a gloss on πρὸς αὐγάς πυρός (explaining the intention of Clyt's words), which later replaced αὐγάς as being more to the point\(^1\)

Nicosa (149) - Cyprus, Ay Demetrios St 10 C E Hadjistephanou

\(^{1}\) I thank Professor J M Bremer for useful suggestions on an earlier draft of this paper

TZETZES ON A MINI THESIS IN HOMER, THE 'ΕΠΙΡΡΗΜΑΤΑ ΘΕΤΙΚΑ\(^1\)

In ancient grammar, the adiectiva verbalia in -τέον are styled ἐπιρρήματα θετικά (e.g. in the Techne of Dionysus Thrax, 85,2). The reason why these forms should be called adverbs is nowhere explicitly discussed. However, we have enough data to be able to reconstruct the train of thought which could lead to such a classification. The forms in -τέον are indeclinable, and thus comparable with other adjectives which exchange their declinability for an adverbial function\(^2\), they can be construed with all tenses, moods and persons\(^3\), they are construed with a verb (namely a form of εἰναι), just like other adverbs—in fact this is the single most important characteristic of any adverb, they are closely associated with δεῖ and χρή which are always used to paraphrase the forms in -τέον. And since there were people who defended the adverbial status of δεῖ and χρή, it stood to reason to give the same status to these words\(^4\).

The stock examples of the 'thetic' adverbs are πλευστέον and γαμητέον. The name for these adverbs is often misunderstood. Some ancient Scholasts go no further than to point out the derivation of θετικά from πιθος\(^5\). The editor of Dionysus, G. Uhlig, does not explain it at all, Schoemann agrees with the Scholasts and says "der Beiname θετικόν soll wahrscheinlich bedeuten, dass durch dasselbe in Wendungen wie τέον εσι etwas als Gebot aufgestellt werde"\(^6\).

However, already in Antiquity a link is laid with rhetoric and this is indeed where we have to look for the origin of our term. The examples πλευστέον and γαμητέον point in this same direction. For these are used by rhetoricians as stock examples of a thesis (θέσις), a rhetorical exercise in which one defends a certain proposition\(^7\). If the proposition is general, it is called a thesis, if specific circumstances are added it is a hypothesis\(^8\). The characteristic form of expression taken on by a thesis is that of a verbal adjective in -τέον or an equivalent like δεὶ γαμεῖν, δεὶ πλεῖν. The connection between the grammatical ἐπιρρήματα θετικά and the rhetorical θέσις is made quite explicit in Ammonius, CAG 4,5,9,14 f ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐπιρρήματα τὰ θετικά λεγόμενα θέσεις καλούοι τινες, οἶον γαμητέον, πλευστέον. Furthermore, a rhetorician can talk about 'the adverb of the grammarians', as

does the Scholiast on Aphthonius in an enumeration of the various significations of the word θέσις (2,59,2 ff. Walz): θέσις καί το παρά τούς γραμματικούς ἐπίρρημα ... θέσις λέγεται καί η τῶν τουωτῶν ἐπιρρημάτων λογική ἐπίσκεψις, περὶ ης νῦν ήμιν ο λόγος, εἴρθη δε θέσις απὸ τοῦ εἰς ης ημᾶς καί ώσπερ νομοθετεῖν καί δογματίζειν. The grammarians classify verbal adjectives as ἐπιρρήματα; the name of the part of speech is then qualified as θετικόν on account of the rhetorical function of these adverbs. The rhetorical thesis consists of the discussion of the proposition expressed by a ‘thetic’ adverb). Thus, the name ἐπιρρήματα θετικά is an example of the frequent interrelationships between the disciplines of grammar and rhetoric.

As an illustration of the relationship between grammatical description and rhetorical function, I shall discuss a Scholium by Tzetzes on Ἰλιᾶς A 216-9. In this Homeric passage Achilles reacts to the stern words of Athena, telling him on behalf of Hera to keep his temper. Achilles answers: χρή μὲν σφωτερόν γε, θεά, ἐπος ἐρύσσασθαι / καὶ μάλα περ θυμώ κεχολωμένον / δαι αμεινον / δς κε θεοΐς ἐπιπείθηται, μάλα τε' ἐκλυον αὐτοῦ. Tzetzes' comment as printed by Lolos runs: Χρή: θετικόν ἐπίρρημα διὰ τῶν τριῶν τόν μόνων στίχων, προγύμνασμα θέσιν ἑλον ἀποτελεῖ πλὴν Λακωνικός συντόμως βραχυλογήματι. Ως μηδέ τάς ἀντιθέσεις καί ἀνθυποφοράς ήτοι τοὺς ἐναντίους λόγους ἐμφαίνεσθαι· εἰ μη σκιάς τινας αὐτῶν ἐκ τῆς κατασκευῆς τῆς διὰ τοῦ μάλα περ φαινομένας.

It is not unusual for χρή to be called an ἐπίρρημα. The same qualification is found in SchHom. A 216 and Apollonius Dyscolus discusses at length whether χρή and δεί are verbs or adverbs. What is unusual is the addition θετικόν: although examples-of ‘thetic’ adverbs are regularly paraphrased by means of δεί and χρή (γαμητέον equals δεί γαμεΐν etc.), δεί and χρή are never themselves called θετικά. And this stands to reason: for a θέσις would lack in Content if it expressed nothing but the bare notion of Obligation, without adding what it is that one is obliged to do). What is meant here is probably that χρή fulfills its ‘thetic’ function with regard to and in combination with ἐρύσσασθαι. It appears that Tzetzes analyses the three verses spoken by Achilles as a miniature thesis. This is in accordance with his view of Homer as a most accomplished rhetorician (he is called a ρήτωρ δείκτατος in 107,4). Indeed, a strictly rhetorical analysis of Homeric passages is very frequent in Tzetzes).

I propose to emend the text of the Scholium as follows: Χρή: θετικόν ἐπίρρημα. Διὰ τῶν τριῶν τόν μόνων στίχων προγύμνασμα θέσιν ἑλον ἀποτελεῖ πλὴν Λακωνικός συντόμως βραχυλογήματι, οὐ μηδέ τάς ἀντιθέσεις καί ἀνθυποφοράς ήτοι τοὺς ἐναντίους λόγους ἐμφαίνεσθαι· εἰ μη σκιάς τινας αὐτῶν ἐκ τῆς κατασκευῆς τῆς διὰ τοῦ μάλα περ φαινομένας. 'Χρή: a thetic adverb. By these three verses only he (Homer) produces a complete progynmasma, a thesis, only with a Laconic brevity of expression. Thus, even the objections and the replies (or the opposite speeches), are not manifest, if it were not for their shadows appearing through the confirmation by means of the words μάλα περ.'
A thesis is the most popular form that a preparatory exercise, or προγύμνασμα, can take. Usually, it will be built up as follows: There is a proposition (thesis), e.g. one must marry; this is worked out by a defense of marriage. Then comes an objection (antithesis): ναί, φησιν, αλλά... An imaginary opponent is produced who presents arguments against the thesis. His objections are replied to in the λύσις: ‘What you are saying is no problem, for ...’. Tzetzes’ ἀνθυποφορά is what is called λύσις in Aphthonius (Rhet. Gr. I 109 ff. Walz).

How, then, does Tzetzes analyse the words of Achilles as a concise version of a completely worked-out preparatory exercise, namely a thesis? The primary thesis is: one must obey (the gods). The objection is hidden in the words και μάλα περ ... κεχολωμένον, which may be rephrased as: “Yes, but what if one is very angry?” The objection is stressed by the words μάλα περ, which reinforce its argument. Here, Tzetzes’ analysis is condensed to the point of obscurity. The λύσις follows: “Even so, one has to obey, for this is better”. The third verse gives the argument for this ἀνθυποφορά: “Who obeys the gods, to that man the gods will gladly listen”. The argument is of the συμφέρον-type.

Laconic brevity ... one cannot but agree.
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1) Research for this article has been made possible by a fellowship of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences. On Tzetzes’ Ilias-exegesis see also Some Notes on the Edition of Tzetzes’ Ilias-Exegesis in this same volume.


5) SchDTh. 101,32 ff. θετικὰ ὅτι τὰ θέσιν καὶ τοίχημα πράγματος ὁρίζεται· ἐν γὰρ τίποτα γαμητέον, ὁρίζει δεὶ δεῖ γαμεῖν κτλ., cf. 434,24 ff.; 282,29 ff.: Θετικὰ νάτο τοίχημα, θετικὰ οὕς τὰ πράκτικα ὁτικὸν οὐν ἐλθεῖ οὐ δὲν πράγματος σημαινεῖ· ἐν γὰρ τίποτα πλεύετον, τίθεται καὶ ὄροσιμν ὃτι δεὶ πλεῦσαι, cf. 282,18 ff.; 434,27 f.

6) G.F. Schoemann, Die Lehre von den Redetheilen nach den Alten (Berlin 1862), 63.

8) Sometimes the difference is made to coincide with the division between rhetoric and philosophy: Stephanus in *Arist. de int.*, CAG 18,3,2,17 ff. discusses τὰ θετικὰ ἐπιρρήματα, δεσπότης τῶν βλέψεων, like πλευστέον and γαμητέον, and proceeds to distinguish between dialectic or philosophical discussions which are καθόλου ‘should (any)one marry?’ and rhetorical ones which add particular circumstances (‘should so and so marry?’). This is only one instance from among many, cf. L. Calboli, *La dottrina degli “status” nella retorica greca e romana* (Bologna 1984), 42.


11) Cf. ApD. Adv., Gramm. Gr. II i 130,7 f.: δὲ and χρὴ indicate an ἔλλειψις τοῦ πράγματος, therefore one must always add what someone is supposed to do; see Sluiter 1990, 110 (cf. n. 3). If χρὴ expresses ‘obligation’ only, it would have the meaning of the verbal (modal) category ‘imperative’, cf. ibid. 89 ff.

12) See e.g. 27,12 ff.; 49,13 ff.; 64,11 ff.; 66,7 ff.; 68,17 ff.; 88,10; 122,15 ff. et seq.

13) For the position of article and demonstrative pronoun in the phrase διὰ τῶν τριῶν τοῦ δὲ τάξιν ὑποθέτων, see KG I 628 A. 5, and see Tzetzes 52,25: τῆς δὲ περὶ ἐξής τεῖχους ὡς ἔχει συντάξιν. The position of ὑποθέτων remains problematic. A more incisive emendation might run thus: προγύμνασμα θέσιν ἔχει Αποστόλης ὑποθέτων <£ν> κλίνων λέοντας μέθοδος μεθάπευστε. Alternatively, read διεγέρεται. Cf. Scholia ad Her. IV 394 Walz, ad Hermog. p. 49 Rabe (cf. note 8). I owe this suggestion to J. Wisse.

14) For the ‘Laconic brevity’, see 93,20 f. φιλοσυντόμως δὲ γράφειν οὐκ ζητῶ γεγονός αὐτοῦ τοῦ πάντων τῶν τῶν μὲν κλίνων, μέντοι γὰρ τῶν γλῶσσας εἰς τάξιν ιδιογραφήσεις τοῦ νόμου (cf. n. 3). If χρὴ expresses ‘obligation’ only, it would have the meaning of the verbal (modal) category ‘imperative’, cf. ibid. 89 ff.


16) See for the connection between προγύμνασμα and θέσις, Lausberg § 1106; 1136; Prisc. Praeexercitamina Gr. Lat. III 439,11 ff.: Positio est deliberatio alcinias rei generalis ad nullam personam certam pertinens vel aliam partem circumstantiae, ut si tristis erat navigandi, an iudicem usum etc.: Aphth. Rhet. Gr. I 108,15 ff. Walz θέσις εἶτα ἐπίσκεψις λογικῆς προγύμνασμον τοῦ πράγματος. Τῶν δὲ θέσεων αἱ μὲν τίνι προσεποίησις, αἱ δὲ θεωρητικαί καὶ πολιτικαί μὲν αἱ προσεποίησις πάλιν συνεχεῖαι εἰς γαμητέον κτλ. (an example of θεωρητικαί would be εἰ σφαιροειδής ὁ οὐρανός) ... διενήνοχε δὲ θέσις ὑποθέσις, τῶν τῶν μὲν υποθέσεως ἔχειν περίστασιν, τῶν δὲ θέσις ὑποθέσις εἶναι ... πρώτον δὲ ἡ θέσις ἐν προγύμνασμα, ἀντίθετα καὶ λόγῳ κατά της διδασκαλίας ἐξεταίρετα τοὺς ἑαυτῶν ἑαυτὰς, ἡ ἄντι προτέρων ἔξαγε, εἰτα δράσεις τῆς τελικῆς κεφαλαίας, νομίμως, δικαίως, συμφέροντι, δυνάμειν.

MORE ON FUNS IN THE CLEOPATRA ODE

In a recent note in this journal, H. Jacobson has suggested that Horace describes Cleopatra’s snakes as asperae (carm. 1.37.26) because they are aspides. Although Jacobson had been anticipated, the unobtrusiveness