

EIKASMOS

Quaderni Bolognesi di Filologia Classica · Studi Online 4

TZETZIKAI EPEYNAI

a cura di / edited by

ENRICO EMANUELE PRODI

PÀTRON EDITORE

Bologna 2022

Copyright: © i rispettivi autori 2022

Curatela e materiali introduttivi: © Enrico Emanuele Prodi 2022



CC-BY-NC-ND. I diritti di traduzione e adattamento, totale o parziale, con qualsiasi mezzo, sono riservati per tutti i Paesi.

Prima edizione, marzo 2022



Il convegno da cui ha tratto origine il presente volume è stato finanziato dal programma di ricerca e innovazione dell'Unione Europea "Horizon 2020" tramite una borsa Marie Skłodowska-Curie (progetto "ASAGIP", Grant Agreement n° 708556).

PÀTRON Editore
Via Badini, 12
Quarto Inferiore
40057 Granarolo dell'Emilia (BO)

Tel. (+39) 051.767003
Fax (+39) 051.768252
E-mail: info@patroneditore.com
Sito: <http://www.patroneditore.com>

Il catalogo generale è visibile nel sito web. Sono possibili ricerche per autore, titolo, materia e collana. Per ogni volume è presente il sommario, per le novità la copertina dell'opera e una breve descrizione del contenuto.

ISBN: 978-88-555-8001-4.

Frontespizio: Licofrone e 'Isacco' Tzetze, da un manoscritto del commento all'*Alessandra*, Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, *Palatinus Graecus* 18, f. 96v. Immagine di dominio pubblico da https://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/cpgraec18_v2/0196

ὅπου πεισθεὶς ὡς παλαιοῖς αὐτοῖς καὶ τεχνογράφοις,
οὐδόλως ἐξηρένησα ταῖς Τζετζικαῖς ἐρεύναις,
ἐν αἴσπερ ἢ ἀλήθεια ἐκ χάους ἀνατρέχει.
ἀλλ' ἐν ἐρεύναις Τζετζικαῖς τοῦτο τανῦν δεικτέον...

(*Hist.* XII 398, 65-68)

Table of contents

Abbreviations	vii
Introduction: A buffalo's-eye view	ix
TOMMASO BRACCINI – A neglected manuscript of Tzetzes' <i>Allegories from the Verse-chronicle</i> : First remarks	1
AGLAE PIZZONE – Tzetzes and the <i>prokatasstasis</i> : A tale of people, manuscripts, and performances . .	19
NUNZIO BIANCHI – Il figlio di capro e il libro sfregiato. Versi inediti di Tzetzes (<i>Laur. Conv. soppr.</i> 627, ff. 20v-21r)	75
YULIA MANTOVA – Tzetzes' scholia to the <i>Histories</i> as a source on the socio-cultural use of invective in Byzantium	105
MARC LAUXTERMANN – Buffaloes and bastards: Tzetzes on metre	117
GIULIA GERBI – <i>Epistulae ad exercitationem accommodatae</i> : Notes on some fictional epistles by John Tzetzes	133
JESÚS MUÑOZ MURCILLO – John Tzetzes on <i>ekphrasis</i> and the art of knowledge transfer	157
VALERIA F. LOVATO – From contentious hero to bone of contention: The reception of Thersites by John Tzetzes and Eustathios of Thessaloniki	185
CORINNE JOUANNO – L'Alexandre de Tzetzés : entre culture savante et culture populaire	211
UGO MONDINI – John of all trades: The Μικρομεγάλη Ἰλιάς and Tzetzes' 'didactic' programme . .	237
ALBERTO RAVANI – «And wishes also a paraphrase of Homer's verses»: Structure and composition of the <i>Prolegomena</i> to the <i>Allegories of the Iliad</i>	261
FREDERICK LAURITZEN – <i>Metapoiesis</i> versus allegory: Psellos and Tzetzes on <i>Iliad</i> IV 1-4	291
ANNA NOVOKHATKO – παρὰ τῶν τεσσάρων τούτων σοφῶν: myth and criticism in Tzetzes	303
JACOPO CAVARZERAN – Φλυαρεῖ Εὐριπίδης: Tzetze commenta Euripide?	317
JULIÁN BÉRTOLA – Tzetzes' verse scholia on Thucydides and Herodotus: A survey with new evidence from <i>Laur. Plut.</i> 70,3	335
THOMAS R.P. COWARD – Towards a new edition of Tzetzes' <i>Commentary on Lycophron</i>	359
CHIARA D'AGOSTINI – Borders to cross the bounds: John Tzetzes and Ptolemy's <i>Geography</i> in twelfth-century Byzantium	403
PHILIP RANCE – Tzetzes and the <i>mechanographoi</i> : The reception of Late Antique scientific texts in Byzantium	427

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of journal titles follow «L'Année Philologique». Those of the names of ancient authors and the titles of their works follow LSJ⁹, with such exceptions as «Eikasmos» house style dictates; any such exceptions ought to be self-explanatory.

Tzetzes' writings are abbreviated as follows:

- Alleg. Il.* *Allegories of the Iliad*: J.-Fr. Boissonade, *Tzetzae Allegoriae Iliadis. Accedunt Psel-li allegoriae*, Lutetiae 1851
- schol. Alleg. Il.* P. Matranga, *Anecdota Graeca e mss. bibliothecis Vaticana, Angelica, Barberi-niana, Vallicelliana, Medicea, Vindobonensi deprompta*, II, Romae 1850, 599-618, 749
- Alleg. Od.* *Allegories of the Odyssey*: H. Hunger, *Johannes Tzetzes, Allegorien zur Odyssee, Buch 1-12*, «ByzZ» XLIX (1956) 249-310; Id., *Johannes Tzetzes, Allegorien zur Odyssee, Buch 13-24*, «ByzZ» XLVIII (1955) 4-48.
- Carm. Il.* *Little-Big Iliad (Carmina Iliaca)*: P.A.M. Leone, *Ioannis Tzetzae Carmina Iliaca*, Catania 1995
- schol. Carm. Il.* *ibid.* 102-243
- De metr.* *On Metres*: J.A. Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis Bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*, III, Oxford 1836, 302-333
- Diff. poet.* *On the Differences between Poets*: W.J.W. Koster, *Scholia in Aristophanem*, IA: *Prolegomena de comoedia*, Groningen 1975, 84-94
- Ep.* *Letters*: P.A.M. Leone, *Ioannis Tzetzae Epistulae*, Leipzig 1972
- schol. Ep.* *ibid.* 158-174
- Exeg. Il.* *Exegesis of the Iliad*: M. Papatomopoulos, Ἐξήγησις Ἰωάννου Γραμματικοῦ τοῦ Τζέτζου εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάδα, Ἀθήναι 2007
- schol. Exeg. Il.* *ibid.* 417-460
- Hist.* *Histories (Chiliads)*: P.A.M. Leone, *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*, Galatina 2007²
- schol. Hist.* *ibid.* 529-569
- Iamb.* *Iambs*: P.L.M. Leone, *Ioannis Tzetzae iambi*, «RSBN» n.s. VI-VII (1969-1970) 127-156
- Prol. com.* *Introduction to Comedy*: W.J.W. Koster, *Scholia in Aristophanem*, IA: *Prolegomena de comoedia*, Groningen 1975, 22-38

- S. Lucia* *Life of St. Lucy*: G. Sola, *Ioannis Tzetzis hypomnema et S. Methodii patriarchae canon in S. Luciam* (2), «Roma e l’Oriente» XV (1918) 48-53; (3), XVI (1918) 106-115; (4), XVII (1919) 90-105
- schol. Ar. Nub.* *Scholia to Aristophanes’ Clouds*: D. Holwerda, *Jo. Tzetzae commentarii in Aristophanem, II: Commentarium in Nubes*, Groningen-Amsterdam 1960
- schol. Ar. Plut.* *Scholia to Aristophanes’ Plutus*: L. Massa Positano, *Jo. Tzetzae commentarii in Aristophanem, fasc. I: Prolegomena et commentarium in Plutum*, Groningen 1960
- schol. Ar. Ran.* *Scholia to Aristophanes’ Frogs*: W.J.W. Koster, *Jo. Tzetzae commentarii in Aristophanem, III: Commentarium in Ranas et in Aves, argumentum Equitum*, Groningen 1962
- schol. Hermog.* *Scholia to Hermogenes*: J.A. Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis Bibliothecarum Oxoniensium, IV*, Oxford 1837, 1-148
- schol. Hes. Op.* *Scholia to Hesiod’s Works and Days*: Th. Gaisford, *Poetae Graeci minores, III: Scholia ad Hesiodum*, Oxonii 1820
- schol. Lyc.* *Scholia to Lycophron*: E. Scheer, *Lycophronis Alexandra, II: Scholia*, Berolini 1908
- schol. Opp.* *Scholia to Oppian*: U. Cats Bussemaker, *Scholia et paraphrases in Nicandrum et Oppianum*, Paris 1849, 260-375
- Theog.* *Theogony*: P.A.M. Leone, *Ioannis Tzetzae Theogonia*, Lecce 2019
- Trag. poes.* *On Tragic Poetry*: G. Pace, *Giovanni Tzetzes. La poesia tragica*, Napoli 2011²

For a complete list of Tzetzes’ works and their respective editions see I.C. Nesseris, *Η παιδεία στην Κωνσταντινούπολη κατά τον 12ο αιώνα*, diss. Ioannina 2014, II, 515-540.

A neglected manuscript of Tzetzes' *Allegories from the Verse-chronicle*: First remarks

As Herbert Hunger noticed more than sixty years ago in a crucial article¹, John Tzetzes devoted many efforts to his *Verse-chronicle* (Μετρικὴ χρονικὴ βίβλος), which he wrote in dodecasyllables. He left it unfinished, because, in his own words (*Hist.* XII 399, 249-251), he realized that “everyone hated that which is technical and loved what is barbarous: what a misfortune!” (ἀτελῆ καὶ ταύτην / ἀφῆκα βλέπων σύμπαντας τὸ τεχνικὸν μισοῦντας, / τὰ βάρβαρα δὲ στέργοντας. ὃ συμφορᾶς ἐσχάτης). In Hunger’s plausible view, τὸ τεχνικὸν hinted at Tzetzes’ dodecasyllable, more ‘pure’ than the average Byzantine dodecasyllable, especially in the use of *dichronoi*, and, in Tzetzes’ view, the true heir to the iambic trimeter². Conversely, τὰ βάρβαρα was possibly an allusion to the «primitive political verse» or pentadecasyllable.

This incomplete work, which should have contained “the history of the world” (κόσμου ἱστορία), seems to be largely lost, except for some fragments. Two such fragments (and possibly a third one³) are short and are contained in the *Chiliades* (XI 396, 890-997, on Mysia, and XII 399, 259-290, on the Metonic cycle), where they stand out because of their metre. The longest and most important one, which we will

* My deepest gratitude goes to Gemma Storti and David Eichert, who generously helped me to improve the English text of this paper. Valeria Flavia Lovato, Enrico Emanuele Prodi, and Marco Barbero were kind enough to read this work in various stages of its writing, and I am very grateful to them for many detailed and valuable suggestions.

¹ Cf. H. Hunger, *Johannes Tzetzes. Die Allegorien aus der Verschronik. Kommentierte Textausgabe*, «JÖByz» IV (1955) 13-49: 13-17; see also Id., *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, II, München 1978, 59. Previously, the *Verse-chronicle* had been discussed in the general context of Tzetzes’ works by G. Hart, *De Tzetzarum nomine vitis scriptis*, Lipsiae 1880, 63, and C. Wendel, *Tzetzes, Johannes*, in *RE* VIIA (1948) 1959-2011: 2000-2001. It is unfortunate that, apparently, I.C. Nesseris did not make use of Hunger’s article for the entry about the *Verse-chronicle* in his most useful catalogue of works by Tzetzes: *Η παιδεία στην Κωνσταντινούπολη κατά τον 12ο αιώνα*, II, diss. Ioannina 2014, 515-526: 526 (VII.1).

² On Tzetzes’ “technical verse”, see the very useful remarks by G. Pace in Giovanni Tzetzes, *La poesia tragica*, Napoli 2007, 31-39. Cf. also Hunger, *Allegorien aus der Verschronik* cit. 13-14; on Byzantine prosody and metrics, see also M.D. Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres: Texts and Contexts*, II, Wien 2019, 265-383.

³ Hart, *o.c.* 63, and Wendel, *o.c.* 2000-2001, also ascribed to this work a passage in the *Chiliades* (XII 438, 713-721) dealing with crocodiles.

deal with here, was transmitted by manuscripts as an independent poem, variously entitled Ἰωάννου τοῦ Τζέτζου ἀλληγορίαι ἐκ τῆς χρονικῆς μετρικῆς βίβλου, or Ἐκ τῆς μετρικῆς χρονικῆς βίβλου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Τζέτζου ἀλληγορίαι, or Τοῦ μακαρίτου Τζέτζου περὶ ἀλληγορίας. In all likelihood, this is an excerpt from the first part of the *Verse-chronicle*, where Tzetzes exposed a typical Greek mythological cosmogony – interpreted, however, in allegorical terms.

Following Hunger's edition, these *Allegories from the Verse-chronicle* consist of 527 verses. After a preamble about the origin of allegory, described as “an Egyptian invention” (εὐρύημα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, v. 1) brought to Greece by Cadmos, Tzetzes divides “every written *logos*” into three groups: completely false texts, completely true texts, and mixed ones. The first category (like myths about Cronos eating his own children, Athena born from the head of Zeus and so on) makes sense only by means of an allegorical interpretation. The second category (i.e. the completely true texts) does not need any allegory: this is the case for the deeds of the Apostles. The third category has a plausible literal meaning (for instance, Egyptian Thebes has one hundred gates, and each of them, in time of war, has space for two hundred war chariots), but also a more hidden sense (in this case, that the city of Thebes, in time of war, disposed of twenty thousand chariots in total). In the same way, allegorical meanings can be decrypted according to the physical elements (στοιχειακῶς), or according to the passions of the soul (ψυχικῶς), or, finally, according to the “nature of the material facts” (ὡς πραγμάτων πέφυκεν ὑλικῶν φύσις), i.e. following a euhemeristic approach⁴.

The *Allegories from the Verse-chronicle* continue with sections (in apparently desultory order) dedicated to the allegorical interpretation of mythical characters and episodes. The list includes Cronos and Rhea, the birth and childhood of Zeus and his rise to power, Eros, the weddings of Prometheus and Peleus, the birth of Athena, Hephaestus, the episode of the apple of discord, the riot of the gods against Zeus and the bondage of Hera, Laomedon, Phaethon, the bondage of Ares and his liaison with Aphrodite, Atlas, Perseus and the Gorgons, Styx and Cerberos, and finally the fight between Typhon and Zeus. The text of these *Allegories*, as known so far, ended with

⁴ On the use of allegory in Tzetzes, see at least H. Hunger, *Allegorische Mythendeutung in der Antike und bei Johannes Tzetzes*, «JÖByz» III (1954) 35-54: 46-47; P. Cesaretti, *Allegoristi di Omero a Bisanzio: Ricerche ermeneutiche (XI-XII secolo)*, Milano 1991, 127-204 (esp. 147, 155, 193-194, where he points out that Tzetzes' division of allegory into physical, psychological and historical was heavily indebted to Psellos); P. Roilos, *Amphoteroglossia: A Poetics of the Twelfth-Century Medieval Greek Novel*, Washington D.C. 2005, 124-127; F. Pontani, *Scholarship in the Byzantine Empire (529-1453)*, in F. Montanari-S. Matthaios-A. Rengakos (edd.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Leiden-Boston 2015, 297-455: 379. See also Lauritzen, this volume.

two verses hinting at the abovementioned μάχη of Zeus against Typhon and the Titans. There is no real conclusion, even if the episode of Typhonomachy might indeed seem appropriate to bring to completion this wide excursus on the allegorical meanings of cosmogonical myths.

Hunger studied and explained the textual tradition of this fragment. The *editio princeps* appeared in 1616, edited and translated into Latin by the French “royal publisher” (*architypographus regius*) and scholar Frédéric Morel as *Ioannis Tzetzae allegoriae mythologicae, physicae, morales*. As Morel himself states in the title page, he obtained the text from a manuscript in possession of the Dutch diplomat Janus Rutgers. Morel hosted Rutgers as a student in Paris in the years 1611-1613 after the latter’s studies at Leiden with Voss, Scaliger, and Heinsius. His manuscript, which featured a badly corrupted text, is lost, and therefore Morel’s edition is a primary witness for its readings (its siglum is **Mo**). Rutgers’ manuscript contained a version of the *Allegories* that reached only up to verse 446, followed by a spurious verse which reads καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω καὶ ᾧδ’ ἔχει τέλος. Verses 1-147, however, are transmitted also by the late-twelfth-century manuscript Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana C 222 *inf.* (Martini-Bassi 886), siglum **A**, which is very hard to read and probably stems directly from the *milieu* of Tzetzes’ pupils⁵. This manuscript was used by Wilhelm Studemund and Carl Wendel. The next major advance in the knowledge of this little-known work by Tzetzes was the discovery by Hunger of manuscript Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Barb. gr.* 30 (siglum **B**, formerly dated to the fifteenth century but recently ascribed to the twelfth)⁶, containing about eighty plus-verses compared to Morel, but lacking the first part (vv. 41-527). This manuscript also contained scholia and glosses to the text of the *Allegories*⁷. Hunger supposed that, with the addition of the verses transmitted by the *Barberinianus*, the allegorical cosmogony was complete, and that Tzetzes meant for it to function as a preamble to his *Verse-chronicle*. Things, however, are different.

In 2013, Silvia Ronchey (whom I wish to thank once again) was kind enough to share with me her digital images of a low-quality microfilm of manuscript Al-

⁵ About the dating and origin of this famous manuscript, see C.M. Mazzucchi, *Ambrosianus C 222 inf. (Graecus 886): il codice e il suo autore*, «Aevum» LXXVII (2003) 263-275 and LXXVIII (2004) 411-437.

⁶ A description is found in H. Hunger, *Johannes Tzetzes, Allegorien zur Odyssee, Buch 13-24*, «ByzZ» XLVIII (1955) 4-38: 8. For the new dating see P.A. Agapitos, *John Tzetzes and the blemish examiners: a Byzantine teacher on schedography, everyday language and writerly disposition*, «MEG» XVII (2017) 1-57: 39 n. 199. A digital reproduction is available at https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Barb.gr.30.

⁷ For the events leading to the discovery of the lost part of the *Allegories*, see Hunger, *Allegorische Mythendeutung* cit. 45-46.

Iskandariyya, Βιβλιοθήκη του Πατριαρχείου 62 (olim 107). Ronchey was studying this manuscript for the edition of Eustathius of Thessalonike's *Exegesis in canonem iambicum*, which she and Paolo Cesaretti have recently published. The origin of the manuscript was interesting enough: in Ronchey's words, it was «produced within a scholarly circle in Constantinople at the end of the 13th century... the fact that [it was] used for research and élite instruction is shown by the almost constant flow of corrections and *additamenta* of *aliae manus* datable between the 14th and 16th century»⁸. The manuscript remained in Constantinople until the beginning of the seventeenth century, when it was presented to Cyril Loukaris, then Patriarch of Alexandria, who brought it to his patriarchal library⁹. As Ronchey pointed out to me, the *Alexandrinus* (for which I propose the siglum C) contains, among many exegetical works and homilies by various authors, also some works by Tzetzes. These texts include parts of his *Allegoriae in Iliadem*, and especially, at ff. 85v-88r, the Ἐκ τῆς μετρικῆς χρονικῆς βίβλου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Τζέτζου ἀλληγορίαι, as already stated by the old catalogue of Moschonas, which however gave no further information¹⁰. The existence of these passages was interesting enough in itself, since this manuscript apparently was not known to Hunger. A closer inspection has revealed, moreover, that the text of the *Alexandrinus* is the longest and most complete among all surviving testimonies of the *Allegories from the Verse-chronicle*, containing 633 verses written in three columns and accompanied by scholia. After v. 482 at f. 87v the text is written in a smaller hand. C has the first forty verses, which are lacking in B, and also 105 additional verses in the final section. Furthermore, this section culminates with a typical conclusion, which seems to indicate that the allegorical preamble to the *Verse-chronicle* really ended with v. 633.

The *Alexandrinus* is not easy to collate accurately, given the less-than-stellar quality of the reproductions and the unreadable sections in the manuscript, which is marred by stains and faded ink, especially at f. 86r¹¹. Nonetheless, a collation reveals something of its stemmatic position.

⁸ S. Ronchey, *Eustathios at Prodomos Petra? Some Remarks on the Manuscript Tradition of the Exegesis in Canonem Iambicum Pentecostalem*, in F. Pontani-V. Katsaros-V. Sarris (edd.), *Reading Eustathios of Thessalonike*, Berlin-Boston 2017, 181-197: 181.

⁹ See the detailed description in *Eustathii Thessalonicensis exegesis in canonem iambicum pentecostalem*, edd. P. Cesaretti-S. Ronchey, Berlin-München-Boston 2014, 201*-209*; see also Ronchey, *Eustathios at Prodomos Petra?* cit. 181-183.

¹⁰ See Th.D. Moschonas, *Κατάλογοι τῆς Πατριαρχικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης*, I: *Χειρόγραφοι*, Salt Lake City 1965² (Alexandria 1945¹), 53.

¹¹ Here are the *variae lectiones* I managed to gather, compared to Hunger's text: Tit. ἐκ τῆς μετρικῆς χρονικῆς βίβλου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Τζέτζου ἀλληγορίαι; 7 ἀπόρνοις; 8 τεθεικότες; 10 ἐν συμβόλοις; 20 κατεσθίων; 26 ᾶ; 28 οὕτως; 30 φέρη; 35 νομήσας; 43 δεικάδα; 46 τηρῆ; 49

First of all, the existence of an archetype can be postulated from errors that are common to the whole manuscript tradition. Hunger already singled out a number of these errors: v. 20: κατήσθιεν Hunger κατεσθίων **ACMo**; v. 26: ὁ Hunger ἃ **ACMo**; v. 62: τοὺς Hunger οὖς **ABCMo**; v. 141: τροφὸς Hunger τροφή **ABC** τροφῆς **Mo**; v. 263: αὐτὸ Hunger αὐτὸς **BCMo**; v. 312: ὄρμα Hunger ἔρμα **BMo** ἔρμ... **C**; v. 315: καὶ **BCMo**, del. Hunger; v. 419: ἐπομβρίαίς Hunger διομβρίαίς **BC** δι'ομβρίαίς **Mo**; v. 426: ὄρμων ἐλικτηρίων Hunger ὄρμιων ἐλικτριῶν **BCMo**; v. 440: λέγουσιν Hunger λέγοντες **BCMo**; v. 464: παρὺγρων ἐκδρομὸν Hunger παρ'ὺγροῖς ἐκδρομῶν **BC**; v. 482: ὄρκος Hunger ὄρκον **BC**; v. 483: εἰλημμένον Hunger λελειμμένῳ **BC**; v. 505: δεδεγμένον Hunger δεδεγμένος **BC**

Because the *Alexandrinus* is by far the most complete testimony, it seems clear that it is not a *descriptus* of some other extant manuscript. Conversely, neither **Mo**, nor **A**, nor **B** can derive from **C**. **C** and **Mo** lack verses which are transmitted by **B** (183a, 252a, 272a, 403a, 425a, 460, 478), and share many errors which separate them from **A** and **B**. It is possible to point out the following examples (the first *lectio* is the right one according to Hunger): v. 7: ἀπέρονοι **A** ἀπόρονοι **CMo**; v. 35: νοσήσας **A** νομήσας **C** νομίσας **Mo**; v. 75: γραφαῖς **AB** φωναῖς **CMo**; v. 140: Θέμις **AB** Θέτις **CMo**; v. 141: Ἴσις **AB** Ἰδη **C** Εἶδη* **Mo**; v. 193: ἀστέρα **B** ἀέρα **C**

δισμυριοστὸν; 50 εἰσφερούσης; 51 δεικάδα; 55 τὴν, ἣν προεῖπεν, ἀρμάτων δεικάδα; 59 ἵπποβρότου; 62 οὖς; 63 οὐδαμῆ; 64 οὖς; 65 μόνον; 73 οἷ; 74 ποσαπλῶς; 75 φωναῖς; 79 τοῦ; 86 ὁ πετανὸς (?); 87 εὐνοοῦσα; 111 πῶς δὲ and γένει; 128 μακρὰν γράφειν θέλων; 132 ὑλικὴν; 135 μῆν (for γῆν); 140 Θέτις; 141 Ἰδη; 151 δέ; 153 τὸ δὲ φαῖνον; 183a missing; 189 λαμπρὰν; 192 τῶν (for τὸν); 193 ἀέρα; 196 μὲν; 199 γράφαντες; 210 βραχὺ τι κίνημα; 213 ἀήρ τε καὶ γῆ καὶ πάλιν; 215 βραχὺ; 216 πέφηνε; 220 ξύμπας; 227 λαβὼν; 239 πλάττων; 245 γάμων; 252a missing; 255 τὴν; 256 μέσην; 258 ταρταρῶδεις; 263 αὐτὸς; 267 δὲ νόει; 272a missing; 273 αὐτῶν and γράφου (χρονο- added by a second hand); 300 Ἐριχθόνα; 301 ἐξ; 306 συνεζύγη; 312 τὲ and ἔρμ- ended by an abbreviation mark; 315 καὶ; 319 τὸν and μακροῖς; 332 κατωτάτω; 340 ὡς παῖς; 344 Ζεὺς ἄλλ'; 345 ἀτράκτων; 351 τούτων; 352 Ζεὺς, τὸ; 357 οὐπα; 362 διατρέχειν βίῳ; 363 παρεισφρῶν; 377 δι' αὐ; 378 τῶν ὑδάτων; 381 ἡλίου; 383 λαβὼν; 391 πᾶν (for πῦρ); 392 τὴν σύγκρασιν δέ; 394 θέα; 402 δόμον; 403a missing; 409 ἐκτεταμένους; 410 λεῶν; 414 πάας τε καὶ ζῶα πάντα τρέφει; 418 ἥλιος; 419 καὶ γῆν οὐρανὸν διομβρίαίς; 422 ἔφθασαν and δέ (for τε); 423 ἦ; 425a missing; 426 πορπύων and ὄρμιων ἐλικτριῶν; 428 συστροφαὶ δὲ τῶν; 430 διφρευτικῶν (?); 431 χρυσεμπόρων; 435 ταχὺς; 437 περιθραύσασαν; 439 πρὶν (for πῦρ); 440 λέγοντες; 442 καὶ; 446 ἂν τὸν; 447 ἐκπεσὼν; 452 Ἡφαιστικάις μηχαναῖς and συνειγμένον; 454 κεραστικὸν; 460 missing; 461 Ποσειδώνειος; 462 λύουσα; 464 παρ'ὺγροῖς ἐκδρομῶν; 466 ἐμπύρου; 467 χύσιν; 468 πη (for ὅπη) and ἄλαις; 474 αὐτό; 476 ἐφυῶς; 478 missing; 479 Πήδασος καὶ Χρυσάο; 481 αἰθερωθὲν and οὐρανὸς; 482 ὄρκον; 483 λελειμμένῳ; 485 τὸ νέρθεν; 486 Γίγαντα; 488 μάχην (for μένειν); 490 μεσητῆς (*i.m.* γρ. καὶ μεσῆτις); 492 ἥλιος ἥλιος; 494 νυχθημέρων and περιδρόμων; 496 ἄλλη; 502 κατέσχεν; 505 δεδεγμένος; 506 πρὶν (for πρὸς); 509 ἀθρόως; 516 ἐντειόσει νοῦν; 519 διττοῖς νῦν ἐπέγνωκας; 520 τὸ **C** (-v added by a second hand) and μάθης; 522 κ' ἔχηκεν; 524 νυχθημέρων; 525 αὐλοῖς and εἶπον (for ἔφην).

Mo; v. 196: πᾶς **B** μὲν **CMo**; v. 215: βαθὺ **B** βραχὺ **CMo**; v. 216: πέφυκε **B** πέφηγε **CMo**; v. 227: λαχὼν **B** λαβὼν **CMo**; v. 256: μέρους **B** μέσην **CMo**; v. 345: ἀτάκτων **B** ἀτράκτων **CMo**; v. 362: διεκτρέφειν βίον **B** διατρέχειν βίῳ **CMo**; v. 363: παρεισφρεῖν **B** παρεισφρῶν **CMo**; v. 377: τάδ' αὖ **B** δι' αὖ **CMo**; v. 383: λαχὼν **B** λαβὼν **CMo**; v. 403: δρόμον **B** δόμον **CMo**; v. 422: ἔφρασαν **B** ἔφθασαν **CMo**.

Could **Mo** derive from **C**? This possibility is excluded by the fact that **C** features some errors or slight inversions of words, which the careless scribe of **Mo** (which has the true reading) could not have corrected *suo Marte* (for instance: v. 10 ἀσυμβόλοις **Mo** ἀσυμβούλοις **A** ἐν συμβόλοις **C**; v. 210: βραχὺ κίνημά τι **BMo** βραχὺ τι κίνημα **C**; v. 266: νόει δὲ **B** νόει δ' (sic) **Mo** δὲ νόει **C**; v. 357: οὕτω **B** **Mo** οὕπω **C**; v. 431: χρυσεμπύρων **BMo** χρυσεμπόρων **C**).

It is likely, therefore, that **C** and **Mo** both derived from a common subarchetype, whose existence can be also postulated from the readings which the two manuscripts feature at v. 414: ὁ δ' αὖ πόας φύει τε καὶ ζῶα τρέφει **B** ὁ δ' αὖ πόας τε καὶ ζῶα πάντα τρέφει **C** ὁ δ' αὖ φύσεις τε καὶ ζῶα πάντα τρέφει **Mo**. Probably πόας or φύει had already disappeared in the subarchetype; πάντα was added to fill in the verse, and the missing word was later written in the margin or between the lines. **C** and **Mo** both choose a different reading (thinking that πόας was an alternative to φύει or vice versa), and **Mo** transformed φύει into the accusative φύσεις.

Agreement between **A** or **B** and a member of the family composed of **Mo** and **C**, therefore, can lead to a reconsideration of Hunger's choices: see for instance v. 50 εἰσφερούσης **CB**, v. 74 ποσαπλῶς **CA**, v. 87 εὐνοοῦσα **CBMo**, v. 111 πῶς δὲ **CAMo**, 319 σὺν μακροῖς ἄλλοις λόγοις **CB**.

In the section where **B** and **C** are the only testimonies (vv. 447-527), the latter quite often has readings that are clearly false, but sometimes it also shows *variantes adiaphorae* which need to be evaluated (such as 447: ἐμπεσὼν **B** ἐκπεσὼν **C**; 466: ἐκπύρου **B** ἐμπύρου **C**; 467: χύσις **B** χύσιν **C**; 494: νυχθημέρω **B** νυχθημέρων **C**; 519: διπλοῖς διεπέγνωκας **B** διττοῖς νῦν ἐπέγνωκας **C**; 520: μάθε **B** μάθης **C**); at other times **C** has even better readings, such as 461: Ποσειδώντειος **B** Ποσειδώνειος **C**; 462: λύσσασα **B** λύουσα **C**; 485: τοι νέρθε **B** τὸ νέρθεν **C**. A reading of the *Alexandrinus* in the previous part (v. 394) confirms an important emendation proposed by Paul Speck (θέα for θεά)¹².

But the most important contribution of the *Alexandrinus* to the *constitutio textus*, of course, consists of the new final verses contained in f. 88r. Unfortunately,

¹² Cf. P. Speck, *Zu Johannes Tzetzes, Allegorien aus der Verschronik*, «RhM» n.F. CII (1959) 95-96.

in order to provide a fully reliable edition, one would need to inspect the manuscript in person (possibly with the help of a blacklight for some passages where the ink has faded), or at least to have better reproductions. So far I have not been able to reach either goal, but I trust that this will be possible in the future; for the time being, I hope that even an interim edition, with all its shortcomings, will be of some utility for a better understanding of this little-known fragment from one of the more ambitious – and more unlucky – works by Tzetzes. The text¹³ and its translation will be subdivided according to the main allegorical themes discussed by Tzetzes, so as to discuss, albeit very briefly, their significance and the major issues that they raise.

The 'new' verses begin with a concluding line attached, as it seems, to the previous section, where Zeus' victories against Typhon and the Titans are listed. This list is now completed by a reference to Zeus' triumph over the Giants with the help of Heracles' arrows (v. 528: Διός τε νίκην ἐκ βελῶν Ἡρακλέους, "and Zeus' victory by means of Heracles' arrows"), which is duly explained as the victory of the sun, by means of his rays, over the unruly elements. Then follows an allegorizing section about Heracles who injured, again with his arrows, Hera and Hades (as hinted at in the *Iliad*, V 392-400). This is the allegorical interpretation of the episode by Tzetzes:

...Διός τε νίκην ἐκ βελῶν Ἡρακλέους.
 Κίνδυνος ἦν γὰρ συγκρουβῆναι καὶ πάλιν
 τὴν εἰδοποιὸν (εἰδοποιῶν ms.) κοσμαγωγὸν οὐσίαν¹⁴, 530
 χύσει πυρός τε καὶ καταιγίδων στρόφοις
 ἔστ' ἂν ὁ λαμπρὸς ἥλιος, γῆς τὸ κλέος,
 ἀνεῖλεν αὐτοὺς ἐκκενῶν οἷα βέλη
 τὰς χρυσοειδεῖς τοξικὰς λαμπηδόνας.

...and Zeus' victory by means of Heracles' arrows. For there was danger that the essence which creates the forms and leads the universe [530] would be concealed again by the stream of fire and the twistings of the hurricanes, until the bright sun, the glory of the earth (= Heracles), neutralized them by pouring his splendid golden rays like arrows.

¹³ Punctuation is mine; accentuation has been adapted to modern conventions, except in the cases where it can have metrical significance. I use three asterisks to signal places which, despite all efforts on my part, I was not able to read.

¹⁴ Cf. vv. 373-374: κίνδυνον εἶχε συγκρουβῆναι καὶ πάλιν / τὴν ὑλικὴν ἄρθρωσιν εἰς κοσμοργίαν.

Τοξεύματα ταῦτα¹⁵ δὲ ποῦ¹⁶ φρασὶ¹⁷ πάλιν 535
 ἐξευστοχοῦντος ἐν βολαῖς Ἡρακλέους
 Ἦρας τε μαζοῦ δεξιῦ τριπλῶ βέλει
 Ἄιδου τε νώτων τοῦ μαιφονωτάτου,
 ὕφ' ὧν χρόνος τε καὶ στροφή¹⁸ (ms. στροφῶν) νυχθημέρων
 ἔχουσι τὴν κίνησιν ἀρραγεστάτην. 540
 Νυχθημέρων γὰρ σφαιρικῶ περιδρομῶ
 κάτω κατελθὼν ἥλιος γῆς εἰς ζόφον,
 ἐκ τῶν ὀπισθεν καὶ μερῶν τῆς ἐσπέρας
 ὡσπερ διώκων ἐν βολαῖς τοξευμάτων,
 τὴν νύκτα ποιεῖ πρὸς τὸ γῆς ἄνω τρέχειν. 545
 Νυχθημέρων¹⁹ μὲν οὗτος ἡλίου δρόμος
 ἐκ δεξιῶν δὲ καὶ μερῶν τῶν τῆς ἕω,
 πᾶς ἐν λόγοις γὰρ δεξιὰ ταῦτα λέγει,
 βάλλων σελασμοῖς ἐν τριπλοῖς τὸν αἰθέρα,
 ὠρῶν μόνη γὰρ ἦν τὸ πρὶν τρικαιρία, 550
 ποιῶν δρόμοις μὲν ἡμέρας ἀκουσίας

[535] This kind of arrows, I believe, are meant again when Heracles, using the bow, transfixes with a triple dart the right breast of Hera, and the back of most murderous Hades. It is thanks to them that time and the cycle of the days [540] have their unceasing movement. For the sun, in the circular orbit of the days, going down into the darkness of the earth, as if it were chasing the night from behind and from the Western parts by the launch of arrows, [545] causes it to run up over the earth. This is the daily course of the sun, from the right and the Eastern parts – for every learned man calls them “right” – which hits the ether with triple brilliance [550] (for previously there were only three seasons), creating the recalcitrant days through its mobile courses

¹⁵ For the lengthening of short *dichronoi*, even in “technical” iambs, in the final syllable of a word, see Pace, *o.c.* 32.

¹⁶ The accentuation of this indefinite adverb occurs often in Tzetzes: see Pace, *o.c.* 27. In this case, the accentuation can have metrical reasons (the caesura must fall after δέ).

¹⁷ The accent can be explained by the lengthening of ι *in arsi*. See Pace, *o.c.* 29.

¹⁸ Cf. Tzetzes, *Schol. Hes. Op.* 412 Gaisford: ...τὴν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦν ἔφην νυχθημερησίαν περιστροφὴν. The phrase ἡ τῆς ἡμέρας στροφή occurs in Maximus Planudes, *Macrobii commentarii in Somnium Scipionis in linguam Graecam translati*, I 6,60,9 Megas.

¹⁹ Enrico Emanuele Prodi proposes the emendation νυχθήμερος (adjective).

πλάνησι τὴν σφαῖραν δὲ τὴν πᾶσαν τρέχων²⁰
καὶ κύκλον αὐτὸν (αὐτῶν ms.) ἐκπεραίνει τοῦ χρόνου,
καὶ δέσμα φασὶν τοῦτο τοῦ Προμηθέως
ἠφαιστίας (ἠφαιστεΐαις ms.) τέχνασιν ἐν τῷ Καυκάσῳ. 555

and going around the whole (celestial) sphere, and it completes the cycle of the year itself, and they call this the chains of Prometheus, [555] (created) by the arts of Hephaestus in the Caucasus.

Among the many observations that could be made, we can limit ourselves to saying that Tzetzes' interpretation of Heracles as an allegory of the sun is different from the traditional, Stoic view of Heraclitus (33-34²¹), shared also by Eustathius (*Comm. in Il.* II pp. 105-106 van der Valk), according to which Heracles is the symbol of the *emphron kai sophos* man. The hero as a symbol of the sun, however, recurs below and elsewhere in Tzetzes (see *De generatione deorum* p. 103 Cramer = 366 Matrangola), and also John Galenos (pp. 318 and 359 Flach)²².

The final verses of the first section announce the protagonist of the second one, that is Prometheus, the symbol of time. After an initial reference to the Titan's marriage, which he had already dealt with (vv. 289, 318-327) along with Peleus' wedding (also hinted at in a previous section, vv. 328-387), Tzetzes focuses on the myth of Prometheus' imprisonment in the Caucasus. The Titan was tormented by an eagle, which day by day devoured his liver, which was destined to grow again in the night. This episode is interpreted in all three manners of allegory expounded in the prologue: according to the elements, as the life-giving effect of the alternation of night and day and of the celestial rotation, along with the heat and the regulating power of the sun; according to the passions of the soul, as the soul tormented by anxieties by day and resting by night; and according to historical reality, Prometheus is seen as an ancient benefactor of humanity.

Γάμοι Προμηθέως μέν, ὡς καὶ πρὶν ἔφη,
ἢ σφαιρικὴ κίνησις εἰς χρόνου δρόμον

Prometheus' wedding, as I said before, is the circular movement in the path

²⁰ Cf. v. 590: πᾶσαν δρομῶν πλάνησι τὴν σφαῖραν δρομοῖς.

²¹ See also the commentary in *Eraclito. Questioni omeriche: Sulle allegorie di Omero in merito agli dèi*, a c. di F. Pontani, Pisa 2005, 304.

²² On whom see Roilos, *o.c.* 128-130.

ἤπερ²³ προμηθῶς πάντα τῷ βίῳ φέρει,
 κἄν οὐ κατέσχε συγχύσει νικωμένη
 ὡς ἦν ἔφην γῆν Πηλέως πρὶν ἐν γάμοις²⁴. 560
 Τὰ νῦν δὲ τὴν στήριξιν εἰς χρόνου δρόμους,
 τὰ πάντα δρῶντος ἐν βίῳ Προμηθέως,
 τὴν ἦν ἐπεστήριξεν ἡλίου δρόμος
 εἰς ῥωστικὴν θερμὴν τε καὶ ζωοτρόφον
 κινῶν ἑαυτὸν ἐξ ἐνύγρων οὐσίας, 565
 ἀλληγοροῦντες φασὶν οὐκ ἀπεικίτως
 ἠφαιστόδεσμα Καυκάσῳ Προμηθέως·
 τὸ καυστικὸν γὰρ καὶ ζέον κεκραμένον
 ῥυθμῷ κατεστήριξε τὴν χρόνου βᾶσιν.
 Τὸν ἠπατοτρόκτην δὲ νῦν ὄρνιν μέγα<ν> 570
 καὶ τὴν ἀνεξάλειπτον ἠπάτων φύσιν
 καὶ τίς τὸν ὄρνιν πῶς τε τοξεύει μάθε.
 Τὴν σφαιρικὴν κίνησιν, αὐτὸν τὸν χρόνον
 τὸ πᾶν προμηθῶς εἰσφοροῦντα τῷ βίῳ,
 Προμηθεῖα λέγουσιν οὐκ ἀπεικίτως 575
 δεθέντα δεσμοῖς οἷς ἔφην Ἡφαιστίοις (τοῦ Ἡφαιστίου ms.)²⁵.

of time, whereby he providently brings everything to life, although, vanquished by confusion, the movement did not stand, [560] like the earth, as I said before in the wedding of Peleus; but now the fixation made by the path of the sun in the path of time (that is, of Prometheus, who does everything in life), so that it be strengthening, warm and nutritive [565] (and the path of the sun obtains this by mixing itself with the essence of humidity), not without reason they call it allegorically chains of Hephaestus in the Caucasus for Prometheus, since the burning and boiling element, mitigated, has regulated the pace of time. [570] But now learn about the liver-eating bird, and the indelible nature of the liver, and who shot the bird with arrows, and how. The circular movement, time itself, which providently brings everything to life, [575] not without reason they call it Prometheus, tied with the chains of Hephaestus I mentioned above.

²³ C usually marks the iota subscript only with dative articles, but here it is traced with insistence, as if to be sure that the reader will not miss it.

²⁴ Tzetzes talks about the wedding of Peleus and Thetis at vv. 349-366.

²⁵ I follow Enrico Emanuele Prodi's suggestion in printing Ἡφαιστίοις. The reading of C presents two problems: a hiatus (but for occurrences of hiatus after an article in the dodecasyllable, see

<O>²⁶ σφαιρικὸς τάχιστος αἰετὸς δρόμος
 ὃς δεξιῶν μέρους τε καὶ τοῦ τῆς ἔω,
 ἐν δεξιῶν δὲ καὶ θέσις τῶν ἠπάτων,
 ἀνατρέχων ἄνω μὲν εἰς τὸν [τῆς]²⁷ γῆς τόπον 580
 τὴν ἡμέραν ἄγει τε καὶ κατεσθίει
 ὡς ἦπαρ οὖσαν δεξιῶν τεθειμένην·
 ἐν τῷ τρέχειν δὲ τὸν νυκτὸς κάτω κύκλον,
 ὡς πρὶν πάλιν πρόεισιν ἐντελεστάτη,
 οὕτω παρραρεῖ καὶ πάλιν δὲ γίνεται²⁸ 585
 τοῖς ἐξ *** σφαιρικοῖς περιδρομοῖς
 ἔστ' ἂν τὸν ὄρνιν, τὴν φορὰν τῆς ἡμέρας,
 ὁ κλεινὸς αὐτὸς Ἡρακλῆς καὶ φωσφόρος
 κτείνῃ βολ*** (βολαῖσι?²⁹) τερματώσας τὸν χρόνον,
 πᾶσαν δραμῶν πλάνησι τὴν σφαῖραν δρόμοις. 590
 Ψυχῆς Προμηθεὺς ἢ προμηθεῖα πάλιν,
 ὁ δ' αἰετὸς πέφυκεν ἄλγος φροντίδων·

The very swift eagle is the circular course, which from the right and the Eastern parts – the liver too is located on the right – [580] running over the earth leads and devours the day, located on the right like a liver; the same day, however, in traveling the lower orbit of the night becomes again perfectly intact, [585] and in this way vanishes and returns again by means of the ... celestial orbits, until the noble and light-bringer Heracles with his arrows (?) kills the bird, which is the movement of the day, thus bringing the year to an end, [590] after having travelled across all the celestial sphere through the mobile courses. Prometheus is also the foresight of the soul, and the eagle is the pain of anxieties;

Lauxtermann, *o.c.* 300-301) and, most of all, the length of the penultimate syllable, which seems hardly acceptable despite the metrical licenses allowed with proper names.

²⁶ Some initial letters in C are rubricated (vv. 1, 21, 30, 184, 223, 286, 292, 305), and possibly its antigraph (i.e. the subarchetype?) featured similar rubrications. In this case the disappearance of the initial omicron may be due to a blank space which was not filled up by the appropriate 'drop cap', as in the case of the similar false reading of C at v. 468 (πη for ὄπη at the beginning of the verse).

²⁷ One of the two articles must be deleted for metrical reasons; since the author often uses γῆς without the article (see for instance vv. 532, 542, 545), it seems more advisable to expunge τῆς.

²⁸ In this poem there seem to be some exceptions to the rule of the stress on the penultimate syllable (e.g. vv. 213, 225).

²⁹ For the -αῖσι ending, see v. 555.

ἡ νύξ δὲ παύει τῶν μεριμνῶν τοὺς πόνους,
 ἄν δ' ἡμέρα πρόεισι φροντίδες ***³⁰
 ἕως θανάων τις ἐκμετρήσῃ τὸν βίον 595
 πέρας λαβόντος ἡλίου τοῦτο[ν] χρόνου.
 Ἔν καὶ Προμηθεὺς πρακτικὸς λελεγμένος
 εὐρῶν τὰ πολλὰ πρὸς τὸ χρήσιμον βίου,
 στοιχειακῶς δὲ ταῦτα τῶν ἀπροσφόρων,
 δεσμὰ Προμηθέως δὲ στοιχείων λόγοις 600
 τοὺς σφαιρικοὺς λέγουσιν εὐτάκτους δρόμους.

while the night causes the pain of worries to cease, if the day arrives the anxieties ... (come back?), [595] until one dying ends his life, the sun having received this limit of time. There was talk also of a real Prometheus, who invented many things useful for life; however, at the elemental level, this is not relevant. [600] By the chains of Prometheus instead, in an elemental sense, they mean the well-ordered circular courses.

The equivalence between the liver-eating eagle and the κατὰ τὸν βίον φροντίδες appears already in Cornutus, 32; this interpretation is shared also by John Galenos in his *Allegory to Hesiod's Theogony* (p. 336 Flach). Prometheus as a benefactor of humanity (γραμμάτων διδάσκαλος, “teacher of letters”, to be precise) is mentioned also in Tzetzes' *Exegesis of the Iliad*, pp. 85-86 Papatomopoulos; in the scholia to the same work there is also a lengthy discussion of the allegorical meanings of the myth of Prometheus, which starts from his historical existence as an Egyptian king (pp. 433-435 Papatomopoulos; see also p. 15). He was worried by the floods of the Nile (the eagle eating his liver), which were controlled with the help of the devices invented by the “historical” Heracles (allegorized by the arrows). Then the scholion delves into the psychic and elemental interpretation, in a very similar way to the *Allegories from the Verse-chronicle*³¹.

³⁰ Enrico Emanuele Prodi suggests the interesting integration πάρα.

³¹ See pp. 434-435 Papatomopoulos: καὶ αὕτη μὲν περὶ Προμηθέως ἀλληγορία ῥητορικὴ καὶ πραγματικὴ ἢ δὲ ψυχικὴ καὶ φιλόσοφος τοιαύτη ἐστίν· Προμηθεὺς ἐστὶν ἡ ἡμετέρα προμήθεια, ἀετὸς δὲ αἰ τοῦ βίου φροντίδες, αἰ τὸ ἡμῶν ἦπαρ κατατρώχουσαι· Ἡρακλῆς δὲ ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ὁ χρόνος τῆς ζωῆς, ὃς πληρωθεὶς τοξεύει τὸν ἀετὸν, ἦγουν τὰς ἡμῶν ἀποπαύει φροντίδας· μετὰ γὰρ θάνατον τῶν πολυμύχθων φροντίδων παυόμεθα. Στοιχειακῶς δὲ προμηθειαν δεῖ σε νοεῖν τὸ κατὰ θεοῦ βούλημα καθ' ἡμᾶς τοιαύσδε κινήσεως τετυχημέναι τὸν οὐρανόν· κατὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκτὸς τὸ καθ' Εἰμαρμένης βουλὴν οὕτω τὸν οὐρανὸν τυχεῖν τῆς κινήσεως ἢν εἰσαεὶ κινούμενος πέφυκε ... ἀετὸς δὲ ὁ τὸ ἦπαρ ἐσθίων ἢ ἀεικίνητος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κίνησις, ἀπὸ τῶν δεξιῶν ἦγουν ἀνατολικῶν γινομένη, δι' ἣν ὁ νυχθήμερος ἀποτελεῖται καιρὸς· ὅστις δὴ

The next section is again about Heracles: this time, Tzetzes focuses on his twelve labours.

Ἡρακλέους ἄθλους γε τοῦτο φασί που
 Εὐρυσθέως ὠθοῦντος εἰς αὐτὸν πόνους·
 τὸν γὰρ ἀεικίνητον οὐρανοῦ δρόμον
 τὸν συμπεριστρέφοντα καὶ τὸν φωσφόρον 605
 Εὐρυσθέα καλοῦσιν ἐκ τῶν φωσφόρων³²,
 θέει γὰρ, ὡς ἔφημεν, οὐκ ἔχων στάσιν
 τόκοις τε φασὶν προδραμεῖν Ἡρακλέους
 ἀνθ' οὐπερ αὐτῷ προσταγέντων τῶν πόνων.
 Ὁ Ζεὺς τελῶν γὰρ πνεῦμα τῆς εἰδουργίας 610
 ἔασε[ν δὲ] κόσμον εἰς διαρθρώσεις τρέχειν
 λαβόντα (λαβόντες ms.) τὴν σύμπηξιν ἦνπερ νῦν ἔχει,
 Ἡρακλέους γίγαντος, ἡλίου λέγω,
 [τούς] σωτηρικοὺς τρέχοντος ἐν ζώοις δρόμους,

They mean this, I believe, by the labours of Heracles, when Euristheus inflicted pains upon him: in fact the perpetual course of the sky, [605] which spins around and brings the light, they call it Eurystheus from the light-bringing (stars), since, as we have said, it runs (*theei*) without pause, and they say that in the birth he preceded Heracles, and because of this the labours were inflicted upon him. [610] For Zeus, being the spirit of specification, allowed the universe to be differentiated, taking the configuration it has now, when the mighty Heracles – the sun, I mean – travels salvific paths

καιρὸς ὁ νυχθήμερος τὸν χρόνον καὶ τὰ ἐν χρόνῳ ἐσθίει, τοξεύεται δὲ ὑπὸ Ἡρακλέους, ἡγουν ἡλίου· οὕτω γὰρ ὁ χρόνος ἀποπληροῦται διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἡλίου κινήσεως, "...and this one is the rhetorical and historical allegory about Prometheus; the psychic and philosophical one is the following. Prometheus is our foresight, and the eagle the anxieties of life, which devour our liver; Heracles is the sun and the time of life, which when is completed shoots with arrows the eagle, that is, stops our anxieties, for after death we are free from toilsome anxieties. But in an elemental sense, you need to think of "providence" as the fact that the sky obtained this movement according to God's will towards us, while for the pagans it is the fact that the sky obtained its unceasing natural movement according to Destiny's will ... The eagle devouring the liver is the perpetual movement of the sky, happening from the right, that is, from the East, by which the period corresponding to a day and a night is completed; and the period of day and night which eats the year and what's in a year, this is shot with arrows by Heracles, that is, by the sun: for in this way the year is completed by the movement of the sun."

³² This repetition from the previous verse is somewhat suspect.

ἀλλὰ παρηπάτησε τὴν εἰδουργίαν 615
 τὸ πῦρ διαρθρὲν εἰς ἀτάκτους ἐκχύσεις,
 τὸν οὐρανὸν κινεῖ δὲ καὶ πρὸ ἡλίου
 κᾶν εἶχε τὴν κίνησιν ἀστατουμένην,
 ἕως τὸ κλεινὸν πνεῦμα τῆς εἰδουργίας
 τὴν σύγχυσιν ἔριψε³³, τὴν Ἄτην, κάτω 620
 τὸ<v> ἥλιον δ' ἔταξεν ἐν σφαίρᾳ τρέχειν
 τοὺς δωδεκαπλοῦς ἀθλικοὺς (-πλῶς -κῶς ms.) περιδρόμους,
 οὗ θερμοῦτος μὲν ἀέρι μεμιγμένη
 ἐκ τῆς ἕρας τε καὶ χθονὸς πάντα φύει.

amid the Zodiac³⁴. [615] But the specification was deceived by the fire that erupted into disordered flows, and it (instead of the sun) moved the sky, although the movement was inconstant, until the noble spirit of the specification [620] threw down Ate, the confusion, and arranged for the sun to travel the twelve-fold orbits of his labours along the (celestial) sphere; and it is the heat of the sun that, mixed with the air, makes everything grow from the ground and from the earth.

The equation between Heracles and the sun is well known (see above), and the final verses are somewhat clarified by the scholia: v. 615 is glossed as πῶς ἠπάτησεν ἡ Ἥρα τὸν Δία, and then v. 620 as τοῦτο δὲ τὸ «αὐτίκα δ' εἶλ' Ἄτην κεφαλῆς λιπαροπλοκάμοιο», with a quotation of *Iliad* XIX 126, which describes Zeus' anger after he realized that Hera deceived him in order to deprive Heracles of the kingdom that rightfully belonged to him. Tzetzes interpreted the episode through a "historical" allegory in his *Allegories to the Iliad* (XIX 52-80 Boissonade and Matrangola) and *Chiliades* (II 36, 171-214). The final verse (ἐκ τῆς ἕρας τε καὶ χθονὸς πάντα φύει) is glossed as a reference to the mythical Erichthonios (τὶς στοιχειοκῶς ὁ Ἐριχθόνιος ὁ ἐκ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς γεννηθεὶς καὶ τοῦ Ἥφαιστου), whose name is interpreted as a compound of ἕρα and χθών also in *Scholia in Lycophronem* 111, 37-45 and above in this same fragment (vv. 298-302). Hunger connected the identification of Heracles' twelve labours with the Zodiac, traversed by the sun in its yearly path, to the method ascribed to Metrodoros of Lampsacus³⁵. This identification

³³ The form with a single *rho*, for metrical reasons, occurs also at v. 629. On the use of such «metrical stratagems» by Byzantine poets, see Lauxtermann, *o.c.* 283.

³⁴ Literally, "amid the animated beings (*zoa*)": I follow Enrico Emanuele Prodi's suggestion for the meaning.

³⁵ See Hunger, *Allegorische Mythendeutung* cit. 52.

appears also in Tzetzes' *Allegories to the Iliad* (VIII 158-175 Boissonade = VIII 161-178 Matranga), and it is remembered also by Tzetzes' contemporary John Galenos, p. 360 Flach: εὐλόγως δὲ καὶ πάνυ σοφῶς ὁ Ἡρακλῆς λέγεται τὴν Ἥβην λαβεῖν εἰς γυναικα τελέσας τοὺς ἄθλους ἐκείνους τοὺς δώδεκα· τὰ γὰρ δώδεκα ζώδια περιπολεύσας ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ ἀπλῶς τὸν ἅπαντα ζωδιακὸν δι' ἐνιαυτοῦ πληρώσας, ἔκ τοτε πάλιν, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἄλλης ἀρχῆς, ἠβιάσκων ἡμῖν ἀνατέλλει ἐν ἔαρι, "With good reason and in a very wise way it is said that Heracles married Hebe, having accomplished his famous twelve tasks. For the sun, having traversed the twelve signs of the Zodiac, and in a word having completed the whole Zodiac in a year, then being young once again, like a new beginning, rises for us in Spring."

After a short section about Cypris, interpreted as the force of generation, there is a conclusion (separated from the preceding verses by a *dikolon* and *paragraphos*, followed by a blank space) where Tzetzes, with his usual aggressiveness, dismisses the attacks of his critics.

Ἡ δ' αὖ Κύπρις τε καὶ κεκραμμένη³⁶ φύσις 625
 εἰς Κύπρον (Κύπριν ms.) ἦλθεν εἰς πορισμὸν τοῦ κύειν
 καὶ πάντα γεννᾷ πρὸς τὸ χρήσιμον βίου.
 Εἰ δυσσεβῆ τε καὶ περιψυχρα τάδε,
 εἰ μέτρα Μούσης δυσσεβοῦς ἐρριμμένης³⁷
 καὶ ῥητόρων λόγων τε (δὲ ms.) καὶ μεταρσίων 630
 ἄμοιρα φησὶν ἢ σοφῆ κουστωδία (κουστουδία ms.),
 πείθεσθε δ' ὑμεῖς τοῖς σοφοῖς τούτων λόγοις·
 ἔστω, δοκεῖτω³⁸ τοιαδί, κριταὶ λόγων³⁹.

[625] And in turn Cypris, the tempered nature, reached Cyprus to provide procreation, and she generates everything for the utility of life. If the gang of the know-all says that these verses are profane and tasteless, rhythms of a profane and careless Muse, [630] bereft of rhetorical and lofty words, and you believe their wise words: well, let it be that way, literary critics!

³⁶ Tzetzes adopted the form with double *my* for metrical reasons.

³⁷ Cf. Him. *Or.* XLVI 4-6 τίς ἐρριμμένην τε καὶ ἄτιμον μοῦσαν οἶον δὴ τι μέγα καὶ πάγκαλον τῶν σῶν εἴσω παράγειν ὧτων ἀνέπεισεν; Tzetzes, *schol. Hist.* IV *ep. ad Lach.*, 779, τὰ ἀστείσματα ἐν μόνῳ ἐγράφη τῷ πρωτογράφῳ χάριτι, ἐν τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν δὲ μεταγραφαί φεῖσι τῆδε οὐκ ἐτέθεσαν ὡς ἐρριμμένα καὶ ἀτελῆ καὶ ἰδιότιδος μούσης καὶ ἀγοραίας.

³⁸ Cf. Lib. *Decl.* XIX 1,33: Βούλεσθε <θῶ>, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, φείσεσθαί μου τὸν ἄνθρωπον, πρῶγμα ἀμήχανον; ἔστω, δοκεῖτω.

³⁹ Cf. Aeschin. *In Ctesiphontem* 50: Ὑμεῖς δ' ἡμῖν ἔσεσθε τῶν λόγων κριταί.

The reference to the arrival of Aphrodite in Cyprus probably alludes to Hesiod, *Theogony* 193, with a pareymology of the name of the island that is also in John Galenos, p. 310 Flach: εἰκότως δὲ λέγεται τὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μήδεα ἐν τῇ Κύπρῳ πεσεῖν ἢ καταβληθῆναι, παρόσον ὁ τόπος γονιμώτατός ἐστι καὶ τοῦ κύειν ποριστικός.

The final tirade, instead, is very typical of Tzetzes; another fragment of the *Verse-chronicle* also ends with a rant against his critics (*Chiliades* XI 396, 978-989). The end of the text transmitted by the *Alexandrinus* is particularly remarkable for its evocation of the σοφὴ κουστωδία of Tzetzes' enemies. His commentaries are studied with invectives against this "gang of know-all", identifiable with the "official" teachers operating at the so-called Patriarchal School and Senate of the Philosophers⁴⁰. One of the most graphic is a scholion to Thucydides I 123,2, which reads:

τὰς συγγραφὰς κρίνειν δὲ τεχνικῶς τρόπῳ
 σκύλλου τε τοῦδ' καὶ παλαιῶν καὶ νέων
 Τζέτζου μόνου χάρισμα δυσμαθεστάτου,
 ἢ φύρσις ὄνπερ καὶ χυδαιότης βίου
 ἐγγωνιῶντα τῇ Στοᾷ καὶ τῇ Θόλῳ
 σύρει διαμπάζ, ἢ σοφὴ κουστωδία,
 ἀνθ' οὗπερ αὐτοῖς οὐδαμῶς συνειστρέχει
 ὅτι τέ φησι τεχνικῶς δεόν γράφειν
 πεζοῖς ὁμοῦ λόγοις τε καὶ τοῖς ἐν μέτρῳ,
 φύρειν δὲ μηδὲν μηδαμοῦ τὰ τῆς τέχνης.

«To judge according to the criteria of *technē* the writings / of this puppy [scil. Thucydides], of the ancients and the recent authors, / is the prerogative of Tzetzes, the most ignorant man: / as he crawls in a corner of the Stoa or of the Rotunda, / the learned guard, the coarse and confuse / mass of his time, targets and ridicules him / because he never rushes to chime in with their opinions, / and argues that one should write according to the *technē*'s norm / both in poetry and in prose, / not polluting in any respect the principles of the *technē*»⁴¹.

⁴⁰ See M.J. Luzzatto, *Tzetzes lettore di Tuciddide: note autografe sul codice Heidelberg Palatino Greco 252*, Bari 1999, 52-55, who recalls passages from the *Commentaries to Aristophanes* such as in *Nub.* 242, p. 442,7 Holwerda; in *Ran.* 259a, p. 772,11 Koster, 507a pp. 836,2, 12 and 837,3 Koster (this passage has been translated and discussed also by Agapitos, *o.c.* 28-32); in *Plut.* 1098, pp. 221,19 and 222,5 Massa Positano; *Iambi* 1,80;

⁴¹ Translation by F. Pontani, *Scholarship* cit. 384-385. See also Luzzatto, *o.c.* 49-55.

This passage is followed by a praise of *technai* and a *psogos* of the ignoramuses trying to subvert them:

πηγαὶ γάρ εἰσι τῷ βίῳ καλῶ τέχναι·
 ὅστις δ' ἀναιρεῖν τοὺς τεχνῶν λόγους θέλει,
 οὗτος παρεισφρεῖ κοπρεῶνα τῷ βίῳ,
 ὦν ἐκ συωδῶν, ἐξ ἀτέχνων βαρβάρων.

Technai in fact are the sources for good life, / and whoever wants to destroy them, / he introduces a dunghill into life, coming from swinish and ignorant barbarians.

The scholion is in the iambic dodecasyllables that Tzetzes (who was very proud of them) called *technikoi*⁴²; and the ‘technical’ dodecasyllable, as stated above, was also the metre of the *Verse-chronicle* and of its preamble constituted by allegories to cosmogonical myths. It may not be a coincidence that this preamble, in the fullest version preserved by the *Alexandrinus* (of which today I tried to provide an interim edition and translation), ends with the proud and scornful mention of the “gang of the know-alls”: the versification of a world chronicle, starting from the mythical cosmogony and its allegorical interpretation, was part of an ongoing and life-long crusade against his ignorant rivals, and the metrical form, far from being a superfluous habit, was for Tzetzes a fundamental component of his being an *entechnos* teacher.

TOMMASO BRACCINI
 tommaso.braccini@unisi.it

⁴² See Luzzatto, *o.c.* 20.