SOME NOTES ON THE EDITION OF TZETZES' ILIAS-EXEGESIS

BY

INEKE SLUITER

In 1981, Anastasios Lolos published Johannes Tzetzes’ notes on *Iliad* A 97-609 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. 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. In the following I will make some additions to the exten-
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 προσέειτε) έειπε· αυξησις ἐστίν τοῦ ε καὶ οὐ διάλυσις. εἰ γὰρ ἦν διάλυσις, ἱώτα ἀν ἐγράφετο τό έειπε (fort. έειπε). Cf. for a similar distinction, this time between πλεονασμός and ἀφαίρεσις, Apoll. Dyscolus Adv., Gramm. Gr. Π i 147,11 f. with the commentary a.l. by Schneider. Tzetzes makes a distinction between αυξησις and διάλυσις. Διάλυσις (dihaeresis) of the diphthong would have yielded trisyllabic έείπε from έειπε. Because Tzetzes reads έειπε, he concludes that the first ε must be an αυξησις. 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 είπεν has no recognizable augment when opposed to subjunctive είπη, for instance), or as a pleonastic addition, the ε duplicating the one contained in the first syllable of είπεν. Apollonius Dyscolus regards the first ε in έ'ειπεν (and in έώρων or έ'ηκεν) as pleonastic, on the ground that the word still begins with a vowel after removal of the ε (as against φή or βή, 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 αυξησις in this context, his argument tells strongly in favour of the interpretation of αυξησις as 'pleonastic addition' in Tzetzes5). And although αυξησις is the normal terminus technicus for augment too, there is no reason why it could not be used in a laxer sense as well6). However, it seems that the whole point of the exact reference of αυξησις 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. Π i 65,25 f. (reporting the position of Trypho): πῶς οὐ χι κατὰ τόν χόνον ἡ ἠμέο καὶ σὲ ἐλλεῖπουσι τῷ ἵ, ἀπὸ τῆς ἠμοῦ καὶ σου αὐξηθεῖσαι. Here, the point is that genitives with a diphthong in dihaeresi are mostly compensated in length (e.g. the dihaeresis of Πράμου yields Πράμοιο rather than *Πράμο). But ἠμέο and ἠμοῦ are equal. Therefore Trypho argued that the original form must have been ἠμείο rather than ἠμέο, because ἠμείο has four χρόνοι whereas ἠμοῦ has only three).

6) V.B. Botas, Diccionario de Terminología gramatical griega (Salamanca 1985), v.v. αυξησις does not mention this possibility.
21,17 ff. (A 117-8: βούλομ’ ἐγώ λαὸν σῶν ἐμμεναι ἡ ἀπολέσθαι:/ αὐτάρ ἐμοι γέρας αὐτίχ’ ἑτοιμάσατ’ κτλ.) ἡ ἀπολέσθαι: παρά ἀπολέσθαι: οὐ γάρ, ὡς τινές φασιν, ἕστι καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπολέσθαι: ὁ αὐτάρ (l. αὐτάρ) καὶ ἀτάρ (l. ἀτάρ) προτάσσονται καὶ υποτάσσονται, καὶ οὐχ, ὡς τινές φασιν, ὁ μὲν αὐτάρ (l. -ἀρ) προτάσσεται, ὁ δὲ ἀτάρ (l. -άρ) υποτάσσεται. The ed. failed to see that two separate lemmata are fused here, the first concerning A 117, the second, starting from ὁ αὐτάρ, A 118). The first remark reflects the discussion about the precise function of ἡ in A 117: Is it an instance of so-called ἡ διασαφητικός, roughly equivalent to μάλλον ἡ? Or do we have to do with ἡ παραδιαζευγτικός? 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 παρά, see LSJ s.v. C I 7: παρά is used here like quam after a comparative in Latin, ‘in comparison with’. Read and punctuate as follows: παρά <τό> ἀπολέσθαι: οὐ γάρ ... ἕστι “καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπολέσθαι” (where καί is meant as a clue to the solution “ἡ παραδιαζευγτικός”). The second remark concerns the protaxis and hypotaxis of αὐτάρ and ἀτάρ. 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 ἢτοι ... ἡ, μέν ... δέ (cf. Apoll. Dyscolus Synt., Gramm. Gr. II ii 437,6 ὁ ἢτοι προτακτικός καὶ οὐδὲποτε υποτακτικός, cf. Coni., Gramm. Gr. II i 220,24 ff.: ἡ and ἡ εἰναι are both προτακτικοί and υποτακτικοί; ὁ δὲ ἢτοι μόνως προτακτικός). Tzetzes alludes to the theory that αὐτάρ is sentence-initial, whereas ἀτάρ 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, αὐτάρ and ἀτάρ 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) ἄλλη: τὰ εἰς ἡ καθαρά ἐπιρρήματα προσγεγραμμένα (l. προσγεγραμμένον I.S.) ἔχει τὸ ἱώτα· πάντη ἄλλη

7) See for a list of similar cases, lakov 1985, 67 ff.
καὶ τὰ ὄμοια πλήν τοῦ, νῆ, νή δὴ καὶ δηλαδή. Read: πλήν τοῦ νῆ, ἢ δὴ καὶ δηλαδή or πλήν τοῦ νῆ, νυνθή καὶ δηλαδή, cf. Herodian, Gramm. Gr. III i 489,6 ff. The use of καθαρά is a bit disturbing here. Normally, τὰ εἰς η 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.9).


9) On the strength of ibid. 489,1 f. maybe καθαρά should be emended to βαρύνοντα.
10) Prof. Ruijgh points out that Ἐ-ννη (-νη-< -σν-) need not be specifically Acolic, cf. Ion.-Att. Ἔ-ρρεον (-ρρ-< -σρ-).
πέρραμος (= βασιλεύς Hsch. or Aeol. for Πρίαμος), see Etym. M. 665,39.

27,16 ff. (A 140) μεταφρασόμεθα· μεταβουλευσόμεθα Αιολικώς, ἀπὸ τοῦ φρήν, φρενός· οἱ γὰρ Αἰολεῖς ἀντὶ τοῦ εα λέγουσι φράνας τὰς φρένας· λέγοντες δὲ τὸ φρασόμεθα μετὰ τοῦ σθ ἄρχασιμός ἔστιν. Here the ed. has unnecessarily complicated matters by inverting the MS order τὸ δὲ τὸ δὲ τὸ in the last line and by punctuating between φρένας and λέγοντες. Read: μεταφράσαμε· μεταβουλευσόμεθα Αιολικώς, ἀπὸ τοῦ φρήν, φρενός· οἱ γὰρ Αἰολεῖς ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐ λέγουσι, φράνας τὰς φρένας λέγοντες. τὸ δὲ φρασόμεθα <σ> θὰ μετὰ τοῦ σθ ἄρχασιμός ἔστιν.

For the Aeolic change of ε into α, cf. 41,20 f. Αἰολικῶς ... τροπή τοῦ ε εἰς α. Maybe this canon was meant to cover the archaic dative plural φρασὶ for φρασὶ. This dative occurs e.g. in Pindar. But he is no model of Aeolic for ancient grammarians. In principle both dative φρασὶ and accusative φράνας are theoretically possible for Aeolic, although the accusative form is completely unattested11). I have not found the example φράνας-φρένας elsewhere.

27,28 f. (A 141 on the etymology νύν < νέον): οἱ Αἰολεῖς καὶ Δωρεῖς τὸ ο ν λέγουσιν νομάζαι τὸ ὄνομάζαι: Iakov 1984, 181 wrongly reads νομάζειν for νομάζαι, thus obscuring the point of the example which is meant precisely to illustrate the Aeolic use of ν instead of ο. Besides, the correct Aeolic form would be ὄνυμάσσαι, Doric ὄνυμαξαι. Since corruption of ξ to ζ is easier, I propose ὄνυμαξαι τὸ ὄνομάσαι. Cf. Greg. Cor. Dial. 584 S.


40,11 ff. (A 186; once more on the Aeolic habit of doubling consonants, cf. ad 23,6 ff.): ὄσσον· Αἰολικῶν· οἱ γὰρ Αἰολεῖς διπλασιάζουσι τὰ σύμφωνα ... οἶον ... ἔλλαβεν ... ὄσσον ... ἔξονος, στένος ... ὅθεν καὶ τὸ στενότατος καὶ ξενότατος καὶ χενότατος Αἰολικῶς μικρὸν γράφεται, κοινῶς δὲ καὶ 'Ἀττικῶς μεθ' ἔνος νη μεγάλου γράφεται· κἂν νῦν πάντες

11) Φρασὶ is, of course, the 'regular' form. The gen. plur. must originally have been *φρανόων (< *φραν-ōm, cf. *φραν- in forms like εὐφραίνω < *φραν-γω). For zero phase in acc. plur., cf. *τρίνης (with τρέ(γ)-ες, τρίων, τρισί). P.c. from Prof. Ruijgh.
πλὴν ἐμοῦ τῇ μωρᾷ (1. μωρᾷ) συνήθεια ύποπεπτώκατι. Read: ... μεθ’ ἐνός ν (or: νυ) μέγα[λον] 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 Chocroboscus (Gramm. Gr. IV ii 76) which are here identified with the μωρὰ συνήθεια. Chocroboscus considered κενότερος and στενότερος exceptions to the rule requiring -ώτερος after a short syllable. He explains this exception by giving as original forms κείνος and στεινός. Cf. Etym. M. 275,50 (where see also the annotations for Moschopulos’ defense of -ώτατος). 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, ο 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 (ἀήρ) close to the earth, and for the moon (σελήνη), 44,1-2; Tzetzes then proceeds to explain her epithet παρθένος): παρθένος δὲ λέγεται, ώ μὴ φθειρόμενη (sic) μήτε ἀήρ μήτε ἡ σελήνη: Read: ώς 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: ἢ γοῦν ψυχῇ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως ... ἀρίστη καὶ λευκήν πράξιν ὑποθεμένη το παύσαι αὐτὸν τῆς ὀργῆς <διὰ addidi> τῆς ἐκείνου φρονήσεως τοῦτο πεποίησε. For the addition, cf. 45,26 ff.: τὸ λογιστικόν αὐτῆς καὶ τὴν φρόνησιν ἐκίνησεν παραπετάσαι αὐτῷ ταύτην τῆς ὀργῆς.


47,22 ff. (A 198 οἶο φαιομένη. Tzetzes reports that according to some only Achilles and Socrates had visions of their particular δαίμονες. He says that what Socrates calls his δαίμονιον is in fact a
manifestation of the prognostic faculty of his own soul): κατά γάρ τὸν Πορφύριον ὁ κατὰ τὰς πολιτικὰς καὶ πρακτικὰς ἀρετὰς ἐνεργῶν σπουδαῖς καλεῖται: ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὰς ψυχικὰς, ἦτοι καθαιροῦσας ψυχῆν, δαιμόνιος καὶ δαίμων [sic] ἀγαθὸς· 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: διό καὶ ὃ μὲν κατὰ τὰς πρακτικὰς (sc. ἀρετὰς) ἐνεργῶν σπουδαῖος ἦν ἀνθρωπος, ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὰς καθαρτικὰς δαιμόνιος ἀνθρωπος ἦ καὶ δαίμων ἀγαθὸς, ὁ δὲ κατὰ μόνας τὰς πρὸς τὸν νοῦν θεός, ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὰς παραδειγματικὰς θεὸν πατήρ. Accordingly, emend the Tzetzes-passage as follows: ὁ κατὰ τὰς πολιτικὰς καὶ πρακτικὰς ἀρετὰς ἐνεργῶν σπουδαίος καλεῖται: ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὰς ψυχικὰς, ἦτοι καθαιροῦσας ψυχῆν, δαιμόνιος καὶ δαίμων ἀγαθὸς· ὁ δὲ τὴν νοερὰν τῆς ψυχῆς ἔχων ἐνέργειαν, θεός· ὁ δὲ τὰς εν τῷ μόνῳ ὑπερτερούσας των ψυχικῶν, <θεὸν> πατήρ. Cf. for the last part of the sentence Porph. ibid. 32,63 ff.: Τέταρτον δὲ εἶδος ἀρετῶν τὸ τῶν παραδειγματικῶν, αὐτὲρ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ νῷ, κρείττους οὕσαι τῶν ψυχικῶν καὶ τούτων παραδείγματα, ὃν οἱ τῆς ψυχῆς ἦσαν ομοιόμοια. Porphyry is here describing the two pairs of virtues, the highest belonging to the νους, the lower ones to the ψυχή. Tzetzes has taken over ἐν τῷ νῷ, while glossing κρείττους οὕσαι with the synonymous ὑπερτερούσας. It is possible that we should also supply μόνην 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 καρδιὰν

12 The change of construction complicates matters somewhat. Tzetzes may either have returned to the construction of 47,23 ff. (ὁ κατὰ τὰς ἐνεργῶν γ καλεῖται), or we should mentally supply ὁ δὲ τὰς ἐν τῷ νῷ <sc. ἐνεργείας (or, preferably, ἀρετὰς) ἔχων>.
τοῦ Διονύσου παλλομένην κινητὴν (1. κινεῖ τὴν Ι.Σ.) καὶ κινοῦσαν τῶν πινόντων τὰς φυχὰς. Subject of κινεῖ is Athena.

49,23 ff. (A 201) ἔπεα πτερόεντα· διὰ τὸ πλῆξιν ἄερος εἶναι τὴν φωνὴν, καὶ τοὺς λόγους πτερόεντας αὐτοὺς κατωνόμασεν· ὅν γὰρ τρόπον τέμνει τὸν ἄερα, τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ λόγοι. ἦ διὰ τὸ δίκην πτεροῦ πανταχοῦ περιπτασθαί τὰς γραφὰς καὶ τοὺς λόγους μᾶλλον δὲ τοὺς ἀπλοὺς λόγους καὶ κρείττω πτεροῦ. ἦν δὲ κάθετη τυχὼν ἀπελεύσομαι νῦν ἐν Ἁθηναίᾳ· ὁ μὲν λόγος ἦν ὑπερεπέτασε τὰ πτερά καὶ πρὸς Ἁθηναίαν περιπολεῖ, πολλαῖς δὲ ἡμέραις καὶ τὰ ταχύτατα πτερωτὰ μόλις εἰς Ἁθηναίαν ἀφίκοντο. Something went wrong with the punctuation and some of the constituents seem to have been interchanged. I propose: ἔπεα πτερόεντα· διὰ ... τὴν φωνὴν, καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοὺς πτερόεντας κατωνόμασεν13). ὅν γὰρ ... τοὺς λόγους· μᾶλλον δὲ <φημὶ> τοὺς ἀπλοὺς λόγους καὶ κρείττω πτεροῦ· (simple words are even better things than wings:) ἦν δὲ κάθετη τυχὼν ἀπελεύσομαι νῦν πρὸς Ἁθηναίαν. ὁ μὲν λόγος ἦν ὑπερεπέτασε τὰ πτερά καὶ ἐν Ἁθηναίᾳ περιπολεῖ, κτλ. Notice that τοὺς ἀπλοὺς λόγους forms one half of a double opposition. On the one hand ‘simple words’ are better then 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. II. Ο 80 ff.: ὃς δ’ ὅτ’ ἀν άίξη νόος ἀνέρος, ὃς τ’ ἐπὶ πολλὴν / γονὶν ἐλποῦσθεν / φρεισὶ πευκαλίμησι νοῆσῃ / ἔνθ’ εἶθ’ ἡ γενίθα, μενοινήσῃ τε πολλά, / ὃς χραιπνῶς μεμαυίη διέπτατο πότνια “Ἠρη14). 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 ἠγραφε. καὶ περὶ μικρόν τι παρηύξησαν οὐτοὶ γοὺς Ὅμηρος εἰδὼς, οὐχ εἰπεν λόχον τὴν ἐνέδραν.

13. Alternatively, delete the comma after φωνὴν and put one after λόγους instead. However, this somewhat disturbs the comparison between φωνὴ and λόγοι that is worked out in the next sentence.
14) I owe this reference to Prof. Ruijgh.
Read with changed punctuation: τὰς γὰρ τακτικὸς συγγραφεύς καὶ ἐτέρας τέχνης λογικῆς ἢ ἅλογου συγγεγραφῶς συγγράμματα ἐξ Ὅμηρου ἀπαρασύμμενος ἔγραφε, κἂν περὶ μικρόν τι παρηξῆσην. οὕτω γοῦν Ὅμηρος εἴδως οὐχ εἶπεν λόχον τὴν ἑνέδραν. 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 Homerus' 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 ἑναντίους ἐφάνης, ἐτι αὐξητικώτερον ἐπάγει λέγων· καὶ τί φημι ὅτι οὐδέποτε πολέμω προσπλάχης τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οὐδέ εἰς λόχον ἀπλῶς καὶ σύνταξιν ἐστίν πολέμου, ὅπου οἳ ἄριστοι ἄλλως εἰπέν ἐγγονιάζεις καὶ κρύπτεις μηδὲ πολέμου πρόσωπον βλέπων. Tzetzes is paraphrasing Achilles' meaning. Here, too, the punctuation is misleading; read: εἰπὼν γὰρ ὅτι 'οὐδέποτε πολεμῶν καὶ σφάττων τοὺς ἑναντίους ἐφάνης', ἐτι αὐξητικώτερον ἐπάγει λέγων· 'καὶ τί φημι ὅτι οὐδέποτε πολέμω προσπλάχης τοῖς ἀνθρώποις; οὐδ' εἰς λόχον ἀπλῶς καὶ σύνταξιν ἐστίν (I. εἰ (or εἰς) ('you go') τὴν πολέμου, ὅπου οἳ ἄριστοι· ἄλλως εἰπέν, ἐγγονιάζεις ('you hide in a corner') καὶ κρύπτεις (fort. κρύπτει) μηδὲ 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, ως πολλάκις εἶπον· οὐ κἀτ' ἔτι καὶ περὶ αὐτῆς ἔρω. προσεκτέον δὲ ἢ ταῖς ἄνωθεν τῶν μαχαίρι θεμέλειας μαχαίρις, ἢ ταῖς ἄνωθεν τῶν μαχρῶν θεμέλειας βραχείος. καὶ οὕτω διακριτέου αὐτάς, ἴνα 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 ψυχήν. 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 δάχυς. 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 ψυχῆν, one may compare Arist. *Ach.* 1: ὅσα δὴ δέδηγμαι τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ 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 κυριεύσεως τῶν ἐπαίνων, ἢν φησὶ Πίνδαρος, τῆς βασιλείας κυριεύσας τὸν ἑπαίνων ἑστι, ἀλλὰ βιάζει τὸν ἑπαίνων προβαίνον μέχρι τοῦ οὕρανοῦ λεληθότος (ἡ λεληθότως) διὰ τοῦ λέγειν, ὧτι τριγέρων ὄν ὁ βασιλεὺς, ἡ τρισσάχης τούτο 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 metὰ ... τριτάτοισιν ἀνασσεν (A 252). Read: ... διὰ τοῦ λέγειν, ὧτι τριγέρων [ὡν] ὁ βασιλεὺς, ἡ τρισσάχης τούτο δ’ οὐκ ἂν ἐγεγόνει πάντως, κτλ. Tzetzes paraphrases A 250-2 by means of the locution τριγέρων ... ὁ βασιλεὺς, τριγέρων functioning as predicate: Nestor ruled over two generations and is now king of the third. Therefore, his kingship is threefold (τρισσάχης). Since this interpretation involves a somewhat novel use of τριγέρων, an alternative emendation could be ... διὰ τοῦ λέγειν, ὧτι τριῶν γενεῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς, ἡ τρισσάχης κτλ.

65,1 Κέπφων 1. κέπφων. Α λέξις 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. κέπφως; Elym. *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’ ἦδη δύο μὲν γενεὰς μερόπων ἀνθρώπων / ἐφθαθ’ οἴ οἱ πρόσθεν ἀμα τράφεν ἢδ’ ἐγένοντο / ἐν Πύλῳ ἡγαθέῃ, μετά δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἀνασεν): πρόσθεν ἀμα· τό ἀμα ἰσοχρονίαν δηλοι· τῷ δὲ πρόσθε, προχρονιώτατον. πῶς οὖν οὕτως εἴπεν ὁ Ὁμηρος τὸ πρόσθεν, ἐπὶ Νέστορος δεῖ νοεῖν· οἶον· οἱ πρόσθε τοῦ Νέστορος· τῷ δ’ ἀμα, πρὸς ἀλλήλους τους τοῦ Νέστορος προγενεστέρους. Read with changed punctuation: ...τῷ ἀμα ἰσοχρονίαν δηλοι· τῷ δὲ
πρόσθεν, προχρονότητα vel προχρονιότητα, Prof. S. R. Slings, p.c.). πῶς οὖν οὕτως εἶπεν "Ομήρος; 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, Tzetzes discusses the *differentia* between the two. He connects πρόσθεν with οἰ: Homer is talking about people who were born and grew up before Nestor. "Αμα 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 οἰ ... ἀμα 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 (οἰ ... ἀμα)' (tr. Murray).

66,7 ff. (A 253) ὃς φιν (l. ὁ φιν): προκατασκευάσας και προεκθέμενος και προχαρακτηρίσας τὸν Νέστορα και προσεκτικωτέρους <ποιήσας addidi> τοὺς ἀκροστάς εἰς τὴν περὶ τούτού ἀκρόασιν, ... φησίν κτλ.

67,28 ff. (A 258) βουλή: περὶ μὲν βουλή περίεστε καὶ ὑπερυπάρχεται τῶν Δαναῶν ἐν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ ἐν τῷ μάχεσθαι. The lemma commented upon is not βουλή, but περὶ μὲν βουλή. The Scholia a.l. (Erbse) note that περὶ either stands for υπέρ or that one should take περὶ ... ἔστε together. Read: [βουλή] περὶ μὲν βουλή 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) ἥ̄ο̄ περ ἡμῖν τοῦ ἡμῖν τὸ η δεῖν (l. δεῖ, Iakov 1985, 49) γράφειν, καὶ πάντες τοῦτο (l. τὸ τὸ I.S.) φιλὸν γράφωσι. δεῖ γὰρ νοεῖν καὶ τὸν Νέστορα συμπεριλαμβανόμενον κατὰ τρόπον μεθόδου δεινότητος, ἵνα μὴ ἀλαζὸν καὶ ἄφρων νομισθῇ, εἰ ὡμῖν κεῖται τῇ γραφῇ μετὰ ϕιλοῦ τοῦ υ· δείκνυσι γὰρ οὕτω Ἀγαμέμνονος καὶ Ἀχιλέως (l. Ἀχιλλέως) χρείττονας τοὺς περὶ Πειρίθουν, οὐ μὴν δ' ἄρα καὶ ἑαυτῷ (l. ἑαυτῷ I.S.) ὑπὲρ Θερσίτης (l. -η Iakov 1984, 181) μᾶλλον ἄρμόδιον ἥ̄ο̄ 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 ἑαυτῷ to ἑαυτόν.

in his arrogance demanded that divine honours be paid to his lance: (70,23 ff.) δς δι' ύπερβολήν ἀνδρείας τὸ δόρυ αὐτοῦ πῆξας ἐν μέσῃ τῇ ἁγορᾷ proestαξεν αὐτῷ (l. αὐτό, Iakov l.c.) <ἐν addidi> τοῖς θεοῖς ἄριστειν. Cf. the parallel passage in Eustath. Ι 158,28 ff. vdV. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ύπερφρονήσαι. ἀχώντιον γάρ, φασίν, ἐν ἁγορᾷ μέσῃ πῆξας εἷς ὀρθὸν θεόν τούτο προσετάξεται ἄριστειν.

72,21 (A 268) ὀρέσχαοις· τοῖς ἐν ὀρεί κοιμωμένοις οἴθεν προσγραπτέον <τὸ ἰ addidi>. Cf. Etym. M. 630,11 ff.: ὀρεσχαοῖς· ὁ ἐν ὀρεί διατιμώμενος. Απὸ τὸ κείω, τὸ κοιμῶμαι, γίνεται ὀρεσχαοῖς· καὶ κατὰ συνεκτικὴν καὶ τροπὴν τοῦ ὀ ἐς ὀ, ὀρεσχαοῖς καὶ μένει τὸ ἰ προσγραμμένον. (See further Cramer Anecd. Ox. I 304,3 ff.; SchHom. Il. Α 268b.)

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


80,20 ff. (A 303 on (αίμα) κελαινόν): πῶς ὦτε μὲν κελαινόν [sic], ὦτε δὲ κελαινεφής τὸ αίμα φησιν, ὀτε μὲν τὴν τοῦ αίματος χροιάν διαγράφει, κελαινόν τούτο φησιν, ὦτε δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκχύσεως τοῦ αἴματος ἐνεργείαν βουλείτα δηλοῦν, οἶνον λιποθυμία ἡ θάνατον, κελαιφενες [sic] τοῦτο φησιν. Read: πῶς ὦτε μὲν κελαινόν, ὦτε δὲ κελαινεφής τὸ αίμα φησιν; ὦτε μὲν τὴν τοῦ αἴματος χροιάν διαγράφει, κελαινόν τοῦτο φησιν, ὦτε δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκχύσεως τοῦ αἴματος ἐνεργείαν βουλείτα δηλοῦν, οἶνον λιποθυμίαν (Iakov 1984, 181) ἡ θάνατον, κελαιφενες τοῦτο φησιν.

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

97,19 ff. This passage concerns Achilles’ appeal to Thetis, A 352 ff., and her advise 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.): οὖχ ἐστι δὲ συμβουλευτικοῦ, ἀλλὰ δικανικοῦ, ὥσπερ ἔφημεν· τὴν γὰρ προσωποποιηθέσαι μητέρα αὐτοῦ τὸ ύγρὸν καθίστα δικαστὴν καὶ πολιτικὸν ἐπάγει διήγημα ἦτοι δικανικόν τὸ ὕψωσε' ἐς Θήβην, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ (viz. A 366 ff.), ἡν τοῖς ἀσκεπτετέροις ἱστορικῶν νομισθῆ τὸ διήγημα. καθηγορίας Ἀγαμέμνονος δεξίον καὶ
απολογίας αυτού και την τής χόρης ἀφαίρεσιν καὶ ἄξιοῦν δικασθήναι τῇ 
χρίσει, ὦ τοῦ δικανικοῦ εἴδους ἐστίν, κάν μετὰ τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν τῆς 
ἐκδικάσεως ἢ χρίνουσα μήτηρ συμβούλευε αὐτῷ προτρέπουσα ... μηνιάν 
'Αχαίοις καὶ ἀποτρέπουσα πολέμειν. 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 κάν τοις ἀσκεπτοτέροις ... τὸ διήγημα must be 
considered a parenthesis. Read with change of punctuation: ...(κάν 
tοις ἀσκεπτοτέροις ἱστορικόν νομισθή τὸ διήγημα) κατηγορίας 
'Αγαμέμνονος δὲ εἰς ἐξίον κτλ. The participles διεξίον and ἄξιοῦν go 
with πολιτικὸν ... διήγημα ήτοι δικανικὸν.

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

101,17 (Α 362) τί δὲ πένθος κατὰ φρένας σε ἢτοι τοῦ (1. σου) ἵκετο 
καὶ ἥλθε. The necessity of the emendation is apparent from the 
sequel: τὸ δὲ σὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ σοῦ (1. σου), ἀντίττωσις ἢστιν.

103,26 f. (Α 368) υἱες· ἡ εὐθεία, ὁ υἱος τοῦ υἱος (1. υἱος) καὶ υἱος 
775,20 ff. (where the forms are spelled with one iota). For the 
accent of υἱος, cf. Sch.Hom. O 138b; E 266al. An alternative is pro-
vided by Sch.Hom. E 216a2 ἱος.

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 ὀδατος παρὰ τῷ νῆχω· θυγάτηρ ἦτοι μέρος ἢ Θέτις 
ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνιμώμενον ὑγρόν καὶ εὐθετούν καὶ κοσμούν· τοῦ δὲ Χείρωνος 
φιλοσόφου τοῦ Κενταύρου, λεγομένου διὰ τὸ σὺν ἄλλοις τισὶν ἐφευρεῖν 
αὐτὴν τὴν ἵππηκην τὴν μονάμπυκα, θυγάτηρ ἢν Θέτις ἢ μήτηρ 'Αχιλλέως, 
σοφή καὶ αὐτὴ καὶ λεκανόμαντις. The passage offers an allegorical
interpretation of Thetis’ embassy to Zeus. The allegorical signification is introduced by ήτοι. 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 (λεκανόμαντεία belongs to this genus): see 92,24 ff.; 112,23; 113,3; 113,27. For λεκανόμαντεία see A. Bouché-Leclerq, 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 ήτοι τοῦ ύδατος (παρὰ τῷ (l. τό, cf. 99,24) νήχῳ) θυγάτηρ ήτοι μέρος ή Θέτις, ἐπὶ (l. ἐπεί) τὸ ἀνιμώμενον ύγρόν καὶ εὐθετοῦν (l. εὐθετεῖ) καὶ κοσμοῦν (l. κοσμεῖ)· τοῦ δὲ Χείρωνος φιλοσόφου τοῦ Κενταύρου λεγομένου διὰ τὸ σύν ἄλλοις ταῖς ἐφευρεῖν αὐτήν (l. αὐτόν) τὴν ἰππικήν μονάμπυκα 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 ἑρρέθησαν καὶ ἱσως καὶ ἁσαφέστερα, δοξεὶ λεκτεὸν δὲ καὶ σαφέστερον. Read with changed punctuation: ταῦτα μὲν ὡς ἐν συντάξει ἑρρέθησαν καὶ ἱσως καὶ ἁσαφέστερα δοξεὶ· λεκτεὸν 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 ἐντὸ· ἐξέβαλον τὸν ἔρωτα τοῦ ἔσθιειν ἄγων ἐκορέσθησαν. τὸ δὲ ὑπερβατὸν Ἰωνικόν, ὡς τὸ ἔρον, τὸ ρον μικρὸν Ἰωνικὸς καὶ Αἰολικός μόνον. In my opinion two different remarks are merged here (see above, ad 21,17 ff.). The first one explains the
so-called tmesis έξ ...έντο. The second comments on the form έρον. In e.g. 12,15 (ἀπὸ πατρί φιλω 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 ος τὸ ... Read: έξ έρον έντο· ἐξέβαλον τὸν ἔρωτα τοῦ ἐσθίειν ήγουν ἐκορέσθησαν. τὸ δὲ ὑπερβατόν Ἰωνικόν, ος τὸ *** έρον· τὸ ρον μικρὸν Ἰωνικῶς καὶ Ἀιολικῶς μόνον. Tzetzes refers to έρον as opposed to Attic έρως with omega (plus their respective declensions). See further Iakov 1985, 63 who offers a different solution (he deletes ος and changes τὸ 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 ύγράν is omitted. Tzetzes proceeds as follows (131,8 ff.): ἀλλ', ὦ σοφώτατε Ἡρωδιανέ, οὐχί πρὸς δρῦς Ὁμήρος γεγραφώς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, "ὑγρά κέλευθα" φάμενος κατ' ἄρχας καὶ ύστερ πυγμώνην αἰτήσας καὶ δείξας ὅτι κατεχρήσατο τούτω, ἡρεάθη καὶ οὐ πάλιν τίθησι τὸ ύγράν, γινώσκων δὴ ὅτι ἐπέγνωσε τὸ τοῦτο εἶναι τοῖς πάσι κατάχρησις, καὶ Ἡρωδιανός μὴ προσχών (1. προσχών) ἀντίκειται σοβαρῶς. For a similar case of criticism against the grammarians, cf. 128,8. For κέλευθος, cf. Schol. Hom. M 262b; Etym. 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) πωλέσκετο· ἀνεστρέφετο· Ὁμήρος <ω add. Lolos> μέγα οὐκ ἔγινωσκε· μικρὰ δὲ εἶναι γράφων Ὁμήρος τὰ πάντα τίθεις, ἐν οἴστερ ἔχρην σημεῖον μακράς, καὶ τὸ πολέσκετο δὲ μικρὸν Ὅμηρος, ός καὶ νῦν Ἰωνες γράφουσιν ἐκτείνεται δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ λ, Ἦττικῶς δὲ μέγα τὸ τούτο γράφεται, ὅπως οἱ νῦν γραμματικοὶ Ὅμήρῳ μὲν καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς μετρικοῖς μέγα τὸ πολέσκετο προσμενίματε ἐν τοῖς σχεδίοις, τοῦτο μικρὸν γράφουσιν, οὐ μᾶλλον ἀρμόζει μηκόνεσθαι κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τοῦ λέγοντα· τὰ ἄπο βαρυτῶν ἐπίματων τραπέντα εἰς περισπώμενα μεγάλα γράφουσιν οὖν νέμω, νομῳ ...πέλο, πωλῇ ... κτλ. Tzetzes points out that since Homer did not distinguish ο and ο in writing, he always wrote ο and added a macron where necessary. Thus, he wrote πολέσκετο (the lemma should be emended accordingly). The Ionians, too, write πολέσκετο, but in Attic the word is spelled with ο. 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/ἐρος plus declined forms. Read with changed punctuation: πολέσκετο· ἀνεστρέφετο· Ὅμηρος <ω> μέγα οὖς ἐγίνωσκε· μικρὰ δὲ εἶναι γράφων Ὅμηρος τὰ πάντα, τιθεὶς ἐν ὀιστὲρ ἐχρῆν σημεῖον μαχρᾶς, καὶ τὸ πολέσκετο [δὲ] μικρὸν Ὅμηρος, ως καὶ νῦν Ἰωνες γράφουσιν· ἐκτείνεται δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ λ. Ἀττικῶς δὲ μέγα τοῦτο γράφεται: [ὁπως] <πῶς οὖν> οἱ νῦν γραμματικοὶ Ὅμηρῳ μὲν καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς μετρικοῖς μέγα τοῦτο προσνεῖμαντες, ἐν τοῖς σχεδικοῖς (σχεδικοὶ malirri) τοῦτο μικρὸν γράφουσιν, οὐ μᾶλλον ἀρμόζει μηκύνεσθαι 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. Ἰστέων δὲ ὃτι τὸ πωλῶ διφορεῖται κατὰ τὰ γραφήν καὶ σημαινόμενον· ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ πιπράσκω διὰ τοῦ Ω μεγάλου· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ κινοῦμαι ἡ περιπατῶ, διὰ τοῦ Ω μικρὸν. In l. 34, the spelling πολέσκετο is used for our passage from Iliad A, but it is derived from πολῶ. The lengthening of O to Ω is called poetic (l. 38-9). Greg. Cor. dial. 271 S.: ὁμοίως τοῖς Ἀττικοῖς καὶ αὐτοῖ (sc. the Dorians) τὰ ἀπὸ βαρυτόνων περιστάμενα ἐκτείνουσιν, οἱον στρεψὶς στροφῶ, 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 πωλέσκω μεγεθύνονται παρὰ τῷ ποιητῆ. Cf. ibid. 216,28 ff. For σχεδικοὶ (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 Ὅμηρος, τοῦτο ἕστι μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν καὶ σημεῖον ἢμῖν προδιδάσκει ἐσομένου τε χειμῶνος καὶ τοῦτον ἐπικρατῆσεως καὶ προεστιμένου χειμῶνος σημεῖον τὰς ὁμίχλας ἢμῖν παραδέδωκεν. ἐπικρατῆσεως δὲ εἰ μὴ προσγείως, ἀλλ' ἐς πολὺ μετεωρισθύσιν ἄχρι τῆς χορφῆς 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 (ομίχλη; cf. A 359) emanating from the sea and filling αήρ (= Zeus). The heavier parts of this fog embrace the lower regions of αήρ, 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: δ (Iakov 1984, 182) δε φησιν "Ομηρος, τούτο ἔστι· μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν καὶ σημεῖον ἡμῖν προδιδάσκει (fort. προδίδωσι vel παραδίδωσι I.S.) ἐσομένου τε χειμώνος καὶ τούτου ἐπικρατήσεως· καὶ προεπομένου (I. πρὸ ἐσομένου) χειμώνος σημεῖον τὰς ὀμίχλας ἡμῖν παραδέδωκεν, ἐπικρατήσεως δὲ εἰ μὴ προσγείως (I. πρόσγειοι ὕσιν), ἀλλ’ ἐς πολὺ μετεωρισθῶσιν ἀχρὶ τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ ἀέρος, οἱ (1. ὅ) καὶ ἐνταῦθα λέγει γενέσθαι.

140,22 ff. (A 561) δαιμονίη· φαυλότατη ... ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ εὐθαμονεστάτη· ἡ λέξις γὰρ τὸ μέσον (I. τῶν μέσων) ἔστι· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τῶν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀναπτυχθέος παρ’ ἡμῶν λεπτῶς τῆς ἐννοίας σαφῆ καὶ < οὐκ add. Iakov 1984, 182> ἀπερινόητα. In view of the correction of ἀτελές to ευτελές in 15,19 (cf. 15,24) and the similarity of the ligature of ευ to α, I prefer the emendation σαφῆ καὶ εὐπερινόητα.

143,10 f. (A 571) οὐκ εστί γαρ οὐδεμία τέχνη, ἦτις οὐ{κ} (secil. Lolos) πυρὸς τα ἐργαλεῖα κέκτηται γενόμενα· καὶ χάρται καί τὸ μέλαν πυρί γίνονται κτλ. Read: οὐκ εστί γαρ οὐδεμία τέχνη, ήτις οὐκ εκ πυρός τα ἐργαλεῖα κέκτηται γενόμενα· καὶ χάρται καί τὸ μέλαν (‘paper and ink’) πυρί γίνονται κτλ.

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

147,9 ff. ... τὴν Πανδώραν γυναῖκα, ήτοι τὴν παντεχνίαν τὴν ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς εὑρεθέασαι καὶ τὰ τοιαύτα ἤδεα καὶ τροφηλά, ἀπερ μαστεύοντες, ἐπικτήσασθαι ἕαυτος σύνομεν. Delete comma between μαστεύοντες and ἐπικτήσασθαι. 'Επικτήσασθαι depends on μαστεύοντες.

151,16 ff. (A 601): One of the many passages where Tzetzes
discusses Homer’s rhetorical skills and merits: ὅρα μὴ πᾶς ὁ βουλόμενος, ὥπως καὶ τὸ δοχοῦν Ὁμήρῳ, ἀποίητον πεποιημένον ἐστὶ καὶ περίεργον τὸ δοχοῦν ἀπερίεργον καὶ μεμελετημένον τὸ ἀμελέτητον, καὶ ἵνα φαίκα φάμμος Ὁμήρου γεωργημένη καὶ εὐσταχυς καὶ κατ’ αὐτὸν εἶπεῖν 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: ὅρα μοι (Iakov 1985, 70) πᾶς ὁ βουλόμενος, ὥπως καὶ τὸ δοχοῦν Ὁμήρῳ ἀποίητον πεποιημένον ἐστὶ καὶ περίεργον τὸ δοχοῦν 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 ἐξοιρεῖ πρὸς τὸ μετέωρον). I suggest e.g. ... καὶ εἶναι φαίνεται καὶ φάμμος Ὁμήρου γεωργημένη καὶ εὐσταχυς καὶ κατ’ αὐτὸν εἶπεῖν 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 κουριοδίης 1. κουριδίης; 31,20 σχετιλιαστικόν 1. σχετιλιαστικόν; 35,24 ἐφενος 1. ἐφενος; 40,20 f. τὸ βέλτερον ἀπὸ τοῦ βάλλειν εὐστόχως δυναμένων τοῖοτῶν 1. ἀπὸ τῶν βάλλειν κτλ.; 44,12 ὑποτυπωτικῶς 1. ὑποτυπωτικῶς; 45,21 σύγχρασιν 1. σύγχρασιν; 47,21 δαήμον 1. δαήμον, cf. Pl. Crat. 398b6; 49,10 f. μήτε βιβλιόθε τι βλεπόντων καὶ γραφόντων 1. μήτε βιβλίον ἐτι βλεπόντων ἢ γραφόντων; 51,23 ὄλεσαι· ὄλεση 'Αττικόν. Read: ὄλεση· ὄλεση 'Αττικόν; 53,3 πρεπώδες 1. πρεπώδες; 53,5 πράττε 1. πράττει; 53,10 μέμφασαι 1. μέμφασθαι; 58,9 πολλοὶ 1. πολλῶ (see further Iakov 1984, 163); 60,23 τριῶν 1. τριῶν; 63,3 ληπηθήση 1. λυπηθήση; 65,12 ἐπάγουσι 1. ἐπάγουσι, see further Iakov 1985, 48; 67,8 ἡμῶν 1. υμῶν; 73,9 οὶ 1. οῖ; 75,8 κατατολμήσαντες 1. κατατολμήσαντες; 88,5 μετά τοῦ νῦ 1. νυ or νῦ). See Iakov 1985, 55; 92,7 ποιότεσι 1. ποιότησι; 93,25 ὄσπερ μοι 1. μὴ ἢ Ὁμήρου αὐτὸς τε καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ταῦτα ἀπαρασάμενοις; 96,2 ἐξετάσαι 1. ἐξετάσας; 96,4 ύποδεικνύς 1. ύποδεικνύναι; 96,9 μήκητα 1. μύκητα;
96,12 ἡντιβολικότι τι. ἡντιβοληκότι; 97,2 συνεκπλεύσαι μοι τι. συνεκπλεύσαι. Cf. 113,29; 97,29 ἐμπροσθιΐ. εμπροσθε; 101,8 ό τι. 102,1 γη τι. γη; 102,12 πώς τι. πώς; 107,11 ωστε τι. ωστε; 107,13 ύπετόπαζε τι. ύπετόπαζον, 107,16 f. ο ὅ τι. 102,11 γη τι. γη; 102,12 πώς τι. πώς; 107,11 ωστε τι. ωστε; 107,13 ύπετόπαζε τι. ύπετόπαζον, 107,16 f. Delete full stop after ἀποτεινόμενον. Read a full stop (or a semi-colon ·) after χομπάζοντας; 107,18 πολλό τι. πολλο; delete comma after βραχυλογήμασι; 107,19 μεγάλον τι. μεγάλας; 110,5-6 δεσμίσασ τι. δεσμήσας; 110,6 Put a semi-colon after χρυσατ; 112,24 ηντοτικός τι. ηντοτικός; 113,5-6 στρατείος τι. στρατείς; 113,27 πάπτο τι. πάπτου; 116,5-6 δομοί τι. 122,19 ff. διηγείται δὲ τις ἀπλῶς, ὅταν ἡ πολλὰ ἡ (τι. ἡ) τὸ πράγματα ἢ ἀρ' ἐαυτῶν μόνων ἢ τὴν τέρφην ἡ τὸ ἐνδύναμον ἔχωσιν; 122,23 ff. διηγείται δὲ τις ἐνδιασκεύως, ἡ (τι. εἰ) πλατύναι γνώριμοι; 125,20 f. Change colon after Ἀντίοχου into comma; change comma after τοξευμάτων into full stop; 126,9 ἀπάσαντο τι. ἐπάσαντο; 126,22 ἔστρεφαν: ἔστρεφον Ιάκων 1985, 62; malim ἔστρεφαν; 127,17 f. κατευθύνεται τι. κατευθύνεσθαι; 128,8 ἔρως τι. ἔρος (see Ιάκων 1985, 63); 128,9 and 128,10 γέλως τι. γέλος; 131,21 σφαιροειδώς τι. σφαιροειδοὺς; 131,29 τῆς τι. τοῖς; 133,25 διευθετήσαντο τι. διευθετήσαντος; 137,9 f. παρατείνουσιν τι. παρατείνει; 140,8 θεοί τι. θεοῦ; 140,21 πυρωειδεῖς τι. πυρωειδεῖς; 143,15 σοφίας τι. σοφίας (‘spongy, porous’), cf. 149,8; 146,7 τοιοῦτον τι. τοιοῦτον; 146,9 πολεμιστήρια τι. πολεμιστήρια; 146,26 δυνατωτάτων τι. δυνατώτατοι; 146,29 παρά τι. περί; 147,2 Σιντίος τι. Σιντίας; 148,3 δυνατωτέρων τι. δυνατωτέρων; 148,4 ἀρετῆς τι. ἀρετή; 148,9 θεότατος τι. θείοτατος; 148,10 φησίν τι. φησίν· ὅπωτε γὰρ τι. φησίν· ὅπωτε γὰρ; 148,17 ξηραινόμενοι τι. ξηραινόμενοι.
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