγράμματα ἐξ Ὀμήρου ἀπαρυσάμενος ἔγραφε. καὶ περ μικρόν τι παρηύξησεν οὕτω γοῦν Ὀμηρος εἰδῶς, οὐκ εἶπεν λόχον τὴν ἐνέδραν.

13. Alternatively, delete the comma after φωνήν and put one after λόγους instead. However, this somewhat disturbs the comparison between φωνή and λόγοι that is worked out in the next sentence.

14) I owe this reference to Prof. Ruijgh.

Read with changed punctuation: πᾶς γὰρ τακτικὸς συγγραφεὺς καὶ ἐτέρας τέχνης λογικῆς ἢ ἀλόγου συγγεγραφῶς συγγράμματα ἐξ Ὀμήρου ἀπαρυσάμενος ἔγραφε, καὶ περ μικρόν τι παρηύξησεν. οὕτω γοῦν Ὀμηρος εἰδὼς οὐκ εἶπεν λόχον τὴν ἐνέδραν. Homer is looked upon as the encyclopedic source of all knowledge here, just as in the tract *de vita et poesi Homeri II*, by pseudo-Plutarch (where § 192 ff. deal with Homer's strategic knowledge). Our passage means: 'For every writer on strategy and every composer of treatises on any other rational or irrational art wrote them taking his cue from Homer, even if he amplified things a bit. Therefore, since Homer was knowledgeable on the subject, he did not use λόχος to indicate an ambush'.

58,25 ff. (On A 226-7, Achilles reproaching Agamemnon with his cowardly behaviour): εἰπὼν γὰρ ὅτι οὐδέποτε πολεμῶν καὶ σφάττων τοὺς ἐναντίους ἐφάνης. ἔτι αὐξητικώτερον ἐπάγει λέγων· καὶ τί φημι ὅτι οὐδέποτε πολέμῳ προσεπλάχης τοῖς ἀνθεστῶσιν, οὐδ' εἰς λόχον ἀπλῶς καὶ σύνταξιν ἔστιν πολέμου, ὅπου οἱ ἄριστοι ἄλλως εἰπεῖν ἐγγωνιάζεις καὶ κρύπτεις μὴδὲ πολέμου πρόσωπον βλέπων. Tzetzes is paraphrasing Achilles' meaning. Here, too, the punctuation is misleading; read: εἰπὼν γὰρ ὅτι "οὐδέποτε πολεμῶν καὶ σφάττων τοὺς ἐναντίους ἐφάνης", ἔτι αὐξητικώτερον ἐπάγει λέγων· "καὶ τί φημι ὅτι οὐδέποτε πολέμῳ προσεπλάχης τοῖς ἀνθεστῶσιν; οὐδ' εἰς λόχον ἀπλῶς καὶ σύνταξιν ἔστιν (I. εἰ (or εἰς) ('you go') τὴν) πολέμου, ὅπου οἱ ἄριστοι· ἄλλως εἰπεῖν, ἐγγωνιάζεις ('you hide in a corner') καὶ κρύπτεις (*fort.* κρύπτει) μὴδὲ πολέμου πρόσωπον βλέπων." Achilles corrects himself: 'Why am I saying that you do not fight? You do not even take the trouble of going to your post in the order of battle!'

61,2 ff. (A 233 ἐπί): κοινὴ συλλαβή, ὥς πολλάκις εἶπον· οὐκέτι δὲ καὶ περὶ αὐτῆς ἐρῶ. προσεκτέον δὲ ἢ ταῖς ἀνωθεν τῶν βραχειῶν κειμέναις μακραῖς, ἢ ταῖς ἀνωθεν τῶν μακρῶν κειμέναις βραχείαις. καὶ οὕτω διακριτέον αὐτάς, ἵνα μὴ καὶ περὶ τούτων εἰκῇ χέωμεν λόγους. From this note it appears that Tzetzes indicated irregular syllable-lengths in the small blocks of text preceding the notes, and possibly in the lemmata too. Ed. has not done this (e.g. in 59,16, to which the note on 61,2 ff. refers).

62,26 (A 243) θυμὸν ἀμύξεις· δάκης καὶ ξέσεις τὴν ψυχὴν. For δάκης one would expect a 2 sing. indicative, preferably future tense in view of the coordination with ξέσεις. This might be a case of the

aorist subjunctive being used instead of a future, cf. S.B. Psaltes, *Grammatik der Byzantinischen Chroniken* (Göttingen 1974), 217 f. In that case read δάκησι. Otherwise, the easiest emendation seems ind. fut. pass. 2 sing. δακήσει (a late Greek equivalent for Attic δηχθήσει), cf. Aretae. 60 (Ed. Oxon. (= SD 2.2)) (see W. Veitch, *Greek Verbs irregular and defective* (Oxford 1879), 163). However, this has the disadvantage of creating a slight zeugma, since τὴν ψυχὴν then has a different syntactic function with each of the two verb-forms (for δακήσει τὴν ψυχὴν, one may compare Arist. *Ach.* 1: ὅσα δὴ δέδηγμαι τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ καρδίαν).

64,25 ff. (Analysing the praise of Nestor, A 247 ff., esp. 250-2; according to Pindar, the highest praise is to say that someone is (or was) king): οὗτος δὲ (sc. Homer) οὐ μέχρι τῆς κορυφῆς τῶν ἐπαίνων, ἦν φησι Πίνδαρος, τῆς βασιλείας κορυφώσας τὸν ἔπαινόν ἐστι, ἀλλὰ βιάζει τὸν ἔπαινον προβαίνων μέχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λεληθότος (l. λεληθότως) διὰ τοῦ λέγειν, ὅτι τριγέρων ὧν ὁ βασιλεύς, ἢ τρισσάκις τοῦτο δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγεγόνει πάντως, εἰ μὴ διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀρετὴν. Homer does not stop short at the highest praise, but he goes one better: he says that Nestor μετὰ ... τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσει (A 252). Read: ... διὰ τοῦ λέγειν, ὅτι τριγέρων [ὧν] ὁ βασιλεύς, ἢ τρισσάκις τοῦτο δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγεγόνει πάντως, κτλ. Tzetzes paraphrases A 250-2 by means of the locution τριγέρων ... ὁ βασιλεύς, τριγέρων functioning as predicate: Nestor ruled over two generations and is now king of the third. Therefore, his kingship is threefold (τρισσάκις). Since this interpretation involves a somewhat novel use of τριγέρων, an alternative emendation could be ... διὰ τοῦ λέγειν, ὅτι τριῶν γενεῶν ὁ βασιλεύς, ἢ τρισσάκις κτλ.

65,1 Κέπων l. κέπων. A κέπων is a kind of bird and metaphorically a 'feather-brained fellow' (LSJ s.v.), cf. Aristoph. *Pax* 1067; *Plut.* 913 with the Scholia a.l.; Hesych. s.v. κέπων; *Etyim. M.* s.v. 504,1 f.; Suda I 3,96 ff. (Adler) s.v.

65,20 ff. (A 251; the context is A 250-2: τῷ δ' ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων / ἐφθίαθ', οἳ οἱ πρόσθεν ἅμα τράφεν ἢ δ' ἐγένοντο / ἐν Πύλῳ ἡγαθέη, μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσει): πρόσθεν ἅμα· τὸ ἅμα ἰσοχρονίαν δηλοῖ· τὸ δὲ πρόσθε, προχρονιώτατον. πῶς οὖν οὕτως εἶπεν ὁ Ὅμηρος τὸ πρόσθεν, ἐπὶ Νέστορος δεῖ νοεῖν· οἶον· οἱ πρόσθε τοῦ Νέστορος· τὸ δ' ἅμα, πρὸς ἀλλήλους τοὺς τοῦ Νέστορος προγενεστέρους. Read with changed punctuation: ...τὸ ἅμα ἰσοχρονίαν δηλοῖ· τὸ δὲ

πρόσθε, προχρονίαν (*fort.* προχρονότητα *vel* προχρονιότητα, Prof. S. R. Slings, p.c.). πῶς οὖν οὕτως εἶπεν Ὀμηρος; τὸ πρόσθεν (A 251) ἐπὶ Νέστορος δεῖ νοεῖν κτλ. The occurrence of two temporal adverbs with incompatible meanings in the same sentence calls for some elucidation. Therefore, Tzetzēs discusses the *differentia* between the two. He connects πρόσθεν with οἱ: Homer is talking about people who were born and grew up *before* Nestor. Ἄμα is taken to refer to the mutual relationship of those people (leaving Nestor out of account): they were contemporaries of each other. Nowadays we would, of course, rather connect οἱ ... ἄμα and separate πρόσθεν: 'Two generations of mortal men had he ere now seen pass away, who *of old* (πρόσθεν) had been born and reared *with him* (οἱ ... ἄμα)' (tr. Murray).

66,7 ff. (A 253) ὅς φιν (l. ὅ σφιν): προκατασκευάσας καὶ προεχθέμενος καὶ προχαρακτήρισας τὸν Νέστορα καὶ προσεκτικωτέρους <ποιήσας *addidi*> τοὺς ἀκροατὰς εἰς τὴν περὶ τούτου ἀκρόασιν, ... φησὶν κτλ.

67,28 ff. (A 258) βουλῇ· περὶ μὲν βουλῇ περίεστε καὶ ὑπερυπάρχεται τῶν Δαναῶν ἐν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ ἐν τῷ μάχεσθαι. The lemma commented upon is not βουλῇ, but περὶ μὲν βουλῇ. The Scholia *a.l.* (Erbse) note that περί either stands for ὑπέρ or that one should take περί ... ἐστε together. Read: [βουλῇ] περὶ μὲν βουλῇ· περίεστε καὶ ὑπεράρχετε (*vel* ὑπερέχετε) τῶν Δ. κτλ. For the emendation ὑπερέχετε, cf. the Scholia *a.l.* in *Anecd. Gr.* Matranga 413,22.

69,6 ff. (A 260) ἡέ περ ἡμῖν· τοῦ ἡμῖν τὸ ἡ δεῖν (l. δεῖ, Iakov 1985, 49) γράφειν, καὶ πάντες τοῦτο (l. τὸ ὑ τὸ I.S.) φιλὸν γράφωσι. δεῖ γὰρ νοεῖν καὶ τὸν Νέστορα συμπεριλαμβανόμενον κατὰ τρόπον μεθόδου δεινότητος, ἵνα μὴ ἀλαζῶν καὶ ἄφρων νομισθεῖται, εἰ ὅμιν κεῖται τῇ γραφῇ μετὰ φιλοῦ τοῦ υ· δείκνυσι γὰρ οὕτω Ἀγαμέμνωνος καὶ Ἀχιλλέως (l. Ἀχιλλέως) κρείττονας τοὺς περὶ Πειρίθουν, οὐ μὴν δ' ἄρα καὶ ἑαυτοῦ (l. ἑαυτόν I.S.) ὅπερ Θεορσίτης (l. -η Iakov 1984, 181) μᾶλλον ἀρμόδιον ἢ περ τῷ Νέστορι κτλ. Reading ἡμῖν is to include Nestor with the heroes of Agamemnon's generation. (Of course, υ φιλὸν refers to the name of the letter only). This reading is necessary, because it fits Nestor's rhetorical tactics: He wins his audience by not putting himself above them. This necessitates the further change of ἑαυτοῦ to ἑαυτόν.

70,20-71,3 (On A 264, Καινήα): See Iakov 1984, 169 f. Kaineus

in his arrogance demanded that divine honours be paid to his lance: (70,23 ff.) ὅς δι' ὑπερβολὴν ἀνδρείας τὸ δόρυ αὐτοῦ πήξας ἐν μέσῃ τῇ ἀγορᾷ προσέταξεν αὐτῷ (l. αὐτὸ, Iakov l.c.) <ἐν *addidi*> τοῖς θεοῖς ἀριθμεῖν. Cf. the parallel passage in Eustath. I 158,28 ff. vdV. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὑπερφρονῆσαι. ἀκόντιον γάρ, φασίν, ἐν ἀγορᾷ μέσῃ πήξας εἰς ὀρθὸν θεὸν τοῦτο προσέταξεν ἀριθμεῖν.

72,21 (A 268) ὀρεσχωῖσι· τοῖς ἐν ὄρει κοιμωμένοις ὄθεν προσγραπτέον <τὸ ἰ *addidi*>. Cf. *Etym. M.* 630,11 ff.: ὀρεσχωῖος· ὁ ἐν ὄρεσι διαιτῶμενος. Ἀπὸ τοῦ κείω, τὸ κοιμῶμαι, γίνεται ὀρεσχοῖος· καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν καὶ τροπὴν τοῦ ὁ εἰς ὦ, ὀρεσχωῖος· καὶ μένει τὸ ἰ προσγεγραμμένον. (See further Cramer *Anecd. Ox.* I 304,3 ff.; SchHom. II. A 268b.)

75,26 f. (A 274) ἐντεῦθεν ἡ διήγησις ἀγωνιστικῆ κεφάλαιον γὰρ κτλ. Punctuate between ἀγωνιστικῆ and κεφάλαιον.

78,12 f. (A 286 s.v. μοῖραν): μοῖρα σημαίνει τρία· μερίδα· εἰμαρμένη <v *suppl.* Iakov> καὶ τὸ πρέπον ὡς νοῦ (νῦν *corr.* Iakov). See Iakov 1985, 50. Add the parallel *Etym. M.* 589,21 ff., esp. 589,33.

80,20 ff. (A 303 on (αἷμα) κελαινόν): πῶς ὅτε μὲν κελεινὸν [*sic*], ὅτε δὲ κελαινεφές τὸ αἷμά φησιν, ὅτε μὲν τὴν τοῦ αἵματος χροιάν διαγράφει, κελαινὸν τοῦτό φησιν, ὅτε δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκχύσεως τοῦ αἵματος ἐνεργεῖαν βούλεται δηλοῦν, οἷον λιποθυμία ἢ θάνατον, κελαιφενες [*sic*] τοῦτό φησιν. Read: πῶς ὅτε μὲν κελαινόν, ὅτε δὲ κελαινεφές τὸ αἷμά φησιν; ὅτε μὲν τὴν τοῦ αἵματος χροιάν διαγράφει, κελαινὸν τοῦτό φησιν, ὅτε δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκχύσεως τοῦ αἵματος ἐνεργεῖαν βούλεται δηλοῦν, οἷον λιποθυμίαν (Iakov 1984, 181) ἢ θάνατον, κελαινεφές τοῦτό φησιν.

86,27 f. (A 332 s.v. μιν): ἐμπροσθεν δὲ δηλώσαμεν (l. δ' ἐδηλώσαμεν) τίς ἕκαστος τούτων καὶ ποτε (l. καὶ πότε) δὴ τούτοις χρηστέον.

97,19 ff. This passage concerns Achilles' appeal to Thetis, A 352 ff., and her advice to him. Tzetzes classifies Achilles' speech as belonging to the γένος δικανικόν, even though he admits that Thetis' reply should rather be considered συμβουλευτικόν (97,26-98,2). He then proceeds as follows (98,3 ff.): οὐκ ἔστι δὲ συμβουλευτικοῦ, ἀλλὰ δικανικοῦ, ὥσπερ ἔφημεν· τὴν γὰρ προσωποποιηθεῖσαν μητέρα αὐτοῦ τὸ ὑγρὸν καθιστᾷ δικαστὴν καὶ πολιτικὸν ἐπάγει διήγημα ἥτοι δικανικὸν τὸ ὠχόμεθ' ἐς Θήβην, καὶ τὰ λοιπά (viz. A 366 ff.), καὶ τοῖς ἀσκεπτοτέροις ἱστορικὸν νομισθῇ τὸ διήγημα. κατηγορίας Ἀγαμέμνονος δεξιὸν καὶ

ἀπολογίας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν τῆς κόρης ἀφαίρεσιν καὶ ἀξιοῦν δικαιωθῆναι τῇ κρίσει, ὃ τοῦ δικανικοῦ εἶδους ἐστὶ, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν τῆς ἐκδικάσεως ἡ κρίνουσα μήτηρ συμβουλευεῖ αὐτῷ προτρέπουσα ... μηνιᾶν Ἀχαιοῖς καὶ ἀποτρέπουσα πολεμεῖν. Tzetzes repeats his view that Achilles' speech to Thetis does not belong to the *genus deliberativum* but to the *genus iudiciale*. Its forensic character appears from the accusations it contains, plus the self-defense and the request to pass judgement. The words καὶ τοῖς ἀσχεπτοτέροις ... τὸ διήγημα must be considered a parenthesis. Read with change of punctuation: ... (καὶ τοῖς ἀσχεπτοτέροις ἱστορικὸν νομισθῇ τὸ διήγημα) κατηγορίας Ἀγαμέμνονος δ <ι> ἐξιδὼν κτλ. The participles διεξιδὼν and ἀξιοῦν go with πολιτικὸν ... διήγημα ἥτοι δικανικόν.

99,25 (A 358; Tzetzes is commenting on seagods metonymically representing 'water', and supports his discussion with etymologies): Ποσειδῶν δὲ ἡ διὰ τὸ βάθος παρὰ <τὸ addidi> τοὺς πόδας δεσμεῖν τοῦ βαδίζειν. Τοῦ βαδίζειν functions as a Complement to δεσμεῖν (construed like κωλύειν), cf. KG II 215 c. Cf. *Etym. M.* 684,25 ff., esp. 30 ff. παρὰ τὸ τοὺς πόδας δεῖν, ὃ ἐστὶ δεσμεύειν· σημαίνει γὰρ τὴν θάλασσαν· ἐκεῖσε γὰρ ἀφικόμενοι βαδίζειν οὐ δυνάμεθα. The passage from *Etym. M.* provides parallels for the other etymologies in our lines as well.

101,17 (A 362) τί δὲ πένθος κατὰ φρένας σε ἦτοι τοῦ (l. σου) ἔκετο καὶ ἦλθε. The necessity of the emendation is apparent from the sequel: τὸ δὲ σέ ἀντὶ τοῦ σοῦ (l. σου), ἀντίπτωσίς ἐστιν.

103,26 f. (A 368) υἱες· ἡ εὐθεῖα, ὃ υἱς τοῦ υἱός (l. υἱός) καὶ υἱός (l. υἱός). Cf. Herodian *Gramm. Gr.* III i 409,17 ff.; *Etym. M.* 775,20 ff. (where the forms are spelled with one iota). For the accent of υἱός, cf. Sch.Hom. O 138b; E 266a. An alternative is provided by Sch.Hom. E 216a<sup>2</sup> ὕιος.

106,22 ff. This paragraph is not, strictly speaking, part of the commentary on A 394, although it is printed as such by Lolos. Rather, a new section begins here, recapitulating Tzetzes' views on the allegorical signification of Thetis' parentage (cf. 92,10 ff.): τοῦ μὲν Νηρέως ἦτοι τοῦ ὕδατος παρὰ τῷ νήχῳ· θυγάτηρ ἦτοι μέρος ἡ Θέτις ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνιμώμενον ὕγρὸν καὶ εὐθετοῦν καὶ κοσμοῦν· τοῦ δὲ Χείρωνος φιλοσόφου τοῦ Κενταύρου, λεγομένου διὰ τὸ σὺν ἄλλοις τισὶν ἐφευρεῖν αὐτὴν τὴν ἱππικὴν τὴν μονάμπυκα, θυγάτηρ ἦν Θέτις ἡ μήτηρ Ἀχιλλέως, σοφὴ καὶ αὐτὴ καὶ λεκανόμαντις. The passage offers an allegorical

interpretation of Thetis' embassy to Zeus. The allegorical significance is introduced by ἦτοι. Moreover, there are two different accounts of Thetis' parentage, each of which accounts for part of her (allegorical) essence: If she is said to be a daughter of Nereus, the soothing capacities of her (i.e. water's) damp evaporations are alluded to. And because she is wise and a 'dish-diviner', she is associated with the philosopher Cheiron (who is nicknamed 'Centaur' because he invented horse-riding). Mantic and philosophical qualities are indeed ascribed to Cheiron, see *RE* III 2302-8 (Escher) s.v. Chiron. His knowledge of the future comes out in Eur. *IA* 1064; Hor. *Epod.* 13,11 ff.; Pind. *Pyth.* IX 52 f. He is known as a philosopher e.g. in Plut. *de E apud Delphos* 6. It is not difficult to imagine what being σοφή and having a philosopher for a father have to do with each other. Nor is the relation between Cheiron's and Thetis' mantic capacities problematic in itself. But why is Thetis a λεκανόμαντις? Tzetzes interprets the messages delivered by Thetis as if they were obtained through divination by means of water (λεκανομαντεία belongs to this genus): see 92,24 ff.; 112,23; 113,3; 113,27. For λεκανομαντεία see A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la Divination dans l'Antiquité* (Paris 1879-82 (New York 1975)), I 184 f. (quoting Psellus, *De op. daem.* p. 42); I 199; I 339-40; III 354. Read: τοῦ μὲν Νηρέως ἦτοι τοῦ ὕδατος (παρὰ τῷ (l. τὸ, cf. 99,24) νήχῳ) θυγάτηρ ἦτοι μέρος ἢ Θέτις, ἐπὶ (l. ἐπεὶ) τὸ ἀνιμώμενον ὕγρὸν καὶ εὐθετοῦν (l. εὐθετεῖ) καὶ κοσμοῦν (l. κοσμεῖ)· τοῦ δὲ Χείρωνος φιλοσόφου τοῦ Κενταύρου λεγομένου διὰ τὸ σὺν ἄλλοις τισὶν ἐφευρεῖν αὐτὴν (l. αὐτόν) τὴν ἵπικὴν μονάμπυχα θυγάτηρ ἦν Θέτις κτλ.

109,22 ff. (On A 407; however, ταῦτα refers to Achilles' version of the story of how Thetis had helped Zeus, A 397-406): ταῦτα μὲν, ὡς ἐν συντάξει ἐρρέθησαν καὶ ἴσως καὶ ἀσαφέστερα, δοκεῖ λεκτέον δὲ καὶ σαφέστερον. Read with changed punctuation: ταῦτα μὲν ὡς ἐν συντάξει ἐρρέθησαν καὶ ἴσως καὶ ἀσαφέστερα δοκεῖ· λεκτέον δὲ καὶ σαφέστερον· (follows the promised explanation). Ὡς ἐν συντάξει must mean something like 'embedded in a (densely) composed story' here.

128,3 ff. (A 469) ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο· ἐξέβαλον τὸν ἔρωτα τοῦ ἐσθίειν ἤγουν ἐχορέσθησαν. τὸ δὲ ὑπερβατόν Ἰωνικόν, ὡς τὸ ἔρον, τὸ ρον μικρόν Ἰωνικῶς καὶ Αἰολικῶς μόνον. In my opinion two different remarks are merged here (see above, ad 21,17 ff.). The first one explains the

so-called tmesis ἐξ ... ἔντο. The second comments on the form ἔρον. In e.g. 12,15 (ἀπό πατρί φιλῶ δόμεναι), too, Tzetzes uses the name ὑπερβατόν for the tmesis-phenomenon; and there, too, it is associated with Ionic; cf. 51,24; 86,1. Accordingly, we have to assume that an example has dropped out after ὡς τὸ ... Read: ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο· ἐξέβαλον τὸν ἔρωτα τοῦ ἐσθίειν ἡγουν ἐκορέσθησαν. τὸ δὲ ὑπερβατόν Ἰωνικόν, ὡς τὸ \*\*\*

ἔρον· τὸ ρον μικρόν Ἰωνικῶς καὶ Αἰολικῶς μόνον. Tzetzes refers to ἔρον as opposed to Attic ἔρωσ with omega (plus their respective declensions). See further Iakov 1985, 63 who offers a different solution (he deletes ὡς and changes τό into τοῦ).

131,4 ff. Interesting for the sarcastic criticism directed against the famous grammarian Herodian. Herodian had deduced from A 483 that κέλευθος must necessarily refer to a journey by sea. For in this verse, the qualification ὑγράν is omitted. Tzetzes proceeds as follows (131,8 ff.): ἀλλ', ὦ σοφώτατε Ἡρωδιανέ, οὐχὶ πρὸς δρυς "Ομηρος γεγραφώς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, "ὑγρά κέλευθα" φάμενος κατ' ἀρχὰς καὶ ὥσπερ συγγνώμην αἰτήσας καὶ δείξας ὅτι κατεχρήσατο τούτῳ, ἡρκέσθη καὶ οὐ πάλιν τίθησι τὸ ὑγράν, γινώσκων ὅτι ἐπέγνωσται τοῦτο εἶναι τοῖς πᾶσι κατάχρησις, καὶν Ἡρωδιανὸς μὴ προσχῶν (l. προσσχῶν) ἀντίκειται σοβαρῶς. For a similar case of criticism against the grammarians, cf. 128,8. For κέλευθος, cf. Schol. Hom. M 262b; *Elym. M.* 502,21 ff. The opinion ascribed to Herodian is neither in the Scholia, nor in *Gramm. Gr.* III i/ii.

132,4 ff. (A 490) πωλέσχετο· ἀνεστρέφετο· "Ομηρος <ὦ add. Lolos> μέγα οὐκ ἐγίνωσκε· μικρὰ δὲ εἶναι γράφων "Ομηρος τὰ πάντα τιθείς, ἐν ὅσπερ ἔχρησεν σημείον μακρᾶς, καὶ τὸ πολέσχετο δὲ μικρόν "Ομηρος, ὡς καὶ νῦν Ἴωνες γράφουσιν· ἐκτείνεται δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ λ, Ἀττικῶς δὲ μέγα τοῦτο γράφεται, ὅπως οἱ νῦν γραμματικοὶ Ὀμήρῳ μὲν καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς μετρικοῖς μέγα τοῦτο προσνειμάντες ἐν τοῖς σκεδικοῖς, τοῦτο μικρόν γράφουσιν, οὐ μᾶλλον ἀρμόζει μηκύνεσθαι κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τὸν λέγοντα· τὰ ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων ῥημάτων τραπέντα εἰς περισπώμενα μεγάλα γράφουσιν· οἷον· νέμω, νωμῶ ... πέλω, πωλῶ ... κτλ. Tzetzes points out that since Homer did not distinguish ο and ω in writing, he always wrote ο and added a macron where necessary. Thus, he wrote πολέσχετο (the lemma should be emended accordingly). The Ionians, too, write πολέσχετο, but in Attic the word is spelled with ω. The second part of Tzetzes' commentary again contains

criticism of the grammarians, whose distribution of *o* and *ω* is completely perverse according to Tzetzes: they spell *ω* when editing Homer, but *o* in their schoolbooks, whereas there of all places *ω* would be in order in view of the explicit *κανών*, prescribing *ω* for contract verbs derived from barytone ones. This criticism resembles the one in 128,6 ff. where the grammarians are reproached with drawing up perverse rules for the distribution of *o* and *ω* in *γέλως/γέλος* and *ἔρως/ἔρος* plus declined forms. Read with changed punctuation: *πολέσκετο· ἀνεστρέφετο· "Ομηρος <ω> μέγα οὐκ ἐγίνωσκε· μικρὰ δὲ εἶναι γράφων "Ομηρος τὰ πάντα, τιθεὶς ἐν οἷσπερ ἔχρῃν σημείον μακρᾶς, καὶ τὸ πολέσκετο [δὲ] μικρὸν "Ομηρος, ὥς καὶ νῦν "Ιωνες γράφουσιν· ἐκτείνεται δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ λ. "Αττικῶς δὲ μέγα τοῦτο γράφεται· [ὅπως] <πῶς οὖν> οἱ νῦν γραμματικοὶ "Ομήρῳ μὲν καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς μετρικοῖς μέγα τοῦτο προσνεύμαντες, ἐν τοῖς σχεδικοῖς (σχεδικοῖς *malim*) τοῦτο μικρὸν γράφουσιν, οὐ μᾶλλον ἀρμόζει μηχανέσθαι κτλ. Cf. Iakov 1985, 64 and 69 (*Etym. M.* 583,4). Other relevant parallels for the spelling of *πολέσκετο*/*πωλέσκετο* are: *Etym. M.* 698,19 ff. (*πολῶ* is synonymous to *συναναστρέφομαι*, *ἐπιφοιτῶ*): 698,22 ff. *Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ πωλῶ διαφορεῖται κατὰ τε γραφὴν καὶ σημαίνον· ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ πιπράσκω διὰ τοῦ Ω μεγάλου· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ κινοῦμαι ἢ περιπατῶ, διὰ τοῦ Ο μικροῦ. In l. 34, the spelling *πωλέσκετο* is used for our passage from *Iliad* A, but it is derived from *πολῶ*. The lengthening of *Ο* to *Ω* is called poetic (l. 38-9). Greg. Cor. *dial.* 271 S.: *ὁμοίως τοῖς "Αττικοῖς καὶ αὐτοῖ* (sc. the Dorians) *τὰ ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων περισπώμενα ἐκτείνουσιν, οἷον στρέφω στρωφῶ, νέμω νωμῶ, τρέχω τρωχῶ, τρέπω τρωπῶ, πέλω πωλῶ ...; Herodian Gr. Gr III i 448,7 f. (πολῶ = ἀναστρέφομαι); Eustath. I 211,4 ff. vdV. πωλῶ = ἀναστρέφομαι. Πωλῶ and πωλέσχω μεγεθύνονται παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ. Cf. ibid. 216,28 ff. For σχεδικοῖς (which is not impossible, though σχεδικοῖς may be preferred), see H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (München 1978), Bnd. II p. 25 f. and n. 20.***

136,8 ff. (A 524) *ὁ δὲ φησιν "Ομηρος, τοῦτο ἐστὶ μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν καὶ σημείον ἡμῖν προδιδάσκει ἐσομένου τε χειμῶνος καὶ τούτου ἐπικρατήσεως καὶ προεπομένου χειμῶνος σημείον τὰς ὀμίχλας ἡμῖν παραδίδωκεν. ἐπικρατήσεως δὲ εἰ μὴ προσγείως, ἀλλ' ἐς πολὺ μετεωρισθῶσιν ἄχρι τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ ἀέρος, οἱ καὶ ἐνταῦθα λέγει γενέσθαι. Tzetzes is dealing with A 524, Zeus' answer to Thetis.*

The actions of the gods are allegorically related to physical (meteorological) phenomena. As Tzetzes has already explained (133,13 ff.), Thetis represents moist vapours (ὀμίχλη; cf. A 359) emanating from the sea and filling ἄήρ (= Zeus). The heavier parts of this fog embrace the lower regions of ἄήρ, i.e. Zeus' knees, while its lighter elements soar up high into the air. Zeus' initial silence represents the uncertainty of the effects the fog will produce. But then a storm breaks out, which will eventually settle down again. In our passage, Tzetzes recapitulates this interpretation. Read with changed punctuation: ὁ (Iakov 1984, 182) δέ φησιν "Ὁμηρος, τοῦτό ἐστι· μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν καὶ σημείον ἡμῖν προδιδάσκει (*fort.* προδίδωσι *vel* παραδίδωσι I.S.) ἐσομένου τε χειμῶνος καὶ τούτου ἐπικρατήσεως· καὶ προεπομένου (l. πρὸ ἐσομένου) χειμῶνος σημείον τὰς ὀμίχλας ἡμῖν παραδέδωκεν, ἐπικρατήσεως δὲ εἰ μὴ προσγείως (l. πρόσγειοι ὦσιν), ἀλλ' ἐς πολὺ μετεωρισθῶσιν ἄχρι τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ ἀέρος, οἱ (l. ὁ) καὶ ἐνταῦθα λέγει γενέσθαι.

140,22 ff. (A 561) δαιμονίη· φαυλοτάτη ... ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ εὐδαιμονεστάτη· ἡ λέξις γὰρ τὸ μέσον (l. τῶν μέσων) ἐστί· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τῶν ἐπῶν ἀναπτυχθείσης παρ' ἡμῶν λεπτῶς τῆς ἐννοίας σαφῆ καὶ < οὐκ *add.* Iakov 1984, 182 > ἀπερινόητα. In view of the correction of ἀτελές to εὐτελές in 15,19 (cf. 15,24) and the similarity of the ligature of εὐ to α, I prefer the emendation σαφῆ καὶ εὐπερινόητα.

143,10 f. (A 571) οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ οὐδεμία τέχνη, ἥτις οὐ{x} (secl. Lolos) πυρὸς τὰ ἐργαλεῖα κέκτηται γενόμενα καὶ χάρται καὶ τὸ μέλαν πυρὶ γίνονται κτλ. Read: οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ οὐδεμία τέχνη, ἥτις οὐκ ἐκ πυρὸς τὰ ἐργαλεῖα κέκτηται γενόμενα· καὶ χάρται καὶ τὸ μέλαν ('paper and ink') πυρὶ γίνονται κτλ.

146,28 πρὸς οἷς τὸ πρότερον εἶπεν αὐτόν, τὸ πᾶν συγκυκᾶν, φυσιολογεῖ καὶ περὶ κτλ. Delete comma after αὐτόν, which is subject of the accusativus cum infinitivo αὐτόν τὸ πᾶν συγκυκᾶν, which explains πρὸς οἷς: 'in addition to what he said before, namely that he (viz. ὁ ἄήρ) puts the whole world into turmoil, he also gives an explanation from natural principles etc.'

147,9 ff. ... τὴν Πανδώραν γυναῖκα, ἥτοι τὴν παντεχνίαν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς εὐρεθεῖσαν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἡδέα καὶ τρυφηλά, ἅπερ μαστεύοντες, ἐπικτήσασθαι ἑαυτοὺς σίνομεν. Delete comma between μαστεύοντες and ἐπικτήσασθαι. Ἐπικτήσασθαι depends on μαστεύοντες.

151,16 ff. (A 601): One of the many passages where Tzetzes

discusses Homer's rhetorical skills and merits: ὄρα μὴ πᾶς ὁ βουλόμενος, ὅπως καὶ τὸ δοκοῦν 'Ομήρῳ, ἀποίητον πεποιημένον ἐστὶ καὶ περιέργον τὸ δοκοῦν ἀπερίεργον καὶ μεμελετημένον τὸ ἀμελέτητον, καὶ ἵνα φαῖκα φάμμος 'Ομήρου γεωργημένη καὶ εὐσταχυς καὶ κατ' αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν βωτιάνειρα. Tzetzes' intention is clear: he comments on Homer's *ars celandi artem*: What seems to be simple in fact conceals a remarkable sophistication. Read with changed punctuation: ὄρα μοι (Iakov 1985, 70) πᾶς ὁ βουλόμενος, ὅπως καὶ τὸ δοκοῦν 'Ομήρῳ ἀποίητον πεποιημένον ἐστὶ καὶ περιέργον τὸ δοκοῦν ἀπερίεργον καὶ μεμελετημένον τὸ ἀμελέτητον ... The last sentence is difficult. If the meaning is parallel to what Tzetzes said before, it must be that what seems to be nothing but bare sand turns out to be fertile soil, once Homer puts his hand to the plough. In fact, this is what Tzetzes proceeds to show in 151,20 ff., the sequel to our passage: Homer wants to expatiate on meteorological phenomena, but he avoids a boring, technical enumeration of facts and instead manages to raise the discussion to a higher, poetic level (151,25 τὸ περιπέζιον ἐξαίρει πρὸς τὸ μετέωρον). I suggest e.g. ... καὶ εἶναι φαίνεται καὶ φάμμος 'Ομήρῳ γεωργημένη καὶ εὐσταχυς καὶ κατ' αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν βωτιάνειρα ('and even sand worked by Homer seems to be rich in corn and—to use his own words—"man-feeding"').

#### Minor corrections:

19,12 κουριοιδίης l. κουριδίης; 31,20 σχετιλιαστικόν l. σχετλιαστικόν; 35,24 ἔφενος l. ἄφενος; 40,20 f. τὸ βέλτερον ἀπὸ τοῦ βάλλειν εὐστόχως δυναμένων τοξοτῶν l. ἀπὸ τῶν βάλλειν κτλ.; 44,12 ὑποτυποτικῶς l. ὑποτυπωτικῶς; 45,21 σύγκρασιν l. σύγκρασιν; 47,21 δαῖμον l. δαῖμον, cf. Pl. *Crat.* 398b6; 49,10 f. μήτε βιβλιόθε τι βλεπόντων καὶ γραφόντων l. μήτε βιβλίον ἔτι βλεπόντων ἢ γραφόντων; 51,23 ὀλέσσαι· ὀλέσση 'Αττικόν. Read: ὀλέσση· ὀλέσση 'Αττικόν; 53,3 πρεπῶδη l. πρεπῶδει; 53,5 πράττε l. πράττει; 53,10 μέμφασται l. μέμφασθαι; 58,9 πολλοὶ l. πολλῶ (see further Iakov 1984, 163); 60,23 τριχῶν l. τριῶν; 63,3 ληπηθήση l. λυπηθήση; 65,12 ἐπάγοντι l. ἐπάγουσι, see further Iakov 1985, 48; 67,8 ἡμῶν l. ὑμῶν; 73,9 οἱ l. οἷ; 75,8 κατατομήσαντες l. κατατολμήσαντες; 88,5 μετὰ τοῦ νῖ (l. ν̄ or νυ). See Iakov 1985, 55; 92,7 ποιόττει l. ποιότησι; 93,25 ὥπερ μοι (l. μὴ) ἐξ 'Ομήρου αὐτός τε καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ταῦτα ἀπαρυσάμενος; 96,2 ἐξετάσαι l. ἐξετάσας; 96,4 ὑποδεικνύς l. ὑποδεικνύναι; 96,9 μήχυτα l. μύχχτα;

96,12 ἡντιβολιχότι l. ἡντιβοληχότι; 97,2 συνεκπλεῦσαι μοι l. συνεκπλεύσαιμι. Cf. 113,29; 97,29 ἔμπροσθι l. ἔμπροσθε; 101,8 ὁ l. ὃ; 102,1 γῆ l. γῆ; 102,12 πῶς l. πῶς; 107,11 ὥσπερ l. ὥστε; 107,13 ὑπετόπαξε l. ὑπετόπαζον, 107,16 f. Delete full stop after ἀποτεινόμενος. Read a full stop (or a semi-colon ·) after κομπάζοντας; 107,18 πολλῶ l. πολλῶ; delete comma after βραχυλογήμασι; 107,19 μεγάλων l. μεγάλας; 108,4 πληρώσεις l. πληρώσαις; 110,5-6 δεσμίσας l. δεσμήσας; 110,6 Put a semi-colon after χρυσαῖς; 112,24 ῥητορικῶς l. ῥητορικῶς; 113,5-6 στρατείοις l. στρατείας; 113,27 πάπου l. πάππου; 116,6; 116,7 ὦ μοι l. ὦμοι; 122,19 ff. διηγείται δέ τις ἀπλῶς, ὅταν ἢ πολλὰ ἢ (l. ἤ) τὰ πράγματα ἢ ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν μόνων ἢ τὴν τέρψιν ἢ τὸ ἐνδύναμον ἔχωσιν; 122,23 ff. διηγείται δέ τις ἐνδιασκεύως, ἢ (l. εἰ) πλατύναι θέλει τὴν διήγησιν; 123,1 καὶ τῆς (l. τοῖς) νῦν ῥήτορσιν γνῶριμοι; 125,20 f. Change colon after Ἀντιόχου into comma; change comma after τοξευμάτων into full stop; 126,9 ἀπάσαντο l. ἐπάσαντο; 126,22 ἔστρεφαν: ἔστρεφον Iakov 1985, 62; *malim* ἔστρεφον; 127,17 f. κατευθύνεται l. κατευθύνεσθαι; 128,8 ἔρω l. ἔρος (see Iakov 1985, 63); 128,9 and 128,10 γέλως l. γέλος; 131,21 σφαιροειδῶς l. σφαιροειδοῦς; 131,29 τῆς l. τοῖς; 133,25 διευθεντήσαντος l. διευθετήσαντος; 137,9 f. παρατείνουσιν l. παρατείνει; 140,8 θεοί l. θεῶν; 140,21 πυρωειδεῖς l. πυροειδεῖς; 143,15 σοφαῖς l. σωμαφαῖς ('spongy, porous'), cf. 149,8; 146,7 τοιοῦτος l. τοιοῦτον; 146,9 πολεμιστήρια l. πολεμιστήρια; 146,26 δυνατοτάτῳ l. δυνατότατῳ; 146,29 παρὰ l. περί; 147,2 Σινιντίοις l. Σιντίοις; 148,3 δυνατοτέρῳ l. δυνατότέρῳ; 148,4 ἀρεῖξαι l. ἀρῆξαι; 148,9 θεότατος l. θειότατος; 148,10 φησὶν, ὁπότε γὰρ l. φησὶν· ὁπότε γὰρ; 148,17 ξηρηνόμενοι l. ξηραινόμενοι.