

ELIZABETH M. JEFFREYS
M. A., M. A., B. Litt.
Ἑποτρόφου τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς

CONSTANTINE HERMONIAKOS AND BYZANTINE EDUCATION

Sometime between 1323 and 1335 John II Comnenus Angelus Doukas¹, the Italian Despot of Epirus, wishing to demonstrate his Hellenism to his Greek subjects, commissioned Constantine Hermoniakos to compose an *Iliad*². Regrettably Hermoniakos has become, as it were, a scapegoat for the literary historians of Byzantium, who are all too conscious of the poverty of the authors with whom they are concerned. Here is a poet so remorselessly lacking in inspiration and sensitivity that the endeavours of any other writer are enhanced by the comparison. A writer so universally and comprehensively derided and condemned by modern scholarship is unlikely to reward those who study him with much literary pleasure. But it seemed to me that his ignorance and incompetence have been painted in such dark colours³ by commentators who often give no sign of having read more than a few lines of his work that an explanation is needed. A poet who can arouse such passionate denunciation cannot at least be dull. I have therefore examined his *Iliad* to see if its sources can be traced. Most can, and show that Hermoniakos was better acquainted with the great works of Greek literature than is usually assumed⁴. The statements he made in his title about his activities are in fact reasonably accurate⁵. I pro-

1. See *W. Miller*, *The Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908, pp. 250 and 273; *D. M. Nicol*, *The Last Centuries of Byzantium 1261-1453*, London, 1972, p. 184.

2. For Hermoniakos' dedication of the poem to John II, see *E. Legrand* (ed.), *La Guerre de Troie*, Paris, 1890 (*Bibliothèque Grecque Vulgaire V*), *Prolégomènes* 1-49; this edition is hereafter cited by book and line-number.

3. He used a laboured octosyllable (*K. Krumbacher*, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, Munich, 1897, p. 847), and a barbaric syntax. For reaction to his technique, cf. *Legrand*, op. cit. pp. vii-ix; *Krumbacher*, op. cit., pp. 845-7; *B. Knös*, *L'Histoire de la Littérature Néogrecque*, Uppsala, 1962, p. 132; *H. - G. Beck*, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur*, Munich, 1971, pp. 167-9: «Diese Poesie ist jeder Inspiration bar» (p. 169).

4. *Legrand*, op. cit., p. ix: «Constantin Hermoniacos a surtout mis à profit les Allégories de l'Iliade de Tzetzés...Il s'est, en outre, servi, je n'oserais dire du texte original de l'Iliade (était-il capable de le comprendre?) mais plutôt de quelque paraphrase du poème homérique». These comments have entered into such literature as exists on Hermoniakos, and seem to have been amplified only by *E. Patzig*, *Dictys Cretensis*, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 1, 1892, p. 139 where he points out the debt to Manasses.

5. Μετάφρασις Ἰστορίας τινὸς ἀρομοδίας πρὸς Ὀμήρου, σὺν αὐτῆς γὰρ ἀκολουθῶς ἔγων

pose to demonstrate here the extent of his borrowings, and the nature of his variations.

Hermoniakos' title claims first that the work is a *Μετὰφρασις ἱστορίας τινὸς ἀρμοδίας πρὸ Ὀμήρου*. Legrand recognized that the work referred to here is Tzetzes' *Allegories on the Iliad*¹, though the question, to my knowledge, was not discussed in detail. The *Allegories* were begun under the patronage of Bertha von Sulzbach, wife of Manuel Comnenus, who would seem to have suggested the verse form though without giving clear and prompt instructions for the contents². On her death the work was incomplete and composition resumed only with the urging and financial backing of John Kotertzes³. Partly as a result of this the

I 60-77

- 60 Ὅ γὰρ Κάδμιον ἐδιδάχθη
ἐκ τὴν γνῶσιν τὴν οἰκείαν
κἄξ ἑτέρων ὅθεν ἡῦρεν
καὶ θυμόσοφος ἐγένη·
κἔμαθήτευσεν ὁ Κάδμος
- 65 τὸν σοφώτατον Ὀλῖνον
καὶ ὁ Λῖνος τὸν Ὀρφέαν
καὶ Ὀρφεὺς τὸν Προναπίδην·
καὶ διδάσκαλος Ὀμήρου
ἦτον γοῦν ὁ Προναπίδης·
- 70 καὶ ὁ Ὀμηρος μαθόντα
πάντα γοῦν τοῦ Προναπίδους,
θέλων καὶ πλεῖον νὰ μάθῃ
εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἀπῆλθεν
κἄξετρύγησεν ἐκεῖσε
- 75 πάσης γὰρ σοφίας ἄνθος,
καὶ σοφὸς ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπους
ἐγεγόνει γὰρ ἐκεῖνος.

τοὺς πολέμους τῆς Τροίας ἀπαρλλάκτως, καθὼς ὁ Ὀμηρος διηγεῖται καὶ ἕτεροι ποιηταὶ τοὺς πολέμους καὶ τὴν τοῦ δουρίου ἵππου κατασκευὴν καὶ τὴν ἀνάλωσιν τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως καὶ τινὰ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάλωσιν τῆς αὐτῆς Τροίας· τὰ μετ' Ὀμηρον τὰ μὴ γραφέν ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ Ὀμήρου βιβλίον τὸ καλούμενον Ἰλιάδα. (Legrand, op. cit., p. 1).

1. Ed. J. F. Boissonade, *Tzetzae Allegoriae Iliadis*, Paris, 1851 (reprinted Hildesheim, 1967).

2. E. g. Prol. 1205-1214, especially 1214 ταχέως δηλωθήτω μοι διαπορῶ γὰρ πάνυ. See C. Wendel, RE VII. 2 (1948), cols. 1967-9.

3. Cf. Alleg. II i-vii.

Allegories fall into three sections. The first, the *Prolegomena*, deals with the background to the *Iliad*, the life of Homer and the events leading up to the war, while the main allegorizing passage is concerned with the Judgement of Paris¹. The second, discussing *Iliad* A-O, book by book, gives a full analysis of the events covered by each book with allegorical interpretation where necessary. The third, covering *Iliad* Π-Ω gives only a very brief description of the action and then follows this with the allegorization. The change in technique from the second to the third section corresponds to the change in patron.

The *Prolegomena* are paraphrased by Hermoniakos between I 1 (cf. *Prol.* 25 ff.) and VII 14 (*Prol.* 1143). The phraseology can echo that of Tzetzes very closely, as the following parallel examples show:

Prol. 68-78

68 ὁ Κάδμος ἐξ Αἰγύπτου γὰρ ἔλθων εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα

69 τὸν Αἴνον ἐξεπαίδευσεν ἐν γράμμασι Φοινίκων·

70 ὁ Αἴνος δ' ἐξεπαίδευσεν ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Κάδμου,

71 Ὅρφέα Ἑρακλέα τε, καὶ γε τὸν Προναπίδην·

67 Διδάσκαλος δὲ γίνεται Ὅμηρου Προναπίδης

74 ὁ Προναπίδης οὗτος δὲ τὸν Ὅμηρον διδάσκει.

75 Καὶ δὴ μαθὼν ὁ Ὅμηρος πάντα τὰ Προναπίδου,

76 χρήζων καὶ πλείονα μαθεῖν, εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀπῆλθε,

77 κακεῖ λοιπὸν ἐτύγχησε πάσης σοφίας ἄνθος·

78 σοφὸς δ' ἄκρω γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπου φύσιν.

1. On Tzetzes' use of allegory, see H. Hunger, *Allegorische Mythendeutung in der Antike und bei Johannes Tzetzes*, *Jahrb. Byz. Ost. Ges.* 3, 1954, pp. 35-54.

I 142-166

- 142 Καὶ κατὰ λεπτόν γάρ μάθε
τοῦ Ὀμήρου καὶ ἑτέρων
βίβλων ἄλλων πρὸ Ὀμήρου·
- 145 καὶ μετ' Ὀμηρόν τινά γαρ·
ὅσα γοῦν ἐσυνεγράψαν
Εὐρεπίδης καὶ Λυκόφρων,
καὶ οἱ ἕτεροι σὺν τούτων
τὰ περὶ τῆς Τροίας τότε.
- 150 Ἐν γὰρ πόνῳ βραχυτάτῳ
περιέκλεισα τὰ πάντα,
ἐν στενωῷ πεπλατυσμένα,
καὶ εὐνόητα τοῖς πᾶσι·
ὁ βουλόμενος ἐν ἄλλοις
- 155 τοῖς ἐκείνοις βίβλου ταύτης
τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀναγνῶσκέναι
τῶν ἐκείνων βιβλοθήκων,
οὐχ εὐρήσει τις ὅποσα
ἐν πολλοῖς βιβλίοις γάρ γε,
- 160 τμήμασι μικροῖς μεγάλοις,
ὡς τὸ πόνημα ἐτοῦτο.
Κένεκεν αὐτοῦ γὰρ μᾶλλον
εὐεργέτησον κάμοι γαρ
δωρεάν, ὡς εὐεργέται,
- 165 τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς σῆς ἀξίως
σῶν τῶν βασιλικωτάτων.

Passages of this type are frequent and many further examples can be found easily, but though Hermoniakos has taken over much of his source text he has also adapted it. There are a number of omissions and some additional material. The omissions simplify Tzetzes' discussion of mythological and historical passages; e. g. I 29-57 (cf. *Prol.* 50-66) on Homer's parentage; I 100 (cf. *Prol.* 86-112) on Homer's dates; III 244 (cf. *Prol.* 430-467) on the upbringing of Achilles; IV 285 (cf. *Prol.* 744-781) on the sacrifice of Iphigenia at Aulis. The additions vary in nature; at I 36-57 is described a prophecy given to Homer's mother; at II 313-III 30 are moral reflections on love and adultery; at V 87-101 are comments on the glory a man gains from bravery and at VI 79-86 and 117-132 on the insidious role of φθόνος (with particular

Prol. 478-498

- 478 εἶτα λοιπόν μοι μετ' αὐτὰ μάθης τὰ τοῦ πολέμου
κατὰ λεπτὸν τὰ σύμπαντα στενωῶς πεπλατυσμένως,
- 480 οὕτως ὡς ἂν ἀνέγνωκας Ὀμήρου, Στησιχόρου,

Εὐριπίδας, Λυκόφρονας, Κολλοῦθους τε καὶ Λέσχας,
καὶ Δίκτυν συγγραψάμενον καλῶς τὴν Ἰλιάδα,
Τρυφιοδώρους, Κόϊντον, καὶ ἑκατὸν βιβλία,
οὐκ ἂν λεπτομερέστερον οὕτως ἐξηκριβώσω·
- 485 καὶ τότε τμήματι βραχεῖ πάντα συγκεκλεισμένα

ὅπως πᾶς ὁ βουλόμενος ἐν πόνῳ βραχυτάτῳ

ἀνεγνωκέναι τοῖς πολλοῖς δοκῆ βιβλιοθήκας...
493 τὰ πάντα περιέκλεισα τμήματι βραχυτάτῳ,
ὅποσα οὐχ εὐρήσει τις οὐδ' ἑκατὸν βιβλίους,...
- 496 μικροῖς, μεγάλους τμήμασι, στενοῖς, πεπλατυσμένοις,

καὶ μᾶλλον ἔνεκεν αὐτοῦ καὶ δωρεὰ δοθῆ μοι

τῆς σῆς ψυχῆς ἐπάξιός τῆς βασιλικωτάτης¹,...

reference to the fate of Palamedes); at VI 269-304 are comments on the pernicious effects of rumour; at V 224-321 are given detailed instructions on how to operate a cross-bow, invented by Palamedes. There are also additional pieces of information in the narrative: at II 186-309 (cf. *Prol.* 367-78) Helen's beauty sends the writer into transports of delight; at II 161-177 (at *Prol.* 359) are details on Helen's parentage; at III 183-7 (contrast *Prol.* 395-418) Aeneas is saved from the sack of Troy; at III 191-226 (at *Prol.* 418) the Greeks had sworn to protect Helen (this is attributed to Συσῆγωρ); at V 130-168 (at *Prol.*

1. The latter example shows that Hermoniakos cannot even bring himself to write his own dedication, but follows the pattern set by Tzetzes. Hermoniakos' dedicatory prologue is thus probably also prompted by Tzetzes' opening dedication at *Prol.* 1-15 though there are no verbal parallels.

855) the total of dead in the first stages of fighting is listed (attributed to ἱστορικὸς τις); at V 174-203 (at *Prol.* 860) is a description of how Achilles and Patroclus were wounded. The source for these, if not Hermoniakos' own imagination, has not so far been traced. Other differences from Tzetzes' narrative occur in the Catalogue and the Portrait lists. In the Catalogue (III 244-IV 31, cf. *Prol.* 508-638) Hermoniakos simplifies the personnel in the contingents, naming only the leaders (but frequently in a distorted form). The only extra name seems to be Βρηχῆνωρ ἐκ Κερκύρας (at IV 28—one of the last nationalistic interpolations in the *Iliad*?). In the portrait list Hermoniakos omits Menelaos (*Prol.* 665-6), Dios and Epistrophos (*Prol.* 823), Chromis and Ennomos (*Prol.* 824), but adds Persilochos (IV 235), Antilochos (IV 239), Lephenor (IV 242), Pyrrhos (IV 250), Semoseus (IV 259), Echepolos (IV 321), Agenor (IV 327), Enedos (V 1)¹. Again the source of these additions has not been traced². These are the sort of points which must have led Legrand to comment that Hermoniakos had a fuller text of the *Allegories* than is now available³; there seems to be no other evidence for his suggestion.

Some of the additional material can however be traced to its source

I 362-II 15

- 362 Λαομέδοντος υἱός γαρ
ὁ Πριάμος γὰρ ἐκεῖνος
εἶχε σύζυγον Ἐκάβην,
365 τὴν τε παῖδα τοῦ Κισσέως
χρηματίσασα γὰρ μήτηρ
ἐκ σπορᾶς γὰρ τοῦ Πριάμου
παῖδας γοῦν δεκαεννέα
(ἀπεκύησεν Ἐκάβη)⁴
- II 10 καὶ κατὰ γαστρὸς γὰρ εἶχε,
καὶ πρὸς γὰρ τὸ τίκτειν οὔσα,

1. However he retains Tzetzes' comparison of himself with Cato and Palamedes (IV 214-226, cf. *Prol.* 724-739) which was a personal quirk of Tzetzes and quite irrelevant to his topic.

2. The extra portraits do not occur, for example, in Malalas (ed. Bonn, 1831, p. 103), Isaac Porphyrogenetos (ed. *H. Hinck*, *Polemonis Declamationes*, Leipzig, 1873, pp. 80-87) or Dares (ed. *F. Meister*, Leipzig, 1873, cap. XII-XIII).

3. *Legrand*, *op. cit.*, p. ix.

4. I, 370-1, II, 1-9: acrostic.

and it is possible to see how Hermoniakos weaves together the strands of two narratives that are not always compatible. The Judgement of Paris, for example, is a story which seems to have aroused Tzetzes' especial indignation (cf. *Prol.* 135, 170-1, 217, 225)¹. It is also one to which he devotes a certain amount of attention, both for the narrative and for its allegorical interpretation (cf. *Prol.* 135-333). Hermoniakos has retained much of Tzetzes' vehemence (e.g. I 181 ἔνι δὲ ψευδῆς ὁ μῦθος; cf. 185-6, 204-5, 338-344, 360-1) and part of the reason for it (that the generation gap postulated between Paris and Achilles is inconsistent with the *Iliad*; cf. I 345-59). Nevertheless he avoids both the complexities of Tzetzes' two versions (*Prol.* 135-169 and 172-249) and the allegorization (*Prol.* 251-334) by using the more straightforward narrative from Manasses' *Σύνοψις Χρονική*².

Thus after I 360-1:

ψεῦδος γὰρ καὶ λῆρος ἔστι,
τὸ γὰρ ἀληθὲς γὰρ τοῦτο·

which is taken from *Prol.* 225 (τοῦτο μὲν λῆρος καὶ ψευδές, τὰ δ' ἀληθές τοιοῦτον) Hermoniakos turns to Constantine Manasses, as the following parallel lines show:

Σύνοψις Χρονική 1118-1123

1118 τῷ Λαομέδοντος παιδὶ τῷ φυλαρχοῦντι Τρώων³

1119 Πριάμῳ

σύζυγος συνῆν Ἑκάβη

παῖς Κισσέως,

1120 καὶ μήτηρ ἐχρημάτισε

πολλῶν ἐκ τούτου παίδων.

1121 ἔχουσα γοῦν κατὰ γαστρός

καὶ πρὸς τὸ τρίκειν οὔσα,

1. These comments are also reflected in the prose introductions to the *Iliad* derived from Tzetzes, cf. *P. Mertens, Songe d'Hécube, Pomme de Dis corde et autres Antehomerica, Antiquité Classique* 29, 1960, pp. 18-28.

2. Ed. *I. Bekker, Bonn, 1837.*

3. But cf. *Prol.* 172.

φρικωδέστατον γὰρ ὄναρ
 βλέπει γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους·
 κούσασα δαλὸν ἐδόκει
 15 ἀνθρακκας καὶ φλόγαν πέμπων.

Manasses' narrative is followed from this point onwards until II 95 (Man. 1148), though with an omission (Man. 1128-31: proposed methods of disposing of the ill-fated child) and additions taken from Tzetzes' account (II 31-3, cf. *Prol.* 191 for the thirty-year term of the oracle, which is not mentioned by Manasses; II 63-9, cf. *Prol.* 238-40 on the education Paris received in the Parion)¹. Hermoniakos thus blends elements first from one then from another of his sources.

Manasses is used again a little later for the account of Paris' flight with Helen (III 50-138, cf. Man. 1173-1208, with a moralizing comment inserted at III 76-85 and a tour-de-force of alliteration in φ at III 113-130). Regrettably on this occasion Hermoniakos fails to notice that there is a fundamental disagreement between Manasses' version and that of Tzetzes to which he subsequently returns. According to Manasses, Paris is compelled by Proteus to leave Helen in Egypt and to sail to Troy empty-handed:

III 136-8 οὐδὲ γὰρ δακτύλῳ ἄκρω
 τῆς Ἑλένης ἠδονῆς γαρ
 εἶδεν γὰρ ὁ Πάρις ὄλωσ·

(cf. Man. 1207) but according to Tzetzes, and also Hermoniakos (III 139, cf. *Prol.* 391), Helen was greeted with delight by the Trojans when she arrived². The two statements are juxtaposed by Hermoniakos without comment, and the rest of his narrative assumes that Helen is in Troy³.

Thus, for his first six books Hermoniakos' main debts to his sources can be expressed as follows (with a few minor discrepancies that are not noticed here):

1. There is also a passage, II 69-76, on the five-fold names of Paris whose source has not been traced.

2. A similar, though not quite so fundamental, discrepancy occurs over the fate of Polydoros as described by Homer and Euripides; see p. 105, n. 2 below.

3. Manasses' *Chronicle* is also used to provide post-Homeric information, which will be discussed later.

- 1122 φοβήτροις ἐκτεθρόητο
 νυκτέρων ὄνειράτων·
- 1123 βλέπειν γὰρ ἔδοξε δαλὸν
 φλόγεον ἀνθρακίαν...

Hermoniakos	Tzetzes' <i>Prolegomena</i>	Manasses
Prologue 1-85	1-15	
I 1-28	25-49	
29-37	50-66	
38-57	— (Homer's mother)	
58-77	67-78	
78-100	79-85	
101-141	113-132	
142-177	468-507	
178-344	133-163	
345-361	217-225	
362-II 100		1118-1148
II 101-125	— (oracles)	
126-160	346-359	
161-177	— (Helen's parentage)	
178-185	361-4	
186-309	367-78	
310-III 30	— (moralizing)	
II 31-49	381-86	
50-138		1173-1208
139-191	395-418	
192-226	— (oath to protect Helen)	
227-243	419-429	
244-IV 31	508-638	
V 32-94	(54-8, cf. <i>Prolog.</i> 471-2; 65-8, cf. <i>Prolog.</i> 469-70)	
95-234	660-743	
235-263	— (extra names)	
264-274	712-7	
275-284	— (extra names)	
285-V 53	782-831	
54-129	832-855	
130-168	— (number of dead)	
169-173	859-60	
174-203	— (wounding of Achilles)	
204-223	866-874	

224-321	— (cross-bow)
322-372	875-898
373-449	899-917
450-VI 78	918-960
VI 79-86	— (moralizing)
87-116	961-976
117-132	— (moralizing)
133-323	1027-1112
324-VII 19	1113-1143

Hermoniakos makes use of the remainder of the *Allegories* elsewhere in his *Iliad*, from IX 319 (cf. *Alleg.* Δ 18, or possibly IX 246, cf. *Alleg.* Γ 172 ff.) to XVII 220 (cf. *Alleg.* O 248). The point where he ceases to follow the *Allegories* corresponds to the change in Tzetzes' method of writing that I have noted, for after the end of O Tzetzes no longer provides a full and detachable account of the Homeric narrative. From *Allegories* Δ to O, however¹, as with the *Prolegomena* many passages have been taken over almost word for word (the ubiquitous γὰρ is an all too useful way of adapting Tzetzes' political lines to octosyllables). The examples given from the *Prolegomena* illustrate how Hermoniakos works. As before he omits a number of passages. These include most of the scenes involving the Olympian deities (e.g. X 210, cf. *Alleg.* E 57-71, Aphrodite rescues Aeneas) though it is worth remembering that in the *Prolegomena* the gods in the Judgement of Paris were retained, without allegorization. Almost all the later allegorization has been left out; e. g. XII 175 (cf. *Alleg.* H 111-141), XII 178 (cf. *Alleg.* Z 2-35), XII 323 (cf. *Alleg.* Θ 78-89), XIII 89 (cf. *Alleg.* Θ 132-144), XIII 100 (cf. *Alleg.* Θ 147-197), XIV 300 (cf. *Alleg.* A 59-66), XV 281 (cf. *Alleg.* N 1-26, though possibly a lacuna), XVI 78 (cf. *Alleg.* M 1-27, also possibly a lacuna), XVI 270 (cf. *Alleg.* Ξ 8-28), XVII 44 (cf. *Alleg.* O 1-101). Other comments in the *Allegories* which refer to non-Christian attitudes are also occasionally omitted; e.g. XII 140 (cf. *Alleg.* H 88-9, a sacrifice), XIV 156 (cf. *Alleg.* K 46-52, on divination), XIV 277 (cf. *Alleg.* Λ 40-41, on fate). Some of the battle scenes are shortened or omitted, e.g. XVI 157 (cf. *Alleg.* N 111-145), XVI 183 (cf. *Alleg.* N 153-184), XVII 115 (cf. *Alleg.* O 137-150); and occasionally Hermoniakos leaves out an arming scene (e.g. XII 51, cf. *Alleg.* H 35-

1. A to Γ have been taken from the *Iliad* and not the *Allegories*, as will be discussed later.

49), though he keeps in Agamemnon's arming from *Alleg.* Λ 10-30 (cf. XIV 205-269). Some speeches are left out; e.g. XII 158 (cf. *Alleg.* H 99-103), XV 76 (cf. *Alleg.* Λ 159-165). Hermoniakos also ignores, at XVII 138, Tzetzes' discussion of the meaning of ἀνεψίος (cf. *Alleg.* O 157-166).

Hermoniakos again brings a little extra information; on weapons, at XI 47-109 (cf. *Alleg.* Z 9) where he seems to be referring to the fourteenth century and not to Homeric techniques; at XII 30-38 (cf. *Alleg.* H 19) Nestor adds some non-Homeric advice; at XIV 1-76 (contrast *Alleg.* I 69-134) the speeches bear no resemblance to Tzetzes' version. Most importantly at XIII 131-251 (cf. *Alleg.* Θ 203) is a summary of the contingents in the army, which is attributed (at XIII 169-173) to

Ἰωάννης
 χρονικὸς Ἀντιοχεύς γὰρ
 τοῦ φουσσάτου γὰρ τὸ μέτρον
 ἔν τε τῇ δευτέρᾳ βίβλῳ
 εἰς τὸν ὄγδοον τίτλον.

This seemingly precise reference has not so far been traced. Hermoniakos also interweaves into his narrative similes and episodes taken from the *Iliad* itself: these will be discussed later.

The text of Hermoniakos as it now stands plainly has a number of lacunas and some displaced lines: this is apparent both from the gaps in sense and from a comparison with the source texts. Most of the lacunas occur in passages derived from the *Allegories*, and have in many cases been filled by Legrand in his edition on the basis of that text; e.g. at XIV 105 a-p, cf. *Alleg.* K 2-10; XIV 108 a-g, cf. *Alleg.* K 12-15; XIV 126 a-h, cf. *Alleg.* K 34-7; XIV 167 a-g, cf. *Alleg.* K 55-8; XIV 318-9, cf. *Alleg.* Λ 84-5; XV 25-34, cf. *Alleg.* Λ 110-127; XV 38 a-d, cf. *Alleg.* Λ 129-32; XV 41 a, 42 a-b, cf. *Alleg.* Λ 135, 136; XV 244 a-b, cf. *Alleg.* M 143; XV 280 a-b, cf. *Alleg.* M 27; XV 282 a-t, cf. *Alleg.* M 29-38; XV 287 a-c, cf. *Alleg.* M 40-41; XVI 124 a-c, cf. *Alleg.* N 92-3. The displaced lines occur at XV 281-XVI 78, which should follow XV 145; the correct order is as follows:

XV 145	<i>Alleg.</i> Λ 215
	M 1-27 (omitted)
XV 281-XVI 78	M 28-102
XV 146-280	M 103-169 (end of book)
	N 1-26 (omitted)
XVI 79 ff.	N 27 ff.

These differences, shared by all three extant manuscripts of Hermoniakos' poem, must be due to a faulty archetype at the head of the copying tradition. That they are not due to an inadequate copy of the *Allegories* is shown by similar lacunas at XXII 26a, in a passage which reflects Sophocles' *Ajax*, and at XVII 417, in a Homeric passage.

From what has been said already certain facets of Hermoniakos' attitudes emerge. He dislikes writing about the Olympian gods, even in an allegorical form; he has a certain interest in weapon technology — but of his contemporaries rather than of Homer; and he has a tendency to moralize. Rather more important for present purposes however is the fact that he likes to follow a written source closely: he rarely seems inclined to let his imagination work. When therefore in the title he states that the fighting at Troy is described καθὼς ὁ Ὀμηρος διηγεῖται, one must first examine the obvious source, the *Iliad*.

At VII 15¹ Hermoniakos makes the transition away from Tzetzes'

VII 19-97

- 19 Τὴν ὄργην ἄδε καὶ λέγε,
 ὃ καλόφθαλμη κυρία,
 Ἄχιλλέως τοῦ ἀνδρείου,
 πῶς ἐγένην ὀλεθρία,
 καὶ τοὺς ἄριστους Ἀχαιοὺς
 πῶς τὰς θλίψεις πεποιῆκεν,
 25 καὶ πολλοὺς ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων
 πῶς ἀπέστειλεν εἰς ἄδην,
 καὶ κινέσι καὶ ὀρνέοις
 πρὸς βορὰν τοῦτους ἐδῶκεν.
 Εἶτα τούτων ἀκουσάντων,
 30 ἡ καλόφθαλμος δεσποίνη
 ἔφη πρὸς τὸν ἐρωτῶντα·
 τοῦ Διὸς γὰρ ἐπληρώθη
 ἦτοι γὰρ ἀνεβουλήθη.

1. The dividing line between Hermoniakos' sources is not clear. *Iliad* Γ 426-446 is summarized inaccurately and with no verbal reflections at IX 226-245; none of this material appears in Tzetzes. *Iliad* Γ 455-461 appears at Alleg. Γ 172-7; IX 246-55 could be derived from either of these passages. IX 256-318 is a summary of the leaders; IX 319 ff., however, is indubitably taken from Alleg. Δ 18 ff.

account of the first stages of the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles, and turns to his new source:

ὥς ὁ Ὅμηρος γὰρ λέγει,
καὶ προσώποιαν ποιεῖ γὰρ
πρὸς θεὰν γὰρ ἐρωτῶντα,
λέγων πρὸς αὐτὴν τοιαῦτα.

Then from VII 19 to c. IX 255 he uses *Iliad* Α-Γ with the expected omissions and a very few additions. That Hermoniakos was using a copy of the *Iliad* itself and not a paraphrase, as Legrand suggested becomes plain when the texts are compared. The two most common Byzantine paraphrases of the *Iliad* were those of Psellos, which seems to have circulated quite widely¹, and that of Moschopoulos, who would have been a slightly older contemporary of Hermoniakos². For the purposes of comparison I quote here *Iliad* Α 1-21³ and with it the versions of Hermoniakos, Psellos and Moschopoulos.

Iliad. Α 1-21

Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος

οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρὶ Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε,

πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν

ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλόφρα τεῦχε κύνεσσιν

5 αἰκονοῖσὶ τε πᾶσι,

Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή,

1. Ed. *I. Bekker*, Scholia in Homeri Iliadem, Berlin, 1825-7: Appendix, pp. 651-811. Cf. *Krumbacher*, op. cit., p. 443.

2. For Moschopoulos' paraphrase I have used the portion edited by *A. Ludwig*, Aristarchus Homerische Textkritik II, Leipzig, 1885 (reprinted 1971), p. 494 ff. For the date of composition, the work appears to be included in Vat. Gr. 29, which is dated to 1292 (cf. *T. W. Allen*, Homeri Ilias I: Prolegomena, Oxford, 1931, p. 44); this manuscript is not listed by Ludwig.

3. I have used the Oxford text, ed. *D. B. Monro* and *T. W. Allen* (3rd ed., 1920).

- Πρῶτον γὰρ ἐκχωρισθέντες
 35 εἰς φιλονεικίαν ἦλθον
 ὃ τε βασιλεὺς Ἀτρείδης
 καὶ Ἀχιλλῖος ταχύπους.
 Τοὺς αὐτοὺς δέ, δέσποινά μου,
 τίς ἠρέθισεν τὴν ἔριν
 40 καὶ τὴν μάχην ἐσυγκρότει;
 Εἶτα πάλιν ἀπεκρίθη·
 ὁ υἱὸς τῆς καλλιμάχου
 τῆς Λητοῦς ἐνδοξοτάτης,
 ὅπερ ἔχει φυτοσπῆρον
 45 τὸν Διὰν αὐτὸν τὸν μέγαν·
 ὁ γὰρ βασιλεὺς αὐτός γαρ,
 χολωθείς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ
 ἐδιέγειρεν κακία
 καὶ τὸ πλῆθος ἀπωλέστην
 50 ἔνεκεν τὴν ὕβριν Χρύσου,
 τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὸν θύτην
 ὃν ἀτίμασεν Ἀτρείδης.
 Ὅ γοῦν ἱερεὺς ὁ Χρύσης
 ἦλθεν εἰς τὰς ναῦς Ἑλλήνων,
 55 ἔν' αἰτήσῃ παρ' ἐκείνων
 τὴν ἰδίαν θυγατέρα
 καλλιπάρειον, ὠραίαν,
 ἀργυροῦ γὰρ καὶ χρυσίου
 φέρων πρὸς αὐτοὺς παντοῖα,
 60 καὶ τὸ στέμμα γὰρ κατέχων
 καὶ τὸ σκῆπτρον καὶ τὴν ῥάβδον
 τοῦ Θεοῦ του τοῦ ἰδίου,
 καὶ δεινῶς παρακλητεῦων
 ἅπαντας τοὺς μεγιστάνους
 (μάλιστα τὸν Ἀγαμέμνων)
 65 ἅμα σὺν τῷ αὐταδέλφῳ
 λέγων πρὸς αὐτοὺς τοιαῦτα.
 λβ' "Ὅρα τὸν ἔπαινον τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ Χρύσου, ὅταν
 ἐδόξαζεν τοὺς Ἑλληνας.
 βασιλεῖς, παῖδες Ἀτρεῖοι,
 ταρσοπέδιλοι, κουρτέσοι,
 γαστροκνήμιδες, ὠραῖοι,
 70 ὠραιόμορφοι εἰς θέαν

ἔξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε
 Ἄτρεΐδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.
 Τίς τ' ἄρ' σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;

Λητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός·

ὁ γὰρ βασιλῆϊ χολωθεὶς

νοῦσον ἀνά στρατὸν ὄρσε κακὴν, ὀλέκοντο δὲ λαοί,
 οὐνεκα τὸν Χρῦσῆν ἠτίμασεν ἀρητῆρα

Ἄτρεΐδης·

ὁ γὰρ ἦλθε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν

λυσόμενός τε θύγατρα

φέρων τ' ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα,

στέμματ' ἔχων ἐν χερσὶν ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος
 χρυσέφ' ἀνά σκήπτρω,

καὶ λίσσετο πάντας Ἀχαιοῦς,

Ἄτρεΐδα δὲ μάλιστα δῦω, κοσμήτορε λαῶν·

Ἄτρεΐδαι τε καὶ ἄλλοι εὐκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί,

- ἀπαράμιλλοι ἐν ἵπποις,
 ἀλλὰ δὴ κέν τοῖς πεντάθλοις,
 κέν πολέμοις τολμηροί μου,
 κέν φρονήσει κέν ἀνδρεία,
 75 ἐξοχώτατοι ἐν πᾶσι
 πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν ἄλλων·
 καὶ ἐσεῖς χαριτωμένοι
 πάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων παῖδες,
 ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ,
 80 ὁ εἰς οὐρανούς οἰκοῦντα,
 δῶ ὑμῖν πορθῆσαι ταύτην
 τοῦ Πριάμου γὰρ τὴν πόλιν,
 εἶτα, τούτης πορθουμένης,
 εἰς τὴν χώραν τὴν ἰδίαν
 85 ὁ θεὸς νὰ ἀποσώσῃ
 μετὰ πάσης εὐθυμίας
 καὶ χαρᾶς ὑπεραπείρου.
 τὴν ἐμὴν δὲ θυγατέρα
 τὴν πολλὰ μου ποθουμένην
 90 ἀποδότε πρὸς ἐμέναν·
 τὰ δὲ δῶρα τὰ κομίζω
 δέξεσθέ τα κατὰ χάριν
 κέντραπῆτε καὶ τὸν Δίαν
 τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος πατέρα,
 95 ὅπου δύναται τοξέυειν
 ὑπεράπειρα μακρὰ
 ὁ θεὸς γὰρ ὁ τοιοῦτος.

Moschopoulos

(1) Ὡ θεὰ Καλλιόπη, εἶπέ ἀκριβῶς ἐν ἐμμελείᾳ ποιητικῇ τὰ κατὰ τὴν μῆνιν τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Πηλέως (2) τὴν ἀπωλείας ἀξίαν, ἣ πλεῖστον ἄλγος ἐπήνεγκε τοῖς Ἕλλησι, (3) πολλὰς δὲ ψυχὰς ἡρώων γενναίας βλάβασα τῷ ἄδῃ παρέπεμψε, (4) τὰ δὲ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐποίησε σπαράγματα κυσὶ πολλοῖς (5) καὶ ὀρνέοις· τοῦ Διὸς δὲ ἐτελεῖτο ἡ βουλή, τῇ μητρὶ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως τῇ Θέτιδι χαριζομένου· (6) ἐξ ἐκείνου δὴ τὰ κατ' αὐτὴν διέλθε, ἐξ οὗ τὴν ἀρχὴν φιλονεικῆσαντες διέστησαν (7) ὁ βασιλεὺς τε τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀτρέως καὶ ὁ ἐνδοξὸς Ἀχιλλεύς. (8) πρὸς τούτους εἶπέ καὶ τίς ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν συνελθεῖν ἐποίησεν αὐτούς, ὥστε μάχεσθαι κατ' ἐριστικὴν καὶ φιλονεικὸν μάχην; (9) ἡ Μοῦσα· ὁ τῆς Λητοῦς καὶ τοῦ Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων τούτους κατ' ἀλλήλων ἐξεπολέμωσεν. οὗτος γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος ὀργισθεὶς (10) νόσον βαρεῖαν ἐπήνεγκεν ἐπὶ τὸ στράτευμα τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἐφθείροντο δὲ τὰ πλήθη. (11) τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἀπόλλων διότι τὸν Χρῦσῃν τὸν ἱερέα αὐτοῦ ἀτίμως ἀπέπεμψεν (12) ὁ Ἀτρείδης· οὗτος γὰρ ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὰς ταχείας ναῦς τῶν Ἑλλήνων (13) λύτροις τε ἐλευθερώσων τὴν ἑαυ-

ὕμῖν μὲν θεοὶ δοῖεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες

ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν,

εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι·

20 παῖδα δ' ἐμοὶ λύσατε φίλῃν,

τὰ δ' ἄποινα δέχεσθαι,

ἀζόμενοι Διὸς υἱὸν ἐκηβόλον Ἀπόλλων·

Psellos

(1) Τὴν ὄργην εἰπέ, ὦ θεά, τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Πηλέως τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως (2) τὴν ὀλεθρίαν, ἥτις πολλὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι κακὰ εἰργάσατο, (3) πλείστας δὲ γενναίας ψυχὰς τῷ ἄδῃ παρέπεμψε (4) τῶν ἡμιθέων ἀνδρῶν, τὰ δὲ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐλύσματα ἐποίει τοῖς κυσὶ (5) καὶ τοῖς σαρκοφάγοις θρυσιν ἄπασιν ἢ τοῦ Διὸς δὲ ἐπληροῦτο βουλῇ, (6) ἀφ' οὗ δὴ χρόνου τὴν ἀρχὴν διέστησαν φιλονεικήσαντες (7) ὁ τοῦ Ἀτρέως παῖς Ἀγαμέμνων ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἑνδοξὸς Ἀχιλλεύς. (8) τίς δὴ αὐτοὺς τῶν θεῶν φιλονεικίᾳ, συνέβαλε πολεμεῖν; (9) ὁ τῆς Λητοῦς καὶ τοῦ Διὸς παῖς Ἀπόλλων. οὗτος γὰρ τῷ βασιλεῖ ὀργισθεὶς (10) νόσον κατὰ τὸ στρατόπεδον διήγειρε κακωτικὴν, ἀπώλοντο δὲ οἱ λαοί, (11) ἐπειδὴ τὸν Χρῦσῃ ἀτίμως ὕβρισε τὸν ἱερέα (12) ἢ Ἀγαμέμνων. οὗτος γὰρ ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὰς ταχείας ναῦς τῶν Ἑλλήνων (13) λυτρωσόμενος τὴν θυγατέρα κομίζων τε πλείστα λύτρα, (14) στεφανώματα κατέχων ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ τοῦ μακροβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος (15) περὶ τῇ χρυσῇ ῥάβδῳ· καὶ παρεκάλει πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας, (16) μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς δύο τοῦ Ἀτρέως παῖδας τοὺς διατάκτορας τῶν ἔχλων (17) αὖ Ἀτρέως παῖδες καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ εὐοπλοὶ Ἕλληνες, (18) ὑμῖν μὲν οἱ θεοὶ παράσχουεν οἱ τὸν Ὀ-

τοῦ θυγατέρα φέρων τε ἐπὶ τούτῳ καὶ πράγματα πλείστα ἀντάξια εἰς ἀμοιβήν, (14) καὶ τὸ στέμμα τοῦ πόρρωθεν τοξέοντος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐν χερσὶ κατέχων (15) ἐπὶ τῇ βάρβδῳ τῇ τιμῇ· καὶ ἰκέτευσέ πάντας τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς, (16) τοὺς υἱοὺς δὲ τοῦ Ἀτρείδου μάλιστα πάντων, τοὺς βασιλεῖς, (17) λέγων· ἄῶ Ἀτρεΐδαί τε καὶ ἄλλοι Ἀχαιοὶ πολεμισταί, (18) ὑμῖν μὲν εἴθε δοῖεν οἱ θεοὶ οἱ οἰκοῦντες τὰ οὐράνια οἰκήματα (19) ἐκπορθῆσαι μὲν τὴν πόλιν τοῦ Πριάμου, καλῶς δὲ ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον ἕκαστον· (20) ἐμοὶ δὲ τὴν παῖδα τὴν φίλην λύσατε, τὰ δ' ἄποινα δέξασθε (21) εὐλαβοῦμενοι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Διὸς τὸν πόρρωθεν τοξέοντα Ἀπόλλωνα, οὗ ἱερεὺς ἐγώ».

Since all three of the Byzantine writers are working from the same text there is an inevitable superficial similarity. This is reinforced by Ludwich's demonstration¹ that many of the words that are common to Psellos and Moschopoulos (as well as to the other two prose paraphrases known) are derived from the scholia minora to the *Iliad*. Hermoniakos also shares a number of the words that were selected by Ludwich for his argument: A 1 μῆνιν: ὀργήν (HP)²; A 2 οὐλομένην: ὀλεθρίαν (HP); A 6 ἐρίσαντε: φιλονεικήσαντες (HMP); A 7 ἄναξ: βασιλεὺς (HMP); A 10 ὄρσε: διήγειρεν (HP); A 15 χρυσέῳ ἄνα σκήπτρῳ: ...ὅ ἐστι τῇ χρυσοῦ βάρβδῳ (HMP). The list of coincidences between Hermoniakos' vocabulary and the lexicological information of the scholia can be extended³: VII 19 ἔδε καὶ λέγε, cf. A 1 ἄειδε: ἔδε, λέγε; VII 93 κέντραπῆτε, cf. A 21 ἀζόμενοι: ἐντρεπόμενοι; VII 122 ὑγίης, cf. A 32 σαώτερος: ὑγίης; VII 131 ἐφοβήθη, cf. A 33 ἔδεισεν: ἐφοβήθη; VII 132 κέπορεύθηκεν, cf. A 34 βῆ: ἐπορεύθη; VII 133 ἠσυχῶς, cf. A 34 ἀκέων: ἠσυχάζων; VII 141 ἐπάκουσον, cf. A 37 κλῦθι: ἐπάκουσον; VII 192 ταχεῖς, cf. A 50 ἀργούς: ταχεῖς; VII 213 φροντίδαν εἶχεν, cf. A 56 κήδετο: ἐφρόντιζεν; VII 258 εἰπεῖν, cf. A 74 μυθήσασθαι: εἰπεῖν; VII 343 ἀγαθόν, cf. A 106 κρήγυρον: ἀγαθόν; etc. One interpretation of this evidence is, of course, that Hermoniakos was relying on the paraphrases, but words like γαστροκνήμιδες (VII 69), a tortured reflection of εὐκνήμιδες (A 17) which appears in the paraphrases as εὐοπλοὶ (P) and πολεμισταί (M), or οὐρῆας (VII 191, cf. A 50) demonstrate that Hermoniakos must have gone to the *Iliad* for himself and that his copy of the text included scholia. This does not, however, mean that he understood all that he read: at VII 41, for example, ὁ γὰρ βασιλεὺς αὐτός γαρ, /χολωθεῖς refers to Apollo (i.e. βασιλεὺς) and his anger, and interprets ὁ γὰρ βασιλῆϊ χολωθεῖς (A 9), that is, Apollo was angry with Agamemnon (βασιλῆϊ).

1. Ludwich, op. cit., II, p. 513.

2. H=Hermoniakos; M=Moschopoulos; P=Psellos.

3. I have used the text of the scholia from *C. G. Heyne, Homeri Ilias cum brevi annotatione, accedunt scholia minora passim emendata*, Oxford, 1834.

λυμπον κατοικοῦντες (19) ἐκπορθῆσαι τοῦ Πριάμου τὴν πόλιν καὶ καλῶς εἰς τὰ οἰκεία παραγενέσθαι (20) τὴν προσφιλῆ δέ μοι θυγατέρα λυτρώσασθε, τὰ δὲ δῶρα δέξασθε (21) σεβόμενοι τὸν Διὸς υἱὸν τὸν μακροβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα.

Hermoniakos begins by giving a very full version of the Homeric text. He covers *Iliad* A 1-171 in VII 19-341, VIII 1-201. Such expansiveness over the whole text would have had unmanageable results, but thereafter he proceeds in a more summary fashion. Thus scenes involving the gods are omitted: at e.g. VIII 202 (cf. A 172-319; Athene's intervention in the debate); VIII 252 (cf. A 357-611, B 1-15: Thetis, the scenes on Olympus, the sending of the Dream); IX 185 (cf. Γ 121 ff.: Iris); IX 190 (cf. Γ 264-345: Aphrodite's protective mist); IX 225 (cf. Γ 383-425: Helen is guided by Aphrodite); IX 255 (cf. Δ 1-290: debate among the gods); so too are the unruly activities of Thersites (VIII 317 ff. cf. B 211-271). Assemblies are abbreviated: e.g. VIII 286-316 (cf. B 35-210); IX 10-39 (cf. B 370-410). The Catalogues are left out (IX 59, cf. B 474-779, the Greek contingents; IX 69, cf. B 786-877, Γ 1-14, the Trojan). Many other dramatic passages are summarized inadequately: e.g. VIII 220-8, cf. A 326-49, the removal of Briseis; IX 70-94, cf. Γ 15-33, Menelaos and Paris; IX 158-185, cf. Γ 121-244, the Teichoskopia. The last example demonstrates Hermoniakos' complete insensitivity to all that is moving in Homer, for the scene is reduced to a bare list of the Greek leaders whom Helen noticed, with no hint of her ambivalent feelings. A similar insensitivity appears in Hermoniakos' version of Andromache's farewell to Hector (cf. XI 201-52). Though here the basic text is Tzetzes' *Allegories* (*Alleg.* Z 67-93), nevertheless none of the pathos which is just visible in Tzetzes' account emerges in Hermoniakos', who prefers to give attention and an expanded (Homeric) simile to Paris (IX 230-243). Hermoniakos seems concerned only to give the outlines of the events dealt with by Homer and is untouched by any subtlety. The only noteworthy addition he makes appears to be at VII 151-71, another passage of alliteration, this time in χ , in Chryses' prayer to Apollo.

The one feature of the Homeric style which does seem to have appealed to Hermoniakos is the use of similes. He not only retains these in the sections based on the *Iliad* itself (e. g. at IX 45-6, cf. B 455-8,

or IX 47-54, cf. B 459-468, used a second time at XIX 165-185), but inserts them into the narrative based on the *Allegories*. Hermoniakos must have kept his *Iliad* open as he worked through Tzetzes, which makes his maltreatment of the great passages of Homer the more distressing. Thus the following are examples of similes which appear in areas of Hermoniakos' text drawn from the *Allegories*; they were not included by Tzetzes but are taken from the *Iliad* (though not always from the parallel context). E.g. X 22, cf. *Iliad* Δ 471-2 (wolves); X 111-118, cf. *Iliad* E 161 (lions); X 175-9, cf. *Iliad* E 783 (boar); XI 230-242, cf. *Iliad* Z 506-510 (stabled horse); XII 108, cf. *Iliad* H 256 (lion); XII 193-201, cf. *Iliad* Λ 113 (lion); XII 302-12, cf. *Iliad* Λ 492 (river); XIII 90-95, cf. *Iliad* Θ 555-60 (camp-fires); XV 148-51, cf. *Iliad* A 305 (waves); XV 187-95, cf. *Iliad* M 279 (waves); XVI 206-216, cf. *Iliad* E 499 (winnowing); XVII 98-101, cf. *Iliad* O 323-5 (lion); XVII 116-123, cf. *Iliad* O 381 (sea); XVII 204-220, cf. *Iliad* O 618-20 (rock). At least two similes seem not to be based on Homeric equivalents, at XIV 262-5 Agamemnon is compared to a prize bull, and at XXI 81-91 the help brought to the Trojans by the Ethiopians is compared to a breeze rescuing becalmed sailors. On the one occasion where Hermoniakos, in a Homeric context, appears to be signalling a simile of his own invention (at XIX 322, "Ακουσον, καλοὶ δεσπότες) and has some lively lines on dolphins beaching themselves, this too is prompted by a simile in a later book of the *Iliad* (Φ 22 ff.).

As well as similes Hermoniakos also inserts into his version short episodes which Tzetzes had passed over - further confirmation that he did not disregard the *Iliad* even while working from the *Allegories*. E.g. XI 155-64, cf. *Iliad* Z 37 ff.; XII 119, cf. *Iliad* H 282 ff.; XIII 51-61, cf. *Iliad* Θ 293-9; XIII 383-443, XIV 1-76, e.g. *Iliad* Θ 430 ff.

Hermoniakos' stamina was perhaps not equal to the task of first reading and then paraphrasing Homer, and at the end of *Iliad* Γ his increasingly sketchy summary turns once more to Tzetzes. At *Iliad* Π, however, Tzetzes fails him, and Hermoniakos reverts once more to the *Iliad*: XVII 221-XXI 10 are based on *Iliad* Π-Ω, though in an even more cursory fashion than before. The by now expected omission of all episodes involving gods results in great distortion to the narrative. Thus in the following passages the gods are ignored and the scene drastically abbreviated: Π 33-7 (at XVII 234 ff.), Π 46-100 (XVII 272-80), Π 200-256 (XVII 342), Π 431-461 (XVIII 40), Π 514-26 (XVIII 57), Π 666-683 (XVIII 103), P 198-209 (XVIII 276), Σ 35-147 (XVIII 349), Σ 355-617 (XIX 34), Y 1-155 (XIX 192), Y 156-199 (XIX 193, intermit-

tent omissions), Y 291-363 (XIX 243), Φ 272-589 (XX 144), X 176-276 (XX 207), X 295-305 (XX 234), Ω 1-127 (XX 275), Ω 330-467 (XX 290). As well, passages describing armour are omitted e.g. at Π 102-8 (Ajax), Π 130-154 (Patroclus); Achilles' armour, divinely wrought, is of course not mentioned (Σ 355-617). Episodes are sometimes taken out of order; e.g. the death of Polydoros (Y 406-437) is given at XX 161, rather than XIX 280. Passages involving continuous fighting are condensed, e.g. at P 288-761 (XVIII 304-24); almost all *Iliad* T is omitted, except for a reference to Briseis' lament over Patroclus (T 282-300, cf. XVIII 360-76). While Hermoniakos seems to accept the psychology of the Homeric heroes, he perhaps finds the trappings of the poem increasingly alien: hence possibly the comments at XIX 143-7 on cremation, and at XX 76-90 on the habit of fighting in full armour (the reason why Achilles was likely to drown in the Scamander). Perhaps for this reason too the funeral games for Patroclus (*Iliad* Ψ) are ignored, apart from a comment on the sacrifice of Trojan prisoners at XIX 133-142 (cf. *Iliad* Ψ 175-83). Priam's moralizing comments to Achilles, at XX 327-72, bear little relation to the Homeric text (*Iliad* Ω 552 ff.) and sound like Hermoniakos' idea of appropriate sentiments. In general however, the summary is hasty and touches only on the main points of the narrative in the *Iliad*. There are few convincing echoes of Homeric phraseology, though Hermoniakos still occasionally shows knowledge of the whole poem; e.g. at XIX 165-185 he introduces a simile from B 459-68, and at XX 263-275 (cf. X 395-403) he comments that the belt used to drag Hector had been given him by Ajax (cf. H 305). However, but for the borrowed phrases earlier in his poem, it would be impossible to prove that he had used the *Iliad* itself for the later books: a paraphrase would have been sufficient to provide the outline he gives.

Hermoniakos' debts to his main sources for books VII to XXI 46 can therefore be summarized as in the following table:

Hermoniakos	Homer
VII 19	A 1
VIII 1	A 116
VIII 253	B 16
IX 10	B 370
IX 70	Γ 15
IX 255	Γ 461
<hr/>	
XVII 221	II 2
XVIII 1	II 403

XVIII 185	P 1
XVIII 325	Σ 1
XIX I	Σ 315
XIX 193	Υ 156
XIX 322	Φ 22
XX 1	Φ 121
XX 183	X 79
XX 276	Ω 29
Hermoniakos	Tzetzes <i>Allegories</i>
IX 319	Δ 18
X 1	Δ 22
X 93	E 6
XI 12	E 99
XI 110	Z 10
XI 253	H 1
XII 14	H 19
XII 175	Θ 1
XIII 7	Θ 96
XIII 252	I 1
XIV 1	I 69
XIV 102	K 1
XIV 197	Λ 1
XV 1	A 98
XV 281	M 27
XVI 1	M 70
XVI 79	N 27
XVI 253	Ξ 1
XVII 1	Ξ 53
XVII 47	O 101

Hermoniakos sets out to provide in addition to an *Iliad* information on the later happenings at Troy (τὰ μετ' Ὀμηρον τὰ μὴ γραφέν ἐν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀμήρου βιβλίον). Part of this is drawn from Manasses' Chronicle-XXI 46-75, which deals with the Trojan request for help from King David, comes from Man. 1358-71, with many similarities of wording. At XXI 212-304 the account of Achilles' fatal passion for Polyxena and the ambush in the temple of Apollo is drawn from Man. 1377-1414. The only close verbal reflections in this case, however, come at XXI

268-70 (cf. Man. 1390). XXI 285-9 (cf. Man. 1406-7) and XXI 292-3 (cf. Man. 1409)¹.

At XXI 351-XXII 96 after a brief discussion of Achilles' burial Hermoniakos describes the quarrel over his armour, the disappointment of Ajax, his madness and his subsequent suicide. This of course is the substance of Sophocles' *Ajax*. Hermoniakos probably had the plot of the play in his mind as he wrote these lines, for the sequence of events does not occur in exactly this order elsewhere, but he does not demonstrate his indebtedness by extensive quotations. Thus XXI 351-361, XXII 1-16 deal with the conflict over the weapons, which occurs in the *Ajax* only by implication. At XXII 17-48 Tekmessa laments for Ajax' madness: here XXII 25 εἰσπηδῶ μέσον τῆς ποιμνῆς can be compared to *Ajax* 300 ἐν ποιμναῖς πίτνων; cf. XXII 35-40, *Ajax* 238-43 on the tortured sheep². The description of the suicide however seems to use no Sophoclean phrasing. From this evidence Hermoniakos need only have had limited acquaintance with the tragedy.

He also makes use, from XXIII 77-XXIV 264 of Euripides' *Hecuba*, to cover events after the sack of Troy. Hermoniakos acknowledges a debt to Euripides at XXIII 238, but as he makes at least two other references to Euripides which are blatantly false (at I 147 and I 351-3), scepticism might be pardonable. There are however sufficient close verbal parallels to prove conclusively that Hermoniakos had access to a text of the *Hecuba*. Here is an example:

1. Man. 1390-1409 is a significant passage in popular political verse: it reappears in War of Troy 10,062-3 (ed. in preparation, E. M. Jeffreys and M. Papatomopoulos), Achilleis N. 1793 (ed. D. C. Hesseling, L'Achilléide Byzantine, Amsterdam, 1919, cf. p. 141) and Troas (Supp. Gr. 926: cf. C. Astruc and M.-L. Concasty, Catalogue des manuscrits grecs III, Paris, 1960, pp. 26-7.

2. Ed. A. C. Pearson, Oxford, 1924.

XXIII 227-37

Νεοπτόλεμος ὁ δὲ γε
 κἄν ἐθέλων κἄν μὴ θέλων
 τέμνει τοῦ λαιμοῦ σιδήρω
 230 ἅπασας τὰς ἀρτηρίας.
 Εἰς τὴν γῆν κρουνοὶ δ' αἰμάτων
 ὡς ποταμηδὸν ἐχώρουν·
 θνήσκουσα γὰρ ὅμως αὕτη
 εὐαισθήτως καὶ φρονίμως
 235 πρόγνωσιν πολλὴν κατεῖχεν
 ὥστε γὰρ πεσεῖν εὐσχήμως
 καὶ τὰ πρέποντα γὰρ κρύπτειν·

After 230 appears a title: ρλα' ὄρα τὴν πρόγνωσιν τῆς Πολυξένης ὅταν ἀπέκοψαν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῆς, πόσῃ φροντίδαν εἶχεν ἵνα ἀποθάνῃ εὐσχημόνως, ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ τις ἐκ τῶν μελῶν αὐτῆς ἅπερ ἔδει κρύπτεσθαι ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν ἀρρένων.

Hermoniakos seems to be so impressed by this point that it is here that he acknowledges Euripides, and in fact quotes the passage a second time, a little more faithfully:

XXIII 238-46

ὡς φησὶν γὰρ Εὐριπίδης
 ὑπὸ Πύρρου Πολυξένην
 φονευμένην οὕτως γράφει·
 «ἢ καὶ θνήσκουσα γὰρ ὅλως
 πρόνοιαν πολλὴν γοῦν ἔχει
 τοῦ πεσεῖν γὰρ εὐσχημόνως,
 καὶ συγκρύπτειν ἅπερ ἔδει
 κρύπτεσθαι διὰ παντός γαρ
 ἐξ ὀμμάτων γὰρ ἀρρένων».

Other passages which show similarities in wording, even if the sense has not always been understood correctly, include XXIII 159-162 (cf. *Hec.* 523-4); XXIII 163-72 (cf. *Hec.* 543-5); XXIII 177-190 (cf. *Hec.* 548-52); XXIII 270-7 (cf. *Hec.* 667-69); XXIII 299-300 (cf. *Hec.* 708); XXIV 36-9 (cf. *Hec.* 809-11); XXIV 63-6 (cf. *Hec.* 876-7); XXIV 69-77 (cf. *Hec.* 883-5); XXIV 124-32 (cf. *Hec.* 978-80); XXIV 153-4 (cf. *Hec.* 1002); XXIV 169-86 (cf. *Hec.* 1005-7); XXIV 189-99 (cf. *Hec.* 1008-10); XXIV 244-7 and 250-3 (cf. *Hec.* 1056-8). The direct quotations end at *Hec.* 1059.

Hecuba 566-701.

ὁ δ' οὐ θέλων τε καὶ θέλων οἴκτω κήρης,

τέμνει σιδήρῳ πνεύματος διαρροάς·

κρουνοὶ δ' ἐχώρουν.

ἧ δὲ καὶ θνήσκουσ' ὁμως

πολλὴν πρόνοιαν εἶχεν

εὐσχήμων πεσεῖν

κρύπτουσ' ἃ κρύπτειν ὄμματ' ἀρσένων χρεών.

Yet other passages show knowledge of the text but the paraphrase leaves few verbal reflections or gives them grossly out of context (e.g. XXIII 96 αἵματι χλωρῷ καὶ νέφ cf. *Hec.* 126. Thus XXIII 69-151 (cf. *Hec.* 98-153); XXIII 212-8 (cf. *Hec.* 553-6); XXIII 278-98 (cf. *Hec.* 678-722); XXIV 51-4 (cf. *Hec.* 850-63); XXIV 55-60 (cf. *Hec.* 870-1); XXIV 135-9 (cf. *Hec.* 981-5); XXIV 144-5 (cf. *Hec.* 986-8).

In other cases Hermoniakos summarizes the action which is necessary to understand the progress of the plot but which has not been given explicitly in the play. E.g. XXIII 250-69 describes how the attendant found Polydoros' body on the sea-shore²; XXIII 301-XXIV 16 describe the murder of Polydoros (for both of these, cf. the Prologue spoken by Polydoros); XXIV 81-119 describes how Polymestor was summoned (cf. his speech at *Hec.* 1132-1182). The parts of the *Hecuba* that are not represented in Hermoniakos are Hecuba's opening lament (*Hec.* 59-97), her lament with Polyxena (*Hec.* 154-217), the debate with Odysseus (*Hec.* 218-443), and the final argument between Hecuba, Agamemnon and Polymestor (*Hec.* 1183-1295). The Prologue (*Hec.* 1-58) appears by implication. The choruses, apart from that at the beginning, are not used. Hermoniakos once more occasionally intersperses comments of his own; e.g. on the pathos of Polyxena's circumstances at XXIII 154-8 and XXIII 196-211.

The text that Hermoniakos had before him probably included scholia: the evidence is numerically small but clear. Thus at *Hec.* 544

1. Ed. *S. G. Daitz*, Euripides *Hecuba*, Leipzig, 1973.

2. Contrast the account of his murder at XX 161, based on *Iliad* Y 407-37.

κολεοῦ has a gloss ξιφοθήκης the word used at XXIII 1661; at *Hec.* 567 πνεύματος διαρροῆς calls for a discussion on τὰς ἀρτηρίας and τὰς φλέβας² while ἄπασας τὰς ἀρτηρίας appears at XXIII 230; at *Hec.* 1056 πᾶ ἔλσω is glossed as προσπελάσω³ which appears at XXIV 253. Though the scholia (particularly those in Vat. Gr. 909) include explanatory material for the plot, this does not appear to have been used by Hermoniakos.

The manuscript tradition for the plays of Euripides is complex⁴, with hundreds of copies surviving, especially for the Byzantine triad of which the *Hecuba* is a part⁵. The quotations Hermoniakos gives are of no value for the history of Euripides' text: they are of interest simply in showing the extent to which that text was comprehensible to an average Byzantine reader.

There remain a number of passages whose antecedents have so far proved untraceable: these range in scale from a few lines to several hundred. Regrettably amongst them is included Hermoniakos' account of the wooden horse which, distinctive though it is, seems to correspond in its details to none of the extant versions of the episode. The section in question runs from XXII 97 to XXIII 76 and covers the wooden horse, the murderous sack of the city, the restoration of Helen to Menelaos (with comments on the disastrous effects of Eros) and Agamemnon's appropriation of Cassandra. The wooden horse is built following the instructions of Odysseus, who had first spied out the city (cf. *Od.* δ 235 ff.) and the dimensions of the gates; the animal is so life-like that it performs all its bodily functions (XXII 140 ff.). The Trojans, wishing to test the animal's divine origins, thrust a spear into its flank: Odysseus compelled Menelaos to put his thigh in the way and so to produce the required blood (cf. Isaac. Porph. p. 71)⁶.

1. *E. Schwartz*, Scholia in Euripidem I, Berlin, 1887, p. 51, ad lin. 543 (from Vat. Gr. 909).

2. *op. cit.*, p. 53 (from Par. Gr. 471, Vat. Gr. 909, Par. Gr. 2713).

3. *op. cit.*, p. 79, ad lin., 1057 (from Marc. Gr. 471, Par. Gr. 2713). None of these passages are discussed by *A. Tuilier*, *Etude comparée du texte et des scholies d'Euripide*, Paris 1972.

4. Cf. *A. Turyn*, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides*, Urbana, 1957; *G. Zuntz*, *An Enquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides*, Cambridge, 1965; *A. Tuilier*, *Recherches critiques sur la tradition du texte d'Euripides*, Paris, 1968.

5. See *K. Matthiessen*, *Manuscript Problems in Euripides' Hecuba*, Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 10, 1969, pp. 293-305.

6. *Ed.* as on p. 86, n. 2.

Elsewhere Hermoniakos discusses the Amazons and their habit of laming their male offspring (XXI 118-154). The fullest account of this occurs in Diodorus Siculus II 45, who seems a slightly improbable author to be available to Hermoniakos. Other passages with information additional to that of the main sources include the prophecy to Homer's mother (I 36-57), the wounding of Achilles and Patroclus (V 174-203), comments on the beauty of Helen (II 236-309) and of Polyxena (XXI 230 ff.); there is also some more factual material, e.g. on the oath made to protect Helen (III 192-226), her parentage (II 162-7), the saving of Aeneas from Troy (III 183-7), the names in the portraits (IV 235-263, 275-284, V 1), the dead in the first stages of the fighting (V 130-168) and the summary of the armies (XIII 131-251). For some of these, as mentioned earlier, Hermoniakos provides authenticating references, though none can, as yet, be associated with any extant text. Thus Johannes Antiochenus is cited for the army lists (XIII 172-3); though Tzetzes uses this name to refer to Johannes Malalas (cf. *Prolog.* 246) no material in either Tzetzes or Malalas seems to match the reference. Perhaps *ἱστορικὸς τις* (V 149) also refers to the same authority that was available to Hermoniakos; *ἕτερος ποιητῆς* (XIII 194-5) is adduced for a contrasting opinion in the excursus attributed to Johannes Antiochenus. A mysterious *Σισήγωρ* (III 203) or *Ἡσύγωρ* (XXIII 156) is mentioned. Lycophron is referred to at I 147 and at XXII 154 (for the numbers of men in the wooden horse): on the first occasion the reference comes straight from Tzetzes' *Prolegomena* 481 and on the second his information is contrasted with that of Tzetzes¹.

Hermoniakos also occasionally names some of the authors whom he can be shown to have used. Thus he refers to Tzetzes at IV 59 (cf. *Prolog.* 471-2), IV 215 and at XXII 158. Homer is named at II 270, IV 30, VI 23 (a quotation from Tzetzes), XII 119, XIII 205 and at XVI 246-52. Euripides, as noted above, is referred to twice falsely (I 147, I 351-3) and once justifiably (at XXIII 238). Manasses and Sophocles are not named.

Hermoniakos' reputation has never been very high and is unlikely to be raised by this further demonstration of his insensitivity. We can see now, however, just how unimaginatively he worked from his source texts, whether acknowledged or not. This raises a number of points. First it throws into relief once more the linguistic incompetence

1. It seems to have no connection with Tzetzes' Commentary on Lycophron's *Alexandra*.

for which he has so often been attacked. It might be worth investigating how many of the «correct» usages occur in quotations or near-quotations, leaving the «incorrect» as Hermoniakos' own attempts to match them. Then too in the variations from his sources some of the man's own attitudes emerge: his resolute refusal to refer to the gods, his interest in weapons, his moralizing, his occasional rhetorical flights and perhaps his medical interests as Legrand suggests¹. But more important is the comment that this *Iliad* provides on the literary resources of fourteenth century Arta. The books he uses are those that, from the numbers of copies that survive, were probably the most readily available. Homer, for example, has come down to us in at least 188 manuscripts either in whole or in part, with or without prefaces, scholia or other explanatory matter². Of the two main Byzantine commentators on Homer, Tzetzes' many short works were more digestible than the vast tomes of Eustathius, and aimed at a less learned audience. They were also popular among readers of Homer, as a glance at a list of Homeric manuscripts indicates, for the *Allegories* (or a selection from them) and prose prefaces derived from Tzetzes are not infrequently attached. The *Allegories* survive independently complete in at least 17 manuscripts, and in selection in a further 8³. The *Hecuba* as I have mentioned survives in hundreds of copies⁴, and the *Ajax* in nearly as many⁵. These two were part of the 'Byzantine selection' for their respective authors and were amongst the most commonly read of the tragedies. Manasses' Chronicle had a wide circulation, to which the prose paraphrases and translations as well as the 70 manuscripts testify⁶; as the quotations in the verse romances show, it had become an important element at the more popular level of Byzantine culture. The banality of this collection makes the identity of the sources for the extra information all the more intriguing⁷. Most important of all, however, we have here in Hermoniakos an example of the effects of a mediocre Byzantine

1. Legrand, op. cit., p. vii, referring to XXIV 261 ff.: 'vanitas vanitatum' with obstetrical details; cf. too the comments on the wooden horse, XXII 142-7.

2. T. W. Allen, op. cit., pp. 11-55.

3. Cf. C. Wendel, op. cit.

4. K. Matthiessen, op. cit., p. 295: 200-300 manuscripts.

5. Cf. W. B. Stanford, Sophocles Ajax, London, 1963, pp. 245-8.

6. O. Lampsides, Notes sur quelques manuscrits de la Chronique de Manasses, Akten des XI Internationalen Byzantinistenkongress München 1958, München, 1960, pp. 295-301; Krumbacher, op. cit., pp. 376-7.

7. No one of the Trojan material appears in, e.g., the War of Troy, the Achilleis, or Troas.

education, for Homer and the tragedies were commonly available because they formed the basis for the school curriculum¹. In his level of understanding, his response to the linguistic variety of Homer, his prejudices, one can judge the school-room attainment of a pupil in a provincial capital. Or perhaps Hermoniakos was the school-master?

1. Cf. *G. Buckler*, «Byzantine Education» in *Byzantium: an Introduction to East Roman Civilization*, ed. N.H. Baynes and H. St. L. B. Moss. Oxford, 1948, pp. 200-220.