

John Tzetzes. *Allegories of the Odyssey*. Transl. by ADAM J. GOLDWYN and DIMITRA KOKKINI (Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 56). Cambridge, Massachusetts – London: Harvard University Press 2019. xxiv, 347 pp. – ISBN: 978-0-67-423837-4 (\$35.00)

- VALERIA F. LOVATO, Centre for Medieval Literature, University of Southern Denmark (lovato@sdu.dk)

John Tzetzes, one of the most prominent literati of 12<sup>th</sup>-century Byzantium, is well known to both Classicists and Byzantinists for his Homeric writings, among which feature the *Allegories of the Iliad* and the *Allegories of the Odyssey*, both written in the so-called political verse. As one can gather from their title, these two works aimed at providing an allegorical interpretation of the Homeric poems. Differently from Tzetzes' hexametric *Carmina Iliaca* and his prose *Exegesis of the Iliad*, however, the *Allegories* primarily targeted the imperial court and the members of the Komnenian aristocracy. Indeed, before being sponsored by the noble Konstantinos Kotertzes, the vast *Allegories of the Iliad* were initially commissioned by none other than the first wife of Manuel I, the empress Eirene, born Bertha of Sulzbach. In 2015, ADAM GOLDWYN and DIMITRA KOKKINI produced the first English translation of this extensive work, published within *The Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library* series. For the same collection, they now propose to do the same with the later *Allegories of the Odyssey*.

As all the volumes belonging to *The Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library*, the book under review is beautifully produced and carefully edited.<sup>1</sup> The Greek text with facing English translation is preceded by an introduction and followed by a “Note on the Text” (pp. 285–286), where GOLDWYN and KOKKINI briefly present HERBERT HUNGER's edition of the *Allegories of the Odyssey*,<sup>2</sup> which serves as a basis for their translation. In the following “Notes to the Text” (pp. 287–288) they list some emendations to HUNGER's edition that they integrated into their translation, while the

1. I was able to detect only a few typos. *All. Od.* 6, 8: “goodly”, read “godly”; 13, 83: πλεύσα, read πλεύσας.

2. HERBERT HUNGER, Johannes Tzetzes, *Allegorien zur Odyssee*, Buch XIII–XXIV. *ByzZ* 48 (1955), pp. 11–38 (henceforth: HUNGER 1955 edition) and IDEM, *Allegorien zur Odyssee I–XII*. *ByzZ* 49 (1956), pp. 249–310 (henceforth: HUNGER 1956 edition).

“Notes to the Translation” (pp. 289–336) include references to the specific Homeric lines commented by Tzetzes, as well as some explanations of particularly difficult passages. The volume ends with a bibliography and an index of names.

The introduction provides the reader who first encounters Tzetzes with a succinct overview of the scholar’s biography, literary works and social networks. After pointing out the differences distinguishing the *Allegories of the Odyssey* from the *Allegories of the Iliad*, the authors proceed to discuss the possible dating of the former, subsequently moving on to Tzetzes’ career, his allegorical method and his relationship with another prominent intellectual of the time, Eustathios of Thessaloniki. The identity of the sponsor of the *Allegories of the Odyssey* is discussed quite at length and the authors seem to be inclined to identify the female commissioner mentioned in the prolegomena A (ll. 15–17) with the *sebastokratorissa* Eirene, who, in their opinion, would be “a likely candidate as patron of the *Allegories of the Odyssey*” (p. xii). However, as noted by JOHANNES HAUBOLD in his review of this work,<sup>3</sup> the female sponsor mentioned in the prolegomena is referred to in the past tense, suggesting that Tzetzes might be alluding to his former patroness, the empress Eirene-Bertha, who had partly commissioned the *Allegories of the Iliad* and was likely dead when the prolegomena to the *Allegories of the Odyssey* were being composed. Moreover, given that in the prolegomena A Tzetzes also mentions the gifts of “other friends” (l. 18), it is surprising that the translators make little effort to establish who these might be, hardly even referring to Konstantinos Kotertzes, who had sponsored the final books of the *Allegories of the Iliad* and for whom Tzetzes had prepared a clean copy of (the second *recensio* of) the *Chiliads*.<sup>4</sup> It would have been interesting to know more about the reasons that have led GOLDWYN and KOKKINI to exclude him from the list of potential patrons. In the introduction, the authors also declare that

---

3. <https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2020/2020.03.07/>.

4. See at least AGLAE PIZZONE, *The Historiai of John Tzetzes: a Byzantine ‘Book of Memory’?* *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 41 (2017), pp. 182–207 (especially p. 186) and ERIC CULLHED, *The Blind Bard and ‘I’: Homeric biography and authorial personas in the twelfth century.* *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 38 (2014), pp. 49–67 (especially pp. 58–67). For Tzetzes’ relationship with Kotertzes, see MICHAEL GRÜNBART, *Paideia Connects: The Interaction between Teachers and Pupils in Twelfth Century Byzantium.* In: SITA STECKEL – NIELS GAUL – MICHAEL GRÜNBART (eds.), *Networks of Learning: Perspectives on Scholars in Byzantine East and Latin West, c. 1000–1200* (*Byzantinistische Studien und Texte* 6). Berlin 2014, pp. 17–31 (especially pp. 27–29).

their work aims at finally dispelling long-standing prejudices that have so far hindered an informed appreciation of Tzetzes' work and personality. However, their presentation of the scholar as a "self-mythologizing" intellectual who fashions himself as a "misunderstood genius" (p. xiii) does seem to stem from the very prejudices they allegedly set out to refute. This dissonance might have been avoided by including in the bibliography recent studies focusing specifically on Tzetzes' networks, literary technique and authorial self-fashioning. The introductory section ends with a note on the translation, where GOLDWYN and KOKKINI point out the "cryptic, complex and opaque" nature of Tzetzes' "allegorical and astrological interpretations", while declaring that they attempted "to clarify the often syntactically messy allegorical sections and to offer consistent renderings of the discourse-specific vocabulary of allegory and astrology"(p. xx).

Tzetzes' allegorical style is indeed rather condensed – especially when it comes to the more synthetic *Allegories of the Odyssey* – and it may sometimes appear quite obscure. The situation is further complicated by HUNGER's edition, which, despite being generally accurate, features some problems that undoubtedly hinder a correct interpretation of Tzetzes' exegesis. In some cases, however, GOLDWYN and KOKKINI manage to overcome these difficulties and end up presenting significant improvements to the text (and interpretation) provided by HUNGER. In what follows, I will discuss two particularly representative examples.

In his summary of book 18, Tzetzes curiously lingers on a secondary episode, recounting how the suitor Eurymachos mocked the baldness of Odysseus, who, disguised as a beggar, was intent on kindling the braziers in the banquet hall. Deriding the fake mendicant, Eurymachos declared that the light of the fire seemed to radiate directly from his shiny bald head. Modern commentators<sup>5</sup> have argued that, when summarizing this Homeric passage, Tzetzes is at pains to demonstrate that the hero who had lain with Kalypso and other "goddesses" could not be bald. According to this interpretation, Tzetzes' mention of the red hat (καυσίαν ἐρυθράν) worn by Odysseus-beggar would be aimed at casting doubt on his supposed lack of hair. In other words, in Tzetzes' view, Eurymachos was not making fun of the hero's shiny head but of the flashy nuance of his red cap. The translation proposed by GOLDWYN and KOKKINI presents an alternative

---

5. See HUNGER (1955 edition), p. 41 and PAOLO CESARETTI, *Allegoristi di Omero a Bisanzio: ricerche ermeneutiche*. Milan 1991, pp. 282–283.

interpretation, which I personally find more convincing.<sup>6</sup>

ὁ Καλυψοῦς δὲ σύνευνος καὶ θεαινῶν τῶν ἄλλων  
 τρίχας ἔχων οὐδ' ἠβαιάς, καυσίαν ἐρυθρὰν δέ,  
 ἀνάπτων πῦρ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ μνηστῆρσι καιρῷ δείπνου (10)  
 πείθει γελᾶν Εὐρύμαχον καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς μνηστῆρας.<sup>7</sup>

The bedfellow of Kalypso and of the other goddesses,  
 with no hair at all on his head and wearing a red hat,  
 lighting the fire at night for the suitors at dinner time,  
 persuades Eurymachos and the other suitors to laugh.

This rendering better conveys the intentions of Tzetzes, who does not appear to be questioning the hero's baldness, but rather seems intent on making fun of Odysseus' supposed amorous exploits. At l. 9 the scholar is clearly paraphrasing *Od.* 18, 355, where the expression *τρίχες οὐδ' ἠβαιαί* is used to highlight the *complete* absence of hair on the beggar's head. Indeed, in the locution *οὐδ' ἠβαιός, ἅ, ὄν, οὐδέ* is not to be read as a negative of *ἠβαιός*; on the contrary, its presence reinforces the meaning of the adjective (“not even one, not even a little”). This reading would not only be in tune with Tzetzes' ambivalent reception of Odysseus, whom he often depicts as a coward and a braggart, but also with the general tone of the *Allegories*, which are punctuated with funny anecdotes and joking remarks. Tzetzes' main goal here is to amuse his readers with a smug comment on Odysseus' alleged ‘conquests’. The fact that these lines might appear to contradict other descriptions of the hero featuring in the *Odyssey* – and in other passages of Tzetzes' writings – is not relevant: what matters here is the entertainment of the audience.<sup>8</sup>

6. Curiously enough, in the related note to the translation (p. 324) GOLDWYN and KOKKINI seem to embrace the traditional interpretation of the passage.

7. Tz. *All. Od.* 18, 8–11.

8. What is more, by mentioning Odysseus' red cap, Tzetzes might be taking part in a scholarly debate probably connected with schol. in *Il.* 10, 265a ERBSE (μέσση δ' ἐνὶ πῖλος ἀρήρει: ὅτι τὸ κοινὸν καὶ συμβεβηκὸς ταῖς περικεφαλαίαις εἰπόντος τοῦ ποιητοῦ, ζωγράφοι καὶ πλάσται πλιόν ἐπέθεσαν τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ; see also schol. in *Il.* 10, 265b ERBSE). Interestingly, in a passage of the *Parekbolai on the Odyssey* where he discusses the very same episode (schol. in *Od.* 1, 31, 25–29), Eustathios goes to great lengths to demonstrate that the Homeric characters never wore hats nor other garments aimed at covering their heads: this would be confirmed by the fact that Odysseus' baldness was clearly visible to the suitors, who could thus make fun of it (οὐδαμοῦ γοῦν ὁ ποιητὴς εὔρηται οὔτε πῖλου ἀσκητοῦ μεμνημένος τοῦ καθ' Ἡσίοδον, οὔτε καυσίας. ἥτις κατὰ τὸν Παισανίαν πῖλος ἦν πλατὺς, ὃν οἱ Μακεδονικοὶ φησι βασιλεῖς ἐφόρουσαν λευκὸν αὐτῷ διάδημα περιειλοῦντες).

Another passage whose interpretation is considerably improved by GOLDWYN and ΚΟΚΚΙΝΙ's reading features in the last book of the *Allegories* (*All. Od.* 24, 222). Tzetzes is now commenting upon Medon's speech to the suitors' relatives. In the previous books, the scholar has argued that 'the Athena' disguised as Mentor who fought side by side with Odysseus was nothing but an effective ploy devised by the hero's own wisdom: to frighten the suitors, Odysseus made it appear as though he had more allies than he actually did and pretended to speak to Mentor, who in fact was never there. According to Tzetzes, Medon too fell for Odysseus' tricks. This is the passage under scrutiny as printed by HUNGER:

τοῦτο δ' ὁ Μέδων οὐκ εἰδὼς ὡς βύρση κεκρυμμένον (222)  
οἶεται καὶ λογιζέται ἀκούειν Ὀδυσσέως (223)

The accusative κεκρυμμένον makes these lines quite hard to interpret, as shown by the fact that HUNGER himself felt the need to add a slightly convoluted explanatory note.<sup>9</sup> The emendation proposed by GOLDWYN and ΚΟΚΚΙΝΙ, who print κεκρυμμένος instead of κεκρυμμένον, does not only simplify the translation, but also perfectly fits with the Homeric text. Indeed, in *Od.* 22, 361–363, Medon is explicitly said to have been hiding under an ox hide, as duly remarked by GOLDWYN and ΚΟΚΚΙΝΙ in the corresponding note to the translation (p. 335).<sup>10</sup> At l. 222 Tzetzes is explaining why Medon was tricked by Odysseus' stratagem by making a direct reference to the related passage of the *Odyssey*: since he hid under an ox hide throughout the massacre of the suitors, Medon was unable to see what was really happening around him.

Despite these and other improvements,<sup>11</sup> in some instances the two authors appear instead to be misled by HUNGER's edition, which, as mentioned, is

οὔτε ἄλλου περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν καλύμματος. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς εἰς φαλάκρῳσιν κωμωδοῦσιν οἱ μνηστήρες, ὡς ἐκκειμένης τῆς αὐτοῦ φαλάκρας εἰς θεῶν διὰ τὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς δηλαδὴ ἀκατακάλυπτον). Could the two scholars' interest in Odysseus' lack of hair be ascribed to their subterranean – but well-attested – rivalry?

9. HUNGER (1955 edition), p. 48: "Medon hielt den Helfer des Odysseus nicht für ein Trugbild vom Aussehen Mentors, sondern für eine Gestalt aus Fleisch und Bein ("für einen, der in einer Haut steckt", βύρση κεκρυμμένον 222)".

10. Once again, however, the emendation to HUNGER's edition is not reported in the notes to the text. This happens also in *All. Od.* 22, 55, where the authors seem to interpret HUNGER's λογισμόν as a nominative. For a discussion of the emendations that do feature in the notes to the text, I refer the reader to J. HAUBOLD's review.

11. For other passages where GOLDWYN and ΚΟΚΚΙΝΙ ameliorate HUNGER's text see: 6, 91–96 (HUNGER's full stop at the end of l. 94 is rightly eliminated since ll. 91–

not always faultless: both the punctuation and some textual choices can prove quite confusing. In what follows, I will list a few tentative emendations that might facilitate the translation of some particularly intricate passages.

At *All. Od.* 4, 24, HUNGER prints “ἢ ὡς πατρίδα λελοχῶς τὰ μέρη τὰ ἑῶα”, which the two authors translate as “or as a man coming to rest in the eastern regions as his homeland” (in this passage, Tzetzes is explaining why Memnon is said to be the child of Dawn). I would consider replacing λελοχῶς with λελογχῶς or λεληχῶς (the latter is preserved by the mss. BP and printed also by MATRANGA).<sup>12</sup> Both are attested in the *Epimerismi Homeric*<sup>13</sup> as alternative forms of the perfect participle λελαχῶς (from λήγω/λαγχάνω). Λαγχάνειν (“being allotted”) a certain place as πατρίδα (“homeland”) is a widespread expression and makes more sense than the text printed by HUNGER.<sup>14</sup>

At 5, 19–20, HUNGER’s edition reads “(...) ὁ Μέντωρ διηγῆται μὲν τὰ περὶ Ὀδυσσεά, | βουλαῖς τῆς Πηνελόπης δὲ οἰκτρᾶ τῇ διηγῆσει”. The two authors translate as: “(...) Mentor is explaining about Odysseus, in a pitiable story following the wishes of Penelope”. I suggest changing the dative βουλαῖς into the accusative βουλᾶς. The latter would better fit the structure of the sentence, which would thus feature two accusatives both depending on διηγῆται and signposted by μὲν (l. 19) and δέ (l. 20) respectively. Notably, as attested by HUNGER’s critical apparatus, the copyist of P, followed by MATRANGA, also felt the lack of a second accusative to go with διηγῆται (specifically, instead of the dative οἰκτρᾶ, P presents the accusative neuter plural οἰκτρά).

At 5, 138, HUNGER’s text (ἀπέβη Ἀργειφόντης δὲ ὁ ἔφορος ἐκείνου) makes little sense, as shown by the translation proposed by GOLDWYN and KOKKINI (“‘*Argeiphontes departed*’ means an overseer sent by Zeus”). Firstly,

96 clearly make up a whole sentence); 8, 157 (elimination of HUNGER’s comma after κάθυγον); 9, 108–109 (HUNGER’s full stop at the end of l. 108 is eliminated; a new one is inserted at the end of l. 109, thus showing that ll. 105–109 form a whole sentence); 24, 284 (τὰ βάθη βλέπειν παρεικῶς ἐν τέχναις βαθυδρόμοις is rendered as “allowing us to see the depths”, in contrast with “preventing us from seeing the depths” proposed by HUNGER (1955 edition), p. 48; on the textual problems presented by this passage, see CESARETTI, op. cit., pp. 197–202).

12. PIETRO MATRANGA (ed.), *Anecdota graeca* I. Rome 1850, p. 246.

13. *Epim. Hom.* λ 44 (in *Od.* 11, 304), 2–5 DYCK.

14. Cf. Tz. schol. in *Carm. Il.* 3, 334, p. 224, 16–18 LEONE, where Tzetzes states that Memnon’s homeland was in Syria.

it is not clear what the genitive ἐκείνου refers to. Moreover, ἔφορος is quite difficult to place in this context. The mss. VB have ἔμπορος, which might refer to Tzetzes' earlier interpretation of Hermes as a merchant-messenger sent to Kalypso (*All. Od.* 5, 35–36; for the use of merchants as messengers see also *All. Od.* 1, 202). Given Tzetzes' tendency to gloss like for like, I therefore suggest replacing ὁ ἔφορος ἐκείνου with ὁ ἔμπορος ἐκείνος.

Another slightly problematic passage is 6, 15: ἄκουε νῦν καὶ μάνθανε σοφῶς, ἠκριβωμένως. From HUNGER's critical apparatus, it seems that all mss. have σοφῶς (printed also by MATRANGA). However, according to the TLG, this would be the only instance in which Tzetzes uses μανθάνω in combination with the adverb σοφῶς, whereas the connection of the imperative μάνθανε with forms of the adverb σαφῶς is considerably more frequent (seven instances in the *Chiliads*,<sup>15</sup> one in the *Allegories of the Odyssey*, at 9, 130). Moreover, the combination of the two adverbs σαφῶς and ἠκριβωμένως features at least three times in the *Chiliads*.<sup>16</sup>

At 7, 32–35, HUNGER's text reads as follows: “θεὸν ὡς εἰσορόωντες ὁποῖαν τὴν σελήνην, | εἶτε καὶ ἕκαστος αὐτὴν ὡς σφὴν ψυχὴν προβλέπει, | ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς τοῖς ἔπεσιν οὕτω προερμηνεύει· | ὡς κείνη περὶ κῆρι τετίμηται τε καὶ ἔστιν”. GOLDWYN and KOKKINI replace the upper dot at the end of l. 34 with a full stop and translate by ““Looking upon Arete as a goddess’, like the moon, | or even that each man foresees in it his own soul, | just as Homer predicts with his words. | ‘So heartily is she honored and has ever been’”. I believe that HUNGER's upper dot at the end of l. 34 should have been kept: the Homeric verse quoted at l. 35 (*Od.* 7, 69) both expands upon and explains what Tzetzes has just said at l. 33. This is why the προερμηνεύει of l. 34 should be translated by “as Homer explains above” and not by “as Homer predicts”. What is more, I suggest that the reading of the passage might be simplified by replacing the προβλέπει of l. 33 with προσβλέπει, which would make more sense and would better fit the Homeric context. The translation of *All. Od.* 7, 33 would thus be “or each one (of the Phaiakians) looks at her (i.e. cherishes her) as if she were their own soul”.

Always in book 7, at ll. 69–70 of HUNGER's edition we find: “θεοὶ ὀρῶνται ἐναργεῖς· σοφοὶ καὶ βασιλέες | ἔρχονται πόδι τοῦ ἰδεῖν χώραν τὴν ἡμετέραν”, which the two authors translate as: ““The gods appear in bodily form’

15. Tz. *Chil.* 2, 908; 4, 825; 6, 869; 8, 863; 9, 434; 12, 420 and 547 (these and all other references to the *Chiliads* are based on PETRUS ALOISIUS M. LEONE (ed.), Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae. Galatina 2007).

16. Tz. *Chil.* 4, 825; 12, 10; 13, 335 LEONE.

means the wise and the kings | come on foot to see our land”. I would suggest replacing πόδω with πόθω (they “come spurred by the desire to see our land”). After all, Tzetzes is referring to the island of the Phaiakians, which could hardly be reached on foot!

At 8, 24, HUNGER prints “μείζων τε καὶ παχύτερος αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ ἐφάνη” and GOLDWYN and ΚΟΚΚΙΝΙ translate as “he [Odysseus] appeared greater and stouter there”. I would suggest changing αὐτοῦ in αὐτοῦ and translating as follows: “He appeared bigger and stouter than he normally was”.<sup>17</sup>

At 8, 64–67, HUNGER’s text reads as follows: “ἡλίου δρόμον δὲ τακτὸν σχόντος περὶ τὴν σφαῖραν, | ὥσπερ δεσμῶ κατέχοντα ταῦτα πρὸς εὐκρασίαν, | τῷ ἀνασπᾶν ὑγρότητα τὸ φλέγον κεραννύντος, | τῷ δὲ θερμῷ καθαίροντος τὸν κάθυρον ἀέρα”. As shown by their translation, GOLDWYN and ΚΟΚΚΙΝΙ have some difficulties interpreting the participle κατέχοντα, which they seem to construe with ταῦτα (likely referring to the στοιχεῖα of l. 62). To simplify the interpretation, I propose replacing κατέχοντα with κατέχοντος, to be construed with ἡλίου of l. 64 (see also the following participles κεραννύντος (l. 66) and καθαίροντος (l. 67), both referring to ἡλίου). This reading seems to be confirmed by what Tzetzes says at 8, 107–108.

At 8, 168, HUNGER prints “καὶ δέσιν τὴν πρὶν ἄτακτον πυρὸς περὶ τὴν σφαῖραν”, which the two authors render as “and the previous disorderly binding together of fire around the sphere”. I would suggest changing ἄτακτον into ἀτάκτου (referred to πυρὸς; the locution ἄτακτον πῦρ features often in Tzetzes’ allegorical works, where it is mostly referred to Ares).<sup>18</sup>

17. A comparison with FINOCCHIARO’s edition of books 13–18 of the *All. Od.* (FRANCA FINOCCHIARO, *Ioannis Tzetzae allegoriae in Odysseae libros XIII–XVIII*. BollClass 5 (1957), pp. 45–61) shows that HUNGER tends to print αὐτός also when the reflexive pronoun would seem more appropriate (it is worth noting here that, throughout the review, I will always reference HUNGER’s line numbering of Tzetzes’ text; readers should bear in mind that FINOCCHIARO uses HUNGER’s numbering plus one). See *All. Od.* 16, 69, where HUNGER’s text reads: πάλιν αὐτὸν τῷ πένητι τῷ πεπλασμένῳ κρύπτει. In this same line, FINOCCHIARO prints αὐτόν, which makes more sense in this context (cf. l. 67 of the same book, where both HUNGER and FINOCCHIARO have αὐτόν). For other instances where the reflexive pronoun seems to be preferable than the simple αὐτός printed by HUNGER, see e.g. 20, 33 (τοιαῦτα λογισάμενος τρέπει αὐτὸν πρὸς ὕπνον: Odysseus puts himself to sleep) and 22, 43–45 (οὐπω δὲ νίκην κατ’ αὐτῶν εἰργάσατο τελείαν, | ἀλλ’ ἔτι ῥώμης τῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς τοῦ Τηλεμάχου | ἀπόπειραν ἐλάμβανε (...): Odysseus is putting to the test his own strength along with that of Telemachus).

18. See e.g. Tz. *All. Il.* 20, 158; 200 and 217–218 following JEAN FRANÇOIS BOISSONADE, *Tzetzae allegoriae Iliadis*. *Accedunt Pselli allegoriae quarum una inedita*.



This emendation might help to produce a smoother translation of the whole passage (ll. 167–175).

At 10, 51, HUNGER’s “ἄκουε καί μου μάθανε τὸ πᾶν ἠκριβωμένως” is translated as “listen to me and learn everything in detail”. I would consider replacing μου with μοι, which should be construed with μάθανε and not with ἄκουε (Tzetzes often uses the dative of interest with imperative forms of μαθάνω).<sup>19</sup>

At 10, 66, HUNGER reads “ἔστ’ ἂν ἀποκομίσηται πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ πατρίδα”. I would suggest changing αὐτοῦ into σαυτοῦ. Here, Tzetzes is paraphrasing the speech of Aiolos, who is addressing Odysseus in the second person. The translation proposed – “it [the West Wind] will carry you to its own fatherland” – goes against the sense of the Homeric text (Zephyros was supposed to carry Odysseus to the hero’s fatherland, Ithaka).

At 10, 76, HUNGER prints “ἀλληγορήσω φροσφθυῶς (read προσφυῶς) τοῖς τόποις τοῖς ἐκάστου”, which GOLDWYN and KOKKINI render as “I will allegorize suitably each thing in its proper passage”. The genitive ἐκάστου seems slightly out of place. Maybe consider a dative plural (ἐκάστοις)? The translation would thus be: “I will allegorize in a manner that is suitable to each passage”.

At 11, 17, HUNGER reads: “ἄλλοι δ’ ἄλλ’ ἀψευδέστατα λέγουσι περὶ τούτων”. In this extract, Tzetzes is presenting alternative versions concerning the location and characteristics of the land of the Kimmerians, some of which he clearly considers to be unreliable. Therefore, I would suggest replacing ἄλλ’ ἀψευδέστατα with ἄλλα ψευδέστατα.

At 11, 67–68, HUNGER prints the following text: “ἀντὶ τοῦ Ἐνιπέως δὲ τίς ποταμὸς τὴν κλῆσιν | ἐμίγη ταύτη τῇ Τυροῖ ἢ τίς τῶν ἐκ θαλάσσης”, which GOLDWYN and KOKKINI translate as “Instead of Enipeus, a river of the same name | or someone from the sea lay with this Tyro”. Here, Tzetzes is proposing an allegorical interpretation of the Homeric passage recounting how Poseidon, disguised as the river Enipeus, tricked Tyro into lying with him. I suggest interpreting ποταμὸς as a proper name and writing it with a

Paris 1851 (Reprint 1967).

19. See e.g. Tz. *Chil.* 4, 786; 9, 181 and 763; 10, 640; 12, 904; 13, 218 LEONE and *All. Il. prol.* 86, 505, 660 and 740 BOISSONADE. Alternatively, it would be possible to keep the genitive μου but still construe it with μάθανε. In this latter case, the translation would be “listen and learn from me” (see *Chil.* 6, 800 LEONE, with the caveat that this seems to be the only instance of μαθάνω + μου in the *Chiliads* and might therefore require to be emended as well).

capital Π. The translation would thus be: “Instead of Enipeus, a man called Potamos (“River”) | or a man from the sea lay with this Tyro”.

I would also like to consider *All. Od.* 12, 8: ἤγουν οὗ φῶς καὶ ἥλιος, οὗ σκότος Κιμμερίων. In his critical apparatus, HUNGER declares that he corrected the οὗ σκότος preserved by the mss. in οὐ σκότος, which makes more sense (Tzetzes is contrasting the sun-lit island of Aiaia with the dark land of the Kimmerians). However, in the main text he prints οὗ. This seems to have escaped the authors, who translate: “where the light and sun are, and the darkness of the Kimmerians”.

At 13, 14–17, HUNGER’s text, which seems to create some difficulties to the translators, reads as follows: “ἴρὸν Νυμφάων, αἱ Νηιάδες καλέονται | ὅσα φησὶν ἐν ἱερῷ τῶ τῶν νυμφῶν ᾧ λέγει. | κρητῆρες τε καὶ ἀμοφοεῖς, ἰστοί, πορφύρας φάρη | λιθόξεστα μιμήματα ἦσαν καὶ εἰκασίαι”. In her edition of books 13–18 of the *Allegories of the Odyssey*, F. FINOCCHIARO<sup>20</sup> prints ἃ λέγει instead of ᾧ λέγει. This variant, preserved by the ms. Vat. Pal. gr. 316, which HUNGER could not consult, is by far the best option (ἃ is to be construed with ὅσα). Moreover, as shown by FINOCCHIARO, ll. 14–17 clearly make up a whole sentence. Therefore, HUNGER’s full stop after λέγει should be eliminated.

It is also worth considering *All. Od.* 14, 33–36. The text as printed by HUNGER reads: “θάρσος, φησί, μοι ἔδοσαν ὁ Ἄρης καὶ Ἀθήνη | θυμός τε καὶ ἡ φρόνησις, δόλοι καὶ πανουργίαι | εἴτ’ οὖν πολέμων ἄσκησις σὺν ἅμα τῇ φρονήσει | φίλα φρεσὶν ἐποίησαν· θεοὶ ἡ εἰμαρμένη”. However, FINOCCHIARO adopts a different punctuation for this same passage: since, in her opinion, at l. 36 Tzetzes is referring to a new Homeric verse (*Od.* 14, 227), she inserts a full stop after φρονήσει (l. 35). This solution makes more sense and considerably facilitates the interpretation of the Greek text.

At 20, 67–68, HUNGER prints: “ὅτε καιρὸς ἦν ταύταις δὲ γάμου καὶ Ἀφροδίτης | ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοῦ Διός, τῆς εἰμαρμένης, τρέπων”, translated as follows by the two authors: “when it was their time for marriage, that is, for Aphrodite, | the weather turned away from the heavens and from Zeus, that is, Destiny”. To facilitate the reading of this passage, I propose to replace τρέπων with πρέπων, which would refer to καιρὸς of l. 67 (“when the appropriate moment came ...”).

At 24, 174–175, HUNGER’s text reads: “τὸν ἀμοφοέα τὸν χρυσοῦν, ὄνπερ τανῦν εἰρήκειν, | δῶρον ἢ Θέτις ἔσχηκεν ἐκ Διονύσου τοῖον”. Since here

20. FINOCCHIARO, op. cit, p. 47.

Tzetzes is going to great lengths to distinguish the ‘allegorical’ Dionysos who gave Thetis the urn<sup>21</sup> from another Dionysos, the son of Semele (see ll. 176–177), I suggest writing τοίου instead of τοῖον.

Yet, there are some instances where GOLDWYN and KOKKINI’s mistranslations cannot be ascribed to HUNGER’s inaccuracies. In what follows, I will discuss some passages that might prove particularly misleading, especially for those readers who are not familiar with Greek and/or with Tzetzes’ allegorical method. Most of the oversights featuring in the prolegomena and in book 1 have been carefully examined by J. HAUBOLD, so I will limit myself to two extracts of the prolegomena that he has not considered in great detail, but that are crucial to fully understand both Tzetzes’ reception of the allegorical tradition and his perception of his own allegorical enterprise.

The first passage I would like to analyze is the long simile that makes up the first half of the prolegomena A (ll. 1–31). In order to illustrate the aims of his work, Tzetzes compares himself to famous builders and architects of the past: just as these men made passable wide and dangerous rivers by constructing bridges and channels, the Byzantine polymath will make possible for his readers to traverse the Ocean of Homer’s poetry without being overwhelmed by its perilous waters. If Tzetzes had not intervened with his allegorical bridge-building, the Homeric waves would have suffocated the empress’s desire for learning, just as the river Gyndes had drowned Cyrus’ white horse. The meaning of these lines is compromised by the translation proposed by GOLDWYN and KOKKINI. For an accurate rendering of the passage, I refer the reader to GARETH MORGAN’s literal but reliable translation.<sup>22</sup> Here, I will focus only on some specific but vital details. For one, the translators do not seem to understand that Homer’s Calliope (i.e. his poems) is likened to the Ocean. In the related note to the translation (p. 289) they remark that in this “strange sentence” Tzetzes might be speaking metaphorically of the “Ocean of words (perhaps the countless words flooding his mind, his inspiration) attempting to “drown” his vigorous desire to allegorize the Homeric text”. Yet, the comparison of Homer’s vast poems with a deep and potentially dangerous Ocean is a topos of Homeric exe-

---

21. According to Tzetzes (*All. Od.* 24, 169), the Dionysos featuring in *Od.* 24, 74 would be nothing but an allusion to the wine sellers, farmers and vine workers who presented the ‘historical’ Thetis with the golden urn.

22. GARETH MORGAN, *Homer in Byzantium: John Tzetzes*. In: CARL A. RUBINO – CYNTHIA W. SHELMERDINE (eds.), *Approaches to Homer*. Austin 1983, pp. 165–188 (here pp. 174–175).

genesis<sup>23</sup> and features prominently in Tzetzes' own works.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, the aforementioned note to the translation explains the source of another misunderstanding – and inappropriate change of HUNGER's punctuation – observable at ll. 14–16. Here, the translators insert an upper dot after λαμπρᾶς (l. 15), thus missing the connection between ἐπιθυμίας σκίρτημα λαμπρᾶς and πρὸς λόγους, an expression which qualifies the nature of the patroness's – not Tzetzes' – ἐπιθυμία: her “desire” was nothing but a commendable yearning for literature (πρὸς λόγους).

Another misunderstanding affects ll. 35–46 of the prolegomena A, where Tzetzes contrasts his clear and simple allegorical method to that of his predecessors, whose style he considers to be obscure and excessively pompous. The substance of this passage is completely lost in the rendition proposed by GOLDWYN and KOKKINI:

ἔχεις Δημοῦς τὸ σύγγραμμα καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἡρακλείτου, (35)  
 Κορνοῦτον καὶ Παλαίφατον καὶ τὸν Ψελλὸν σὺν τούτοις,  
 καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος λέγεται γράψας ἀλληγορίας,  
 ἀνερευνήσας εὔρισκε καὶ τὰ τοῦ Τζέτζου βλέπε,  
 εἴτ' οὖν τοῖς πᾶσι ζηλωτῆς καθέστηκεν Ὅμηρου,  
 κἂν τοῖς σαφέσι καὶ ληπτοῖς καὶ παιγνιωδεστέροις (40)  
 καὶ τοῖς ἀποκαθάρμασι τοῦ λόγου τῆς οἰκίας,  
 ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνος καὶ αὐτὸς ὄλβον διδοῦς εὔρισκειν  
 μαργάρων, λίθων τιμαλφῶν, ἄλλων τερπνῶν παντοίων,  
 ἢ ὡς πολλοὶ τῶν νέων τε καὶ τῶν παλαιότερων  
 σφῶν τοῖς δοκοῦσι θησαυροῖς, τοῖς διηρμένοις λόγοις, (45)  
 οἷα περ τύμβοι φέρουσι σαπρίαν τε καὶ κόνιν.

You have Demo's book and that of Herakleitos,  
 and moreover Cornutus and Palaiphatos and, with them, Psellos,  
 and if anyone else is said to have written allegories,  
 after seeking them out, then find and look at Tzetzes' work as well,  
 since he is a zealous admirer of everything Homeric,  
 both their clear and comprehensible and more playful parts  
 and the filthy by-products of the edifice of speech;  
 just as Homer did, so too Tzetzes makes it possible to discover  
 a wealth of pearls, precious stones, all kinds of other delights,

23. For Eustathios' use of this imagery, see BAUKJE VAN DEN BERG, *The wise Homer and his erudite commentator: Eustathios' imagery in the proem of the *Parekbolai on the Iliad**. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 41 (2017), pp. 30–44 (especially pp. 35–37).

24. See e.g. CESARETTI, *op. cit.*, pp. 180–181.

not in the manner of many ancient and more recent writers  
who do it rather through their own supposed treasures, their con-  
flicted<sup>25</sup> speeches,  
which are like the contents of tombs, decay and dust.

In order to better convey the sense of this passage, I would rather propose  
to translate these lines as follows:

You have the book by Demo and that of Herakleitos,  
and, along with these, you have Cornutus, Palaiphatos and Psellos  
and everyone else who is said to have composed allegorical treatises:  
find them and, after having examined them, have a look at Tzetzes’  
work  
[to see] if he is not a follower of Homer in every single aspect,  
and if he does not allow – just as Homer himself did – the readers to  
find a treasure-trove  
of pearls, precious stones and all sorts of other delightful things  
– even though he employs a clear, simple and rather playful style  
as well as the offscourings of everyday language –  
or if he is like most of the recent and more ancient writers, who,  
with their supposed treasures and lofty words,  
are just like tombs, offering nothing but decay and dust.

Aside from these crucial passages, which deserved to be discussed in some  
detail, there are other instances where GOLDWYN and KOKKINI appear to  
misread Tzetzes’ text. I will start by considering some mistranslations that  
significantly alter the meaning of the scholar’s allegorical interpretations.  
As already pointed out by J. HAUBOLD, some of these mistakes seem to  
stem from the translators’ misunderstanding of Tzetzes’ condensed gloss-  
ing style. In book 3, 96–104 Tzetzes is discussing *Od.* 3, 346 (Ζεὺς τὸ γ’  
ἀλεξήσειε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι). At ll. 97–100 he proposes three dif-  
ferent alternative readings for the Homeric Zeus: he might be interpreted  
either as the planet Jupiter (with each of the other gods representing a ce-  
lestial body), or as Destiny, or even as the mind of divine providence (ὁ  
νοῦς ὁ τῆς προνοίας). After presenting these options, the scholar adds (ll.  
101–103):

---

25. The translators seem to interpret διηρμένοις as a form of the verb διαίρω and not  
of διαίρω, whose perfect participle διηρμένος is often used in rhetorical discussions to  
qualify lofty or sublime style. The confusion might have been caused by the iota subscript  
printed by HUNGER (the perfect participle of διαίρω is διηρμένος, not διηρμένος).

οἱ ἄλλοι νῦν ἀθάνατοι κωλύουσι τὸν Δία  
 ἐνθάδε νοῦν λαμβάνεσθαι προνοίας, ὥσπερ εἶπον.  
 ἐπεὶ δ' ἐγράφη, κείσθω σοι· βίβλον χιοῦν οὐ θέλω·

GOLDWYN and KOKKINI translate as follows:

Now the other immortals are hindering Zeus,  
 here preventing the mind from exercising foresight, as I said.  
 Because it is written, let it stand; I don't want a marked-up book.

Yet, in this passage, Tzetzes is not further expanding his chain of allegorical readings, but he is actually rectifying the last of the three interpretations he has proposed in the previous lines. According to the scholar's exegetical framework, when the Homeric Zeus is accompanied by the mention of "the other gods", he cannot be construed as an allegory of providence. However, the mistaken interpretation has already been written down and the polymath decides not to erase it, lest he ruin the book on which he is writing (see l. 104). This passage shows that Tzetzes' allegorical method is far less abstruse than it might appear: a correct interpretation of his works is essential to finally demonstrate the consistency of his exegesis. I would therefore propose to translate the extract quoted above as follows:

In this line, the mention of the other gods makes it impossible to interpret Zeus as the mind of providence, as I have just said. Since it has already been written, let it be. I do not want to ruin the book by crossing it out.

Another passage whose translation does not do justice to the criteria informing Tzetzes' allegories features in book 5. At ll. 117–120, the scholar is explaining the meaning of *Od.* 5, 119 (οἷ τε θεαῖσ' ἀγάσθε παρ' ἀνδράσιν εὐνάζεσθαι), where Kalypso accuses the Olympian gods of resenting the goddesses who lie with mortal men. As usual, Tzetzes' explanation focuses especially on the Homeric gods:

νῦν σχέτλιοί ἐστε, θεοί, τὴν εἰμαρμένην λέγει. (117)  
 θεαῖς ταῖς βασιλίσσαις δέ, ἀνδράσι δὲ τοῖς κάτω.  
 θεαῖς καὶ τοῖς στοιχείοις δέ, οἷς ἔστι θῆλυς κλῆσις,  
 ὥσπερ ἡμέρα τε καὶ γῆ, θαλάσση καὶ τοιούτοις. (120)

GOLDWYN and KOKKINI translate as follows:

Here ‘*Cruel you are, O gods*’ means Destiny.

‘*For goddesses*’ means for queens, while ‘*with men*’ means with those of lower rank.

For goddesses and elements are grammatically feminine, just like earth, sea, and such things.

This reading does not convey Tzetzes’ exegesis of the Homeric text. At l. 119, the polymath is proposing an alternative interpretation for the Homeric goddesses: they might simply be powerful queens, as stated at l. 118, or they might also represent the elements, but only those that are grammatically feminine, as further confirmed by the list featuring at l. 120 (ἡμέρα, γῆ and θάλασσα: “day”, “earth” and “sea”, all feminine nouns in Greek). Once again, if properly interpreted, Tzetzes’ readings appear much less obscure than it is generally believed.

GOLDWYN and KOKKINI’s translation of *All. Od.* 20, ll. 18–23 equally obfuscates the meaning of Tzetzes’ allegorical readings. Here, the scholar is discussing the passage where Athena comes down from the sky in the form of a woman to bring comfort to the despairing Odysseus.

„μοῦνος ἐὼν πολέσι. σχεδόθεν δὲ οἱ ἦλθεν Ἀθήνη“  
 „οὐρανόθεν καταβᾶσα· δέμας δ’ ἦικτο γυναικί·“  
 Ἀθήνη νῦν ἡ φρόνησις ἐστὶ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως. (20)  
 ὁ οὐρανὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ, διὰ δὲ πανουργίαν  
 καὶ τὰ πυκνὰ νοήματα τὰ τοῦ Ἰθακησίου  
 γυναιῶ φρόνησιν αὐτοῦ τῷ συνεργῶ εἰκάζει.

The authors propose to translate the passage as follows:

‘*One man as he was against so many. Then Athena came down from heaven and drew near to him in the likeness of a woman.*’

Athena here is the wisdom of Odysseus.

The sky, that is, the head, because of his scheming and the crafty thoughts of the Ithakan,

likens his wisdom to a woman collaborating with him.

This rendering is quite confusing and any reader who is not familiar with Greek might indeed think that Tzetzes is not making much sense: how could the sky, i.e. Odysseus’ head, compare the hero’s own wisdom to a woman? The unjustified change to the punctuation proposed by HUNGER – who printed a comma and not a full stop at the end of l. 20 – might have contributed to clouding the picture. In any case, in this passage Tzetzes is

explaining the component elements of the Homeric lines one by one, following the order in which they appear:

Here, Athena is Odysseus' wisdom  
and the sky is his head. Because of the  
craftiness and the shrewd plans of the Ithakan,  
[Homer] likens his wisdom to a woman who helps him.

These are only some examples of how Tzetzes' condensed allegorical style has led GOLDWYN and KOKKINI to misrepresent his thought.<sup>26</sup> In what follows, I will briefly consider another selection of passages that, despite being more faithful to the Greek text, end up altering the meaning of recurrent terms or *topoi* that are central both to Tzetzes' exegetical method and to his self-presentation.<sup>27</sup>

26. For other such instances, see e.g. 7, 40–41 (the sentence is misconstrued: *πλασθέντος* goes with *Ἐρεχθέως*; Tzetzes is saying that we ought to distinguish the fictional (*πλασθέντος*) Erechtheus of *Od.* 7, 81 from the 'historical' Erechtheus, the king of Attica); 7, 72 (*θεοὺς ἀνθρώπους τέ φησι σοφὸς καὶ ἰδιώτας* ≠ "Homer says that the gods are both wise and ordinary men"; translate: "Homer calls 'gods' wise men, whereas he calls 'human beings' (*anthrōpous*) the common people"; a similar misunderstanding occurs also at 9, 104, where *οὐ βασιλεὺς οὐδὲ σοφός, οὔτε τῆς κάτω τύχης* should be translated as "neither a king, nor a wise man, nor one of the common people"); 8, 17–18 (*δαίφρων νῦν πολεμικὸς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Ἀλκίνοος, | ὁ πάντα δὲ λεπτοτομῶν φρονήσει καὶ συνέσει* ≠ "Alkinoös here is not warlike and combative, he who analyzes everything with wisdom and prudence"; Tzetzes is distinguishing between two different acceptations of *δαίφρων*, which can mean either 'warlike' or 'wise': his point is that Homer does not qualify Alkinoös as *δαίφρων* to highlight his warlike nature, but to stress his wisdom); 8, 158–160 (in this passage Tzetzes is contrasting the lighter elements (*τὰ λεπτότερα τούτων*), which go up, to the heavier ones (*βαρύτερα*), which remain in the lower regions of the earth); 20, 56 (*πρὸς τὰς ἀέρων κράσεις γὰρ ἴδοις καὶ ζώων φύσεις* ≠ "you could see the mixing of the air and animal natures"; here Tzetzes is explaining that the nature of all living beings is influenced by the climate of the area where they dwell); 24, 48 (*πρὸ τῶν θνησκόντων σιωπᾷ καὶ προεκτρέχει λόγος* ≠ "speech goes silent and runs out before dying men"; in these lines Tzetzes is saying that uttered speech 'leaves' those who are about to die even before their soul does: see ll. 64–65 and cf. also 24, 50 (*βραχέα γὰρ συμβέβηκε λαλοῦσιν ἀποθνήσκειν* ≠ "for it happened for those who are dying to speak briefly"), with the related comment by HUNGER (1955 edition), p. 46, which the two authors mention in the notes to the translation, but do not seem to take into account in their rendition of the Greek text).

27. Another set of problematic translations, which cannot all be discussed here, seem to stem from a superficial reading of the Greek. For some representative examples, see: 2, 54 (*τινὰ* here is the indefinite pronoun, not the interrogative one); 4, 61 (*θεῖα* is acc. neut. plur. – not nom. fem. sing. – and is the object of *εἰδυῖα*); 5, 180 (*τίνα* here is interrogative, not indefinite); 7, 31 (*ὀξεῖς* goes with *θανάτους*); 8, 151 (*ἀνασπωμένων* ≠ "was being pulled down", but rather "was being pulled up"); 9, 47 (*αἴγες ἐκ τῶν ἀγρίων*: translate as "wild



The first example I would like to discuss has to do with the Greek term μῦθος, which can have multiple meanings, as Tzetzes himself remarks in his *Exegesis of the Iliad*.<sup>28</sup> Among other things, μῦθος can signify the “spoken word” or the “myth” in the sense of an (apparently) fantastic tale, such as those that are interspersed throughout the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. According to Tzetzes, Homer used μῦθος/myth as a sort of bait, aiming at attracting less sophisticated readers with its sweetness.<sup>29</sup> These “delicate minds” will thus be fascinated by the pleasant surface of the poet’s tales, but – differently from Tzetzes and his audience – they will not be able to perceive the deep allegorical meaning of the Homeric μῦθοι. This concept is central to Tzetzes’ perception of both Homeric poetry and his own exegetical task. This is why a correct translation of the term μῦθος is not of secondary importance, especially in a work centering on the allegorical interpretation of the *Odyssey*. Therefore, when, at *All. Od.* 9, 34, Tzetzes says that Homer μυθικῶ τῷ νέκταρι πάντα καταγλυκάζει, it would be advisable to translate “[Homer] sweetens everything with the nectar of myth” (rather than “with his mythical nectar [Homer] makes everything sweeter”). These considerations are all the more relevant when it comes to passages such as *All. Od.* 23, 61 (μύθοις γλυκάζων ἅπαντα τοῖς ἔπεσι), where μύθοις should be translated as “myths” and not simply as “words”. Compare also 24, 282, where τῷ νέκταρι τοῦ μύθου is not “the nectar of [Homer’s] tale” but rather “the nectar of [Homer’s] myth(s)”. In programmatic passages

goats”; ll. 44–47 are misconstrued); 9, 68 (μὴ ξενωθεὶς κατασχεθῶ τοιᾶδε εἰμαρμένη ≠ “lest, after entertaining you as a guest, I might endure such a Destiny”; translate: “lest, if I ever find myself to be someone’s guest, I might endure such a destiny”); 11, 4 (τινὰς does not refer to the heroines mentioned in the preceding line but to the Greek heroes who had fought at Troy and were now in Hades); 15, 26 (the subject of παρείς cannot be Telemachus, but is the messenger mentioned at l. 23; see also CESARETTI, op. cit., p. 279); 24, 93–96 (παρέδραμον (l. 96) is to be construed with all the accusatives featuring at ll. 93–96); 24, 187 (πέπεικε περι θάλασσαν ἀγῶνας ἡμᾶς θεῖναι ≠ “have persuaded us that there were contests near the sea”; translate: “persuaded us to hold games near the sea”); 24, 195 (ἐκβαλὼν ἀγροῖς τοῖς τοῦ Αἰγίσθου ≠ “pushed him out ... from Aigisthos’ lands”; translate: “having pushed him out (of the sea) ... into Aigisthos’ lands”; see *Od.* 11, 388–389 and cf. *All. Od.* 24, 197 for a similar use of the dat. ἀγροῖς); 24, 244 (εὐφρόνως βουλευσάντων does not refer to βροντῆς and κεραυνῶν of l. 244); 24, 277–280: (πάντα of l. 277 should be construed with ὅποσα at l. 280); 24, 289 (συστροφῶν is not a verb but a noun, referring to “the spires” of the Labyrinth). The translators also seem to have some trouble conveying the attenuating force of τέως (see e.g. 4, 53; 10, 74 and 20, 36).

28. See e.g. Tz. *Exeg. in Il.* 1, 388, p. 339, 8–13 (for this text, I rely on M. ΠΑΡΑΘΗΜΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ (ed.), *Εξήγησις Ἰωάννου Γραμματικοῦ τοῦ Τζέτζου εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάδα*. Athens 2007).

29. See e.g. CESARETTI, op. cit., p. 143 n. 46 and pp. 199–201.

such as these, a consistent translation is crucial to convey the coherence of Tzetzes' thought and terminology.

The second example that I would like to consider features in the last book of the *Allegories of the Odyssey* (24, 84–86), where Tzetzes is trying to remember the name of a source he has just quoted. Being unable to recall the identity of the author in question, the scholar declares:

ἐν δέλτοις δέ μου τῶν φρενῶν μυρίων σοφῶν ὄντων  
οὐκ ἔχω λέγειν ἀκριβῶς τὸν ιστοροῦντα τάδε  
ἢ Καισαρεὺς Προκόπιος εἴτε τίς ἐστὶν ἄλλος.

GOLDWYN and KOKKINI translate as follows:

In the books stored in my mind, written by countless wise men,  
I cannot say accurately who recorded these things;  
either it is Prokopios of Kaisareia or someone else.

Despite not deeply altering the meaning of the Greek text, this translation fails to convey one of Tzetzes' favorite *topoi*. Here, the scholar is not simply saying that he has stored many books in his mind, but he is implying that his mind – along with its mnemonic abilities – is itself a book (δέλτος).<sup>30</sup> I would therefore propose to translate as follows (interpreting μυρίων σοφῶν ὄντων as a genitive absolute):

Since the pages of my mind are populated by a myriad of wise men,  
I am not able to identify with any certainty the source of this episode:  
it might be Prokopios of Kaisareia or someone else.

Before concluding this review, I would like to make some remarks that might be of use to the readers of GOLDWYN and KOKKINI's translation, while also proposing a few suggestions that may be implemented in future works of comparable nature and scope. As GOLDWYN and KOKKINI themselves note in their introduction, the *Allegories of the Odyssey* were probably meant to be read with a copy of the *Odyssey* at hand. This applies also to the modern reader, who needs to be able to quickly locate the Homeric passages that Tzetzes is commenting upon. For this reason, it might have been worth preserving the layout of HUNGER's edition, where

30. For this motif, see e.g. Tz. *All. Il.* 15, 87–88 BOISSONADE, *Chil.* 4, 808 and 10, 450 LEONE. See also PIZZONE, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

the Homeric lines under scrutiny are indicated in the right and/or left margin of the page, just next to the related interpretations. Such a solution considerably simplifies the consultation of the work, since it does not require the reader to go back and forth from Tzetzes' text to the corresponding notes, placed at the very end of the volume. Moreover, the preservation of HUNGER's original layout might have helped the reader to visualize the constant dialogue between the Homeric poem and Tzetzes' allegorical interpretations, while also allowing the authors to save space and thus expand upon some of the existing notes.<sup>31</sup> This would have been especially desirable for the passages where Tzetzes supports his exegesis with etymological explanations, which, if not properly elucidated, may be completely lost to the reader who has no knowledge of Greek and/or is not familiar with the Byzantine taste for etymological games.

A case in point is book 5, 67–71, where Tzetzes is explaining what exactly Homer is referring to when he says that Tithonos slept next to Dawn (*Od.* 5, 1–2). GOLDWYN and KOKKINI propose the following translation:

τὸν τοῦ Πριάμου ἀδελφὸν νῦν, Τιθωνόν, μοι ἕα  
καὶ τὴν ἠὼ δὲ σύνευνον θεὰν νοεῖν ἀθλίαν.  
τὸ πρωῖνὸν κατάστημα νῦν Τιθωνόν μοι νόει,  
τὰ ὄνια, ἃ τίθεται ταῖς ἀγοραῖς εἰς πράσιν, (70)  
ἦτοι ἡμέρα ἦπλωτο ἀνθρώποις καὶ στοιχείοις.

Here allow me to explain that Tithonos is Priam's brother,  
and his wretched wife is the goddess Dawn.  
Here I understand the morning weather as Tithonos,  
who is goods for sale, which are placed in markets for purchase,  
that is, day was spreading over men and the elements.

This reading presents many problems. First, at ll. 67–68, Tzetzes is inviting his reader not to interpret this particular Tithonos as Priam's brother,<sup>32</sup>

31. Despite often providing useful information for a better understanding of Tzetzes' work, the notes to the translation are sometimes inaccurate. A case in point is the note to *All. Od.* 7, 20 (p. 305). Here, the authors observe that HUNGER was not able to find the term ἀερόστημος in any of the writings by George of Pisidia. Since they apparently could not locate it in the TLG, they conclude that the term is likely a hapax. However, the word does feature in the *Hexaemeron* by George of Pisidia (l. 268 TARTAGLIA), as attested by LAMPE's *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, the ancient Greek-Italian dictionary edited by FRANCO MONTANARI (second edition 2004) and now also by the TLG. Once again, a more accurate reading of Tzetzes and his sources could have contributed to nuance the image of the scholar as an imprecise and chaotic compiler of erudite works.

32. On this 'other' Tithonos, see e.g. Tz. *Theog.* 570–571 BEKKER.

just as the mention of dawn should not be read as an allusion to his alleged divine wife (μοι ἔα νοεῖν does not mean “allow me to explain”, but rather “please do not interpret [him/her] as ...”). Furthermore, the meaning of the lines where Tzetzes presents the correct allegorical interpretation of this Homeric Tithonos (Il. 69–71) is not clearly conveyed by the translation nor is it explained in the notes. As remarked by HUNGER,<sup>33</sup> in this passage Tzetzes is proposing an etymological interpretation of Tithonos’ name, which would derive from ὄνια (“merchandises”) and τίθημι (“arrange, put in order”). In sum, according to Tzetzes, by fashioning this Tithonos, Homer would be simply alluding to the fact that morning, the moment when merchandises are exposed for sale in the markets, had finally come both for the elements and for men (the ἀθανάτοισι and βροτοῖσιν of *Od.* 5, 2). This rather convoluted explanation is completely lost to someone who is not familiar with Greek: when faced with the apparently absurd claim that Tithonos “is goods for sale”, this reader might indeed conclude that Tzetzes is cryptic and opaque.<sup>34</sup>

As a last remark, I would like to go back to the close connection linking Tzetzes’ and Homer’s texts. Leaving aside the not always reader-friendly layout, the constant dialogue between allegorical interpretations and related passages of the *Odyssey* is sometimes further blurred by the translations of the Homeric text adopted by GOLDWYN and KOKKINI. In the introduction, the two authors declare that, despite generally following MURRAY’s 1919 Loeb translation, they have sometimes felt the need to modify it so as “to provide a similar juxtaposition in English” (p. xxi). However, in some instances Tzetzes’ interpretations are made almost unintelligible by the English translation – be it MURRAY’s or the authors’ own – of the very Homeric line he is commenting upon.

As an example of this additional difficulty, I would like to briefly discuss a passage where Tzetzes is explaining the epithet δῖα θεάων that Homer ascribes to Athena in *Od.* 20, 55. Tzetzes’ point is that this epithet is particu-

33. HUNGER (1956 edition), p. 307.

34. Notably, the very same etymological interpretation of Tithonos’ name features in *All. Il.* 11, 1–4 (Ἡμέρα μὲν ἐξέτρεχεν ἐκ Τιθωνοῦ τῆς κοίτης· | ἦτοι, μετὰ τὴν θέσιν δὲ πάντων τῶν πωλουμένων, | τὸ πρωῖνὸν κατάστημα, ὃ Τιθωνὸς καλεῖται | ἡμέρα μὲν ἐπλάτυνεν ἀνθρώποις καὶ στοιχείοις). However, having based their translation of the *Allegories of the Iliad* on BOISSONADE’s edition only, GOLDWYN and KOKKINI could not but miss Tzetzes’ etymological game. Indeed, instead of the correct πωλουμένων (from πωλέω, “sell”) featuring in MATRANGA’s edition, BOISSONADE printed πολουμένων (from πολέω, “go about, revolve”), thus irreparably altering Tzetzes’ line of reasoning.

larly felicitous since Athena, whom he now glosses as the allegorical representation of wisdom, is indeed the most divine amongst the goddesses, just as wisdom is the most important of all the “psychological faculties” (*All. Od.* 20, 37–48). To allow the reader to understand the connection between Tzetzes’ explanation and the Homeric epithet, the superlative force of  $\delta\tilde{\iota}\alpha$   $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$  should have been preserved also in the translation of the Homeric line. Following MURRAY, who translates the Homeric expression by “fair goddess” (*All. Od.* 20, 32 and 37), the authors completely blur the connection between Tzetzes’ exegesis and the Homeric line inspiring it.<sup>35</sup>

To conclude, GOLDWYN and KOKKINI set out to undertake a challenging task, that of making available for the first time to the English-speaking world such a complex work as Tzetzes’ *Allegories of the Odyssey*. Precisely because they aim to provide the first translation of the *Allegories* into any language, as they themselves claim, their primary goal should have been to facilitate the understanding of Tzetzes’ words, thought and personality as much as possible. Admittedly, HUNGER’s edition can significantly complicate the task and the book does present some strengths, as I outlined at the beginning of my review. However, I would not recommend GOLDWYN and KOKKINI’s translation to someone who cannot read ancient and Byzantine Greek – and therefore cannot make sense of the at times confusing English rendition. Graduate students and academics who master Greek but have limited knowledge of Tzetzes and his style are advised to make use of this book along with other references, some of which have been mentioned in the footnotes of this review.

#### Keywords

John Tzetzes, *Allegories of the Odyssey*, translation; Homer, allegory; Komnenian literature

---

35. For other passages where the translation of the Homeric lines runs the risk of further obscuring the meaning of Tzetzes’ allegorical interpretations, see e.g. 6, 35 (MURRAY’s rendering of the Homeric  $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\alpha$   $\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$  (*Od.* 6, 12) as “made wise in counsel” does not fit the explanation proposed by Tzetzes, who glosses  $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\alpha$  as “ $\sigma\omicron\phi\acute{\alpha}$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\chi\iota\nu\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\alpha$ ”), 13, 23 ( $\acute{\omega}\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$  of *Od.* 13, 121 is not translated, thus obfuscating the connection between the Homeric line and Tzetzes’ exegesis) and 22, 63 (MURRAY’s translation of  $\mu\tilde{\upsilon}\theta\omicron\nu$  (*Od.* 22, 289) as “matter” and not as “word, discourse” does not allow the reader to understand the meaning of Tzetzes’ explanation at *All. Od.* 22, 64:  $\eta\tau\omicron\iota$   $\sigma\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$   $\nu\tilde{\omega}$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\tilde{\omega}$   $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\mu\eta$   $\phi\lambda\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega\varsigma$ ).