

CHAPTER 3*

SACHLIKIS AND HIS RHYMES

The two subjects that have been treated so far have shown mainly one side of oral poetry. They have shown oral poetry in the process of disintegration, of passing from its sophisticated origins in the surrounds of rich men, towards popularity with the commons. The whole history of *Acritas* exemplifies this process, and the same thing can be seen in the fragmentation which has made Byzantine ecphrases into folksongs¹, and reduced the great Pan-European ballads from the magnitude we may assume they once had².

The other process, the composition of new poetry to take the place at court of that which was becoming too popular for courtly acceptance, is shown in the stream of poems which were produced in Crete in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Since most of them appear in a sudden spate at the end of the fifteenth century it has been usual to think of the fall of Constantinople, and the arrival in Crete of great numbers of exiles, as the immediate cause. The recent discovery of *Della Porta* has emphasized how unnecessary this explanation is. It is more likely that the composition of poetry for the more sophisticated classes of Crete was a continuous process. Its products in the late fifteenth century happen to have been caught by the very intense development at the time of a Cretan manuscript-industry, which may itself, very paradoxically, have been stimulated for a short while by the invention of printing. When cheap books became possible, it was at last profitable for comparatively uneducated men to learn to read. And once the habit of reading was established, they did not remain satisfied with the foreign works that were most accessible, but insisted on reading, privately and at any time, the poems they had been content before to

*) «Cretan Poetry: Sources and Inspiration», συνέχεια ἐκ τῆς σελ. 68.

¹) See chapter 1.

²) An assumption which can be made by analogy with other works in Greek (e. g. *Acritas*, *Apollonius of Tyre*, *Erophile*, etc. (see chapter 8)) and with similar ballads in other better recorded literatures.

hear on special occasions. The poems we can assign to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries — *Mavrianos's Sister*, *The Evil Mother-in-Law*, and the rest³ — were either a little early, or a little unfortunate, not to be included in our handful of manuscripts, so that they reach us only in the brief versions that we have. Of the current favourites of the last years of the century we may suspect that our copies (one of which, at least, seems to be an omnibus of the popular poems of the day)⁴ contain the best.

I hope to show that about the early stages of one group of these poems, the works of Sachlikis, we know considerably more than usual; and it is to a study of this group, in its origins and development, that we now turn.

The story generally told of Stephanos Sachlikis is so short that it may easily be repeated here; how as a boy in Candia he hated books and schooling, and turned so profligate that he had a spell of prison, and was forced to abandon the city and withdraw to the countryside; how there he was sickened by the rustic manners of the peasantry, and spent his time with horses and dogs until the day when the Duke of Candia took pity on him and gave him the post of advocate at the ducal court⁵.

This much we know from his own account. To it we may add, as background, that he came from a very old family that

³) See chapter 1.

⁴) G. Morgan, *Three Cretan Manuscripts* (K. X. 8 (1954) pp. 61 - 71). See p. 66.

⁵) The editions of Sachlikis's poems are: Paris MS in E. Legrand *Coll. de. mon.* no. 15; Paris and Montpellier MSS in W. Wagner, *Carmina graeca medii aevi* Leipzig 1874 pp. 62 - 105 (to whose numbering references are given); Naples MS in C. D. Papadimitriou, *Ἀφήγησις παράξενος τοῦ ταπεινοῦ Σαχλήκη* Odessa 1896 (in Russian). The other bibliography is fully given in R. Cantarella *Un poeta cretese del secolo XV: Stefano Sachlikis* (Atene e Roma, series 3, no. 3 (1935) pp. 53 - 72). This was intended as the introduction to a new edition; it has not yet appeared. Cantarella's article is translated in *Μύσων* 7 (1938) pp. 74 - 91; see also Σ. Ἀλεξίου, *Φιλολογικαὶ παρατηρήσεις εἰς κρητικὰ κείμενα* (K. X. 8 (1954) pp. 238 - 272), pp. 239 - 243, Σ. Ἀλεξίου, *Κρητικὴ ἀνθολογία* Heracleion 1954 pp. 30 - 34, and Φ. Μπουμπουλίδης, *Κρητικὴ λογοτεχνία* Athens 1955 pp. xixff, 54 - 56. A recent account, with copious quotation, is given in G. Reichenkron, *Stephanos Sachlikis, Autobiograph und Moralist* (Formen der Selbstdarstellung - Festgabe für Fritz Neubert, Berlin 1956, pp. 363 - 377).

was established in Crete already in 1206⁶; and that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, at least, the family estates (perhaps those where Sachlikis found refuge from the effects of his misdeeds) were at Roustika, a village in the province of Rethymno, in the northwest foothills of Mount Ida⁷.

This information stands in a vacuum. Although we may reasonably suspect that the Notarial Archives of Candia would be able to tell us more of Stephanos Sachlikis, at present we must admit that no fact about him can be tied to a date: and that attempts to date his work on internal evidence have been quite inconclusive. The two most notable fail to convince.

The line

ὡσὰ μανδᾶτον θλιβερόν ἀπὸ τῆ Ρωμανίαν

need not refer to the fall of Constantinople in 1453, or Athens in 1462, or to any other specific date, before or after, and even if it did, the phrase seems to be quite clearly semi-proverbial and therefore useless as evidence⁸. Moreover, it occurs in only the Paris manuscript, where it has been put in to fill the gap where two lines have been accidentally compressed into one. The true reading, in M, is

*ἀφές τῆν, τῆν κακότυχην, ποιίζεις τῆν πικροίαν,
ὡς ἔναιν κακορίζικος μηδὲν τῆν δίδης κάψαν,*

which P makes

ἀφές τῆν, τῆν κακότυχον, μηδὲν τῆν δίδης κάψαν.

Recently, Mr. Styl. Alexiou⁹ has suggested that the use of the word «λούβα» refers to the great epidemic of the mal française¹⁰ that swept over Europe (and would certainly have taken heavy toll of Sachlikis's acquaintance) in the last decade of the fifteenth century. But the matter is not so straightforward, and much more will have to be said about it.

After this sad and negative introduction we may perhaps be

⁶) F. Miklosich · J. Müller, Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi vol. 6, 1890, p. 151. MS Prov. Duc. C 675/5(1) in the Museo Correr at Venice mentions an orthodox priest of Candia, onè Basil Sachlikis, in 1322.

⁷) Α. Μ. Βουρδουμπάκης, Κρητικά έγγραφα ἐκ τῆς ἐνετοκρατίας καὶ τουρκοκρατίας (ΧΚ 2 (1915) pp. 339 · 424) pp. 351, 354, etc.

⁸) See Σ. Ἀλεξίου, Παρατηρήσεις... p. 240.

⁹) Ibid. p. 239.

forgiven if we postpone the attempt to approach Sachlikis through the snares set by his editors, and go instead to the little French town of Gourdon, in Perigord, and to a man whose dates are better documented. At Gourdon, in the last years of the fifteenth century, was born one Martin de la Broue, whose social position very much resembled that of Sachlikis; the son of a family ancient and respected, but not of the first rank¹⁰. He was *qualifié noble*, and so, although not a knight in the nobility of France, was able to join the French tongue of the order of Saint John of Jerusalem, and become a Knight Hospitaller of Rhodes. And so, as Fra Martino¹¹ della Brossa¹² he was among the three hundred knights who manned Rhodes against the Turks' final attacks in 1522.

After the capitulation on Christmas Eve of that year, he sailed on the fleet which evacuated some four thousand people from the island and, after a storm-tossed passage, dribbled into the harbour of Candia between January 18th, 1523 and the end of February¹³. The knights were met with honour, and a solemn respect. The Grand Master was lodged in the Archbishop's palace, and some of the officers of the order with him. The knights were accommodated through the town, until, early in March, their Armada sailed for Messina. One of them, Martin de la Broue, took back with him to France a copy made by his own hand of the poems of Sachlikis¹⁴.

¹⁰) For Martin de la Broue, see *Dictionnaire de la Noblesse*, vol 4. Paris 1863, col 328.

¹¹) For his name in the list of defenders see J. Bosio, *Dell'istoria della sacra religione et illma. militio di San Giovanni Gierosolimitano*. Rome 1591 - 1602, vol. 1. p. 534. Bosio has it as «Maturino», in error.

¹²) «Brue» is an early French word meaning a «copse» or «thicket», for which the mediaeval Latin form «brossa» would be used in official documents. See Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae Latinitatis* Niort 1883 s. vv. Broa, Brua, Brossa.

¹³) For the voyage and the stay in Crete see Bosio, *op. cit.* vol. 2, pp. 2 - 7.

¹⁴) The subscription of the Montpellier manuscript refers, of course, to a Noel de la Broue:

«. .Φοὰ νοελ δὲ λὰ μπρωῶ ἐκ τῆς ροδῶν καβάλλαρεϊς»

But we know of no other member of the family who was ever a knight of Rhodes; and certainly no other De la Broue was a Knight Templar during the short period when he might be referred to as «from Rhodes», and not «of Rhodes», or «of Malta». The answer lies in the fact that

This is not just a pleasant anecdote of literary detection. Nor is its only function to pin the Montpellier manuscript to a certain point of time, though this in itself is highly important, both for the chronology of Sachlikis and for the study of the Cretan dialect. The real value of this story is that it prompts us to make certain deductions from the text about the composition of these poems: deductions which arise quite naturally from the manuscripts, but which have escaped the attention of the editors.

Martin de la Broue was a Frenchman. The mistakes he makes in writing Greek are naturally the mistakes of a man whose own language does not possess the sounds of χ , ϑ , and γ . He writes $\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\chi\omicron\nu$ and $\tau\omicron\iota\chi\omicron\nu\varsigma$ for $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\chi\omicron\nu$ and $\tau\omicron\iota\chi\omicron\nu\varsigma$ (I 262,232), $\pi\epsilon\theta\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$ and $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota$ for $\pi\epsilon\iota\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\iota\alpha$ and $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota$ (I 8,16), $\pi\epsilon\rho\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{\omicron}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\upsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ for $\pi\omicron\nu\rho\gamma\alpha\iota\acute{\omicron}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\lambda\upsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ (I 244,197). He almost regularly confuses \omicron and $\omicron\upsilon$, which were sounds very similar to each other in sixteenth-century Cretan, as we may see from the characteristic pairs $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\upsilon$ and $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\upsilon$, which occur simultaneously and quite at random in manuscripts of this period. And of course he is very inaccurate about accents. At least once, too, he uses a Rhodian form $\pi\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\epsilon\iota\epsilon$ for the Cretan $\pi\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\beta\epsilon\iota\epsilon$ (I (M) 353)¹⁵.

For all these reasons it is quite clear that de la Broue was not copying any written original, but was taking down from hearing. Only in this way can the phonetic peculiarities of the Montpellier manuscript be explained. And, since he is quite literate in Greek, it is also quite clear that when de la Broue heard

the Montpellier manuscript is an immediate copy of the more cursive original. The word *Μαγτ* (Mart (ino)) was seen as *Νοελ* (Noel ()). The unnecessary abbreviation-mark which the manuscript has above the λ makes this explanation seem very likely.

It may be noted that the most famous member of the De la Broue family was the physician Pierro-Louis, who died at Montpellier in 1721. He was the fifth in direct succession from Martin and is probably the link with the manuscript's present home. Also recorded is Pierre de la Broue, Bishop of Mirepoix (d. 1720), who collaborated in religious works with the Bishop of Montpellier. (*Nouvelle Biographie Generale* Paris 1855). The connexion of the family with Montpellier seems well-established.

¹⁵) A. G. Tsopanakis, *Essai sur la phonétique des parlers de Rhodes* Athens 1940, p. 142 (*πούεια*).

these poema, there was no written copy available - in fact, that in 1523 the poems of Sachlikis were capable of oral transmission.

Again, it is certain that the performance heard by the Rhodian knight was not merely recited, but sung: and sung to the sort of tune we have discussed already¹⁶, abounding in repetition of single syllables and phrases. The examples that follow are all resurrected from the apparatus criticus of Wagner's edition. When we remember that Wagner never saw the Montpellier manuscript, but was working from a copy procured for him by Legrand, and actually made by some unnamed person¹⁷, it will be realised that the account is not necessarily complete.

There are two half-lines of the sort we have learned to recognise from the feast-songs and the Escorial Acritas:

...καὶ τότε ἐγνωρίζει τον ὁποῖος καὶ ἂν ἔν ἐκεῖνος.

Ὡσὼν ἀκούσῃ οὕτως,

κρατίζει του τὸ πλεότερον, θέλει κι ἂν οὐκ ἐθέλει

(II (M) 302 · 304)

and the other,

Θωρεῖς, νιέ μου Φραιζησκή,

τὸ τί κάμνουσιν οἱ πολιτικῆς οἱ παλαιοκουρεμένες.

(I (M) 362 · 363)

which is the end of the poem.

Examples of syllable-repetition due to the tune are:

Ἄν ἔχη πέρ-, πέρπυρα πολλά, ἂν ᾗχη λογάριν βρούσην I 147

ὁ ζαριστιῆς ἐσμίγεται μὲ σύντροφον, μὲ μὲ φίλον I 228

κι ὅταν εὖρη ἀκρό-, ρόνεον, κάμει τὸν ἀφορμάρα I 279

καὶ τὸ, τὸ ἐγνώρισ' ἀπὸ μὲν, ἔχε παρηγορίαν I M 350

πιωχαίνουν κ' ἐρημάσσουν τον, καὶ, κ' ὕστερον τὸν γελοῦσιν I M 357

ἤθελα φρόνεσιν πολ-, πολλήν, κ' ἀπείκασιν μεγάλην II 223

οἱ τοῖχοί της μοῦ φαίνονται ὡσὼν ἐγκρεμοῦ-, μοῦ¹⁸ χαράκια II 230

καὶ πάντα μὲ τὴν μάνιταν νὰ μεγαλ-, γαλοφωνάξη II 282

¹⁶) See chapter 2.

¹⁷) W. Wagner, op. cit. p. 62. The ghastly figure of Mme. Legrand looms over our argument.

¹⁸) De la Brue's spelling — ἐγρεμομονκαράκια.

- εἰς ποῖαν λότζαν κάθεσαι, καὶ εἰς ποῖαν (θαρρεῖς !)*
καὶ εἰς ποῖαν κούρτην εἶσαι; II 363
- διατὶ ἂν οὐκ ἔ-, ἔχῃ δύναμιν ἢ πολιτικὴν γὰ βλάβη* II 429
ἦ ρ θ εν καὶ, ἦ ρ θ εν καὶ ἢ Φατρᾶλαινα κι ὅλες ἀντάμα ἐμεῖναν
 II 442
- ἦ κυρὰ ἢ Μπελλα-, ἢ Μπελλα-μούραινα ἔναιν ὀπου*
τὴν μανλίζει II 581
- καὶ, καὶ ἀπὸ τὴν τόσην τὴν χαρὰν ὅλες τὴν ἐγελοῦσαν* II 586
γὰ πίν-¹⁹, γὰ πίνω γὰ ζεσταίνομαι, τὸν μῆναν τὸν Γεννάρον
 II 674
- ὀπὸ τὲς νύκτες περπατεῖ, κ' εἰς τὰ πουρδέλλι α-, α μένει* II 674

The line II 363 quoted above even has the singer's interjection, of a very common type - «*θαρρεῖς*».

The opposite mistake, where the writer avoids a repetition which actually is in the text, occurs three times:

- οἱ ψεῖρες της, <τῆς> φυλακῆς ὡσὰν κοριοὶ δαγκάνουν* II 241
γὰ ἰδῶ τες, <τὲς> πολιτικές, καὶ γὰ τὲς γεβεντίσουν II 421
καὶ λέγ' ἢ Ποθαῖζου<τῆς> γὰ τῆς Ράντιας «ἔπαρέ τα» II 523 (e)

If any doubts remain as to whether these errors could possibly be due to ordinary scribal dittography and haplography, they should be dispelled by the following table which gives the number of times each syllable is affected by repetition:

Syllable No:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Repetitions :	3	3	2	3	1	1	1	—
Syllable No:	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Repetitions :	2	1	2	2	2	—	—	

In other words, the first part of the line, which is the part of the tune most likely to contain repetitions, accounts for the greater part of de la Broue's errors: and the last syllable of the hemistich, which is hardly ever repeated in singing, is not affected at all.

So the Montpellier manuscript represents a collection of the songs which in 1523 passed under the name of Sachlikis. Bearing in mind the fact of their oral tradition and the sort of variation to which this makes them liable, we can now return to the question of the syphilis - epidemic as evidence for their date.

The lines in question are:

Κάτεχ', νιέ μου Φραιζησοκή, ἔδῶ κ' εἰς ἄλλην χώραν

¹⁹⁾ Wagner, *ρασην*. Is this a Frenchman's slip of the pen - *ρασην*?

ὥς διὰ τοὺς νεοὺς οἱ πολιτικὲς ἔναιν μεγάλη ψώρα,
καὶ ὅποιος σμίγεται μ' αὐτιές, χροιά κάμνει νὰ ψωριάσῃ,
κι ἂν ἔχη προᾶγμαν τίποτες, ὅλον νὰ τὸ ξοδιάσῃ.
Καὶ μερικοὶ λεπριάζουσιν καὶ μερικοὶ λωβιάζουν
κι ἄφ' τὴν λωβάδα τὴν πολλὴν τὴν νεότην τως διαβάζουν.

(I (M) 340 - 347)

It is still fiercely argued whether syphilis was brought from the Caribbean by Columbus's sailors in 1493, or had been known in the Old World for some four thousand years before²⁰. It has been said in favour of the latter proposition that many of the lepers of the Middle Ages were in fact syphilitics; certainly for many years after 1493 the two diseases were regarded as forms of the same thing, and it was natural, if confusing, that the word *λώβα* or *λωβάδα*²¹ used in Byzantine times for leprosy, should extend its meaning. Whatever the truth of the matter may be, it seems obvious that if syphilis existed in Europe before 1493, it occupied no great place in the public interest; and that so specific a reference to *λωβάδα* in connexion with whores must refer to venereal disease and be dated after the siege of Naples in 1495.

To us it is another facet of the argument that is of more importance. Writer after writer from 1495 onwards emphasizes the general terror and panic that swept across Europe with the new disease. This was no short-lived epidemic to be escaped from by withdrawal to a country estate; no Black Death to kill, and die away. This was an evil whose victims dragged themselves horribly in the common view for years; whose treatment with agonizing quicksilver ointments killed more than it cured, however expensive it might be; which changed the whole conception of social intercourse in cities like Venice, where eleven thousand prostitutes are noted in a census, or Rome, where a Pope might make a fortune by confiscating their jewellery at Mass one Sunday. Yet Sachlikis mentions syphilis only once.

²⁰) The best recent discussion of the subject is in A. Castiglioni A history of medicine (English translation) New York 1947 pp. 452 ff, which gives a good impression of the immense bibliography. Early texts in K. Sudhoff - C. Singer The earliest printed literature on syphilis (1495 - 1498) Florence 1925. See also J. Clough, The Secret Enemy London 1954.

²¹) DC s. v. *λωβολ*.

This is a case where an *argumentum ex silentio* is legitimate. If in these poems written against whores by a man whose professional soubriquet was «the Death of Whores», the only mention of the *mal française* is found in one orally-transmitted manuscript, then it is quite certain that, far from being a proof of a date «quite some years after 1493», this mention is a later interpolation in works written before 1500, and almost inevitably before 1495.

Some other indication of the interval of time that divides de la Broue's version from the other manuscripts may be found in the names of the ladies mentioned. In few professions would the turnover be so high. Although the main characters of the *Assembly of Whores* are constant all those who have something to do, to act as Koutayiotena's herald, or lieutenant - the common personnel of the lists must be largely topical. In fact we find that although forty - five names are common to the Paris, and Montpellier manuscripts, twenty - four occur only in P, and sixteen more only in M. (This must be a rough count; often it is hard to know whether two similar names are in fact the same). Perhaps, too, Mistress Pertziolena has died by 1523. For P refers to her in the present tense, M in the past.

But de la Broue's minstrel had ability beyond that required for the mere introduction of topical names : there is evidence of his tactful desire to suit his matter to his audience. We are told that Scandinavian bards thought it good manners to include in their lays a reference to the great achievements of their hearers. Cretan good manners in 1523 led to exclusion rather than inclusion. It was thought wise that in the presence of Brother Martin, Friar of the Hospitallers, Pilataina's niece should be not *φραρογαμημένη*, (473), but *κρυφογαμημένη* (6740); and that perhaps Laphrena was a better name for a prostitute than Frarena.

If all the poems that now pass under the name of Sachlikis were in fact written by the same person (and that there is some doubt about this may appear later), we may accept that the last of them could not have been written more than a year or two after 1495; and the first of them, if we are to accept the obvious interpretation of the facts they contain, must be pushed back at least as far as 1480, and probably earlier.

But in talking of «poems», it must be emphasized that something very different is meant from the usual classification

into *Ἀφήγησις παράξενος, Γραφαὶ καὶ σίχοι καὶ ἐρμηνεῖαι*, and *Γραφαὶ καὶ σίχοι καὶ ἐρμηνεῖαι, ἔτι καὶ ἀφηγήσεις*. These traditional titles are quite comprehensive enough, in all conscience; and Cantarella has seen, at least, that they have some relation to the *mélange* of styles in, apparently, the same long poem²² The key is given yet again by the Montpellier manuscript and the knowledge we get from it about the conditions under which these poems were performed. We have already heard about the bards from Serbia (or Turkestan, or Sakhalin), who chant on for hours on end, day after day²³: these highly organised feats are quite irrelevant to the performance of poetry for a sophisticated (or semi-sophisticated) audience. The truth is very different. When poetry is a normal part of a celebration, of a feast-

*Τρῶιτε καὶ πίνει' ἄρχοντες, κ' ἐγὼ θὰ σᾶς δηγοῦμαι,
κ' ἐγὼ θὰ σᾶσε δηγηθῶ γιὰ ἕναν ἀντριωμένο...*²⁴

-then no singer goes on long enough to break the flow of the party, to interrupt the conversation beyond repair, or to let his own throat get dry. The unit of performance in the age and society of Sachlikis can never have been more than a few hundred lines.

A catalogue of Sachlikis's poems, in the order of composition, might run as follows:

- (a) Friendship (II 1 - 201)
- (b) Prison and Warders (II 204 - 340)
- (c) My Warder (II 344 - 377)
- (d) Autobiography (P 1 -)
- (e) The Assembly of Whores (II 378 - (M) 674x)
- (f) The Battle of the Whores (fragment) (II 675 - 712)
- (g) Pothotsoustounia (P 811 - 908)
- (h) Advice to Francescin (i) Wandering at night (I 1-117)
 - (ii) Gambling (I 118 - 239)
 - (iii) Prostitutes (I 240 - 367)

The most controversial point arising from this list is the suggestion that Sachlikis fell from his uneasy post as advocate at the ducal court, and went to prison for a second time. An attempt to justify this brings us to the question of the introduction of rhyme in Greek poetry: a question which has never

²²) Cantarella, op. cit. p. 65.

²³) See chapter 2.

²⁴) From a gramophone record, Columbia DCG 102—Ριζίτικο τραγούδι.

been satisfactorily dealt with; but to which Sachlikis provides, in my opinion, one of the most hopeful approaches²⁵.

An approach previously used has been through the three works ascribed to the Rhodian Manoles Georgillas, or as he seems to prefer to call himself, Manoles Limenitis²⁶. But of these three the only one that can incontestably be placed to his credit is *The Plague of Rhodes*, written not long after October 1498. In this he describes how he is now forced to support the orphans of his three married sisters, dead in the plague; and how, apart from these the only survivors of the family are his son George and his old mother. This combination of facts: nephews too young to support themselves, a son too young to help, and a mother alive, make it at least unlikely that Georgillas wrote *The Lament of Constantinople*, which cannot be dated later than 1455, when the sultan moved his court from Adrianople²⁷. Moreover, the author of the *Lament* claims that he has personally visited all the places he mentions, in a list which covers almost every notable town north of the Gulf of Corinth to Albania Serbia and Bulgaria, as far as Skoplje—

ἤξεύρετε, αὐθέντες μου, τὲς χῶρες ὅπου εἶπα,
ὄλες τὲς εἶδα, ἐπάτησα, πεζὸς καὶ καβαλλάρης. (984 - 985)

and it is for safety in his underground activities that he conceals his name. This does not suggest a youth.

Belisarius is quite unreliable from our point of view because the rhymed end, (though quite in character with, say, *The Plague of Rhodes*, and very probably genuine) is detachable from the body of the poem, and in any case provides

²⁵) Some of the aspects of this subject have been skilfully dealt with by Σ. Π. Κυριακίδης, 'Ἡ γένεσις τοῦ διστίχου καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς ἰσομετρίας Salonica 1947 (Λαογραφία, παράρτημα 4), who discusses Professor Baud - Bovy's work.

²⁶) C. Gidel, *Étude sur la littérature grecque moderne* Paris 1866, p. 367. Wagner, quoting Gidel's arguments, and entering into the whole question, makes nonsense of his own statements by thinking that the line (*Belisarios* 841)

τὴν πόλιν πού 'ναι κεφαλὴν, θέλουσιν τὴν ἐπιάσειν

refers to the Turks, and not to the Christian powers. (W. Wagner, *Medieval Greek texts* (The Philological Society's extra volume, 1869-72) London 1870, p. 113).

²⁷) K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur* Munich 1891 (first edition) p. 426.

no good evidence of date. The other shortcoming of an approach through Georgillas is that he is the only extant Rhodian poet, and so quite out of the main stream of development which at this time was flowing definitely through Crete.

With Sachlikis the case is different. The works are connected biographically, and the placing of one of them enables us more or less accurately to place the rest.

The sudden efflorescence of the rhymed couplet at the end of the fifteenth century, and the speed and completeness with which it displaced the old style, have rather obscured the existence of the intermediate stages between unrhymed political verse and the mature skill of *Ērotokritos* and Cretan drama. It may be said first of all that perfection of rhyme has no satisfactory correlation with date. Although there is a tendency for the earlier poets to use assonances and shifted accents where true rhymes elude them, this is a question of individual facility rather than general practice.

The first sporadic rhymes coincide almost exactly with the fall of the Byzantine Empire. The most primitive stage of all is seen in *The Appeal of Constantinople*²⁸ (1453). Where the single rhymed couplet might be regarded as an accident were it not that it rings so true :

κ' ἔκτεινε τις ἀκτίνες σου σ' ὄλην τὴν οἰκουμένη

κ' εἰς τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν τὴν πρώην φουμισμένη (58 · 60)

and is followed by the assonance *φέγγης - σιέλλης*, and shortly by the assonance - group *αλες - ενες - αδες - ενες - εντες*.

It was natural that the first rhymes should tend to go in pairs, since the primitive *mantinada*, the unrhymed couplet, was already a popular literary form, with its own unconscious principles of isometry²⁹. But there was no rule at all at this point that the rhyming unit was the couplet, and in fact larger units are frequently found. To this stage we may assign such poems as *The Lament of Constantinople* (1044 lines, 3 fives, 1 quatrain, 8 threes, and 47 couplets)³⁰, *The Don-*

²⁸) To be dated 1453: see chapter 7.

²⁹) Σ. Κυριακίδης, *op. cit.* pp. 9 · 10.

³⁰) All the counts are taken strictly on the basis of a three - element, rhyme (vowel - consonant(s) - vowel), which became the accepted form. A count which accepted twoelement rhymes (*CV, V*V, and especially VC*) would in early, poems, and specially in the *Lament pro-*

key's *Synaxarion* (393 lines, 2 triplets, 9 couplets), and *Exile* (548 lines, 1 triplet, 8 couplets). In all these, and especially in the last, many of the couplets are in fact «repetition-rhymes», where the same word ends both lines.

This jingling habit continued, until poems were dominated by it. The *Praise of Venice* (84 lines) has four triplets and sixteen couplets. Picatoros's poem of 563 lines presents almost the last stage of the transition to fully rhymed verse; it is generally in couplets, but has fifteen single lines, two triplets, three quatrains, one group of six, and another monstrous group of twelve rhyming lines. But although in Picatoros the movement towards the couplet seems so definite, a tendency to group rhyming is still apparent in other poems, and the first extant work completely in rhyme is in fact Sachlikis's *Assembly of the Whores*. The group rhyme was a passing fashion, but it did leave one mark on early couplet poetry. The most common group rhyme was of four lines: and the first works in couplets admit freely of double-couplets. Sclavos's *Cretan Earthquake* (1508) has four in 282 lines, *The Plague of Rhodes* has nine in 626 lines, *Ass, Wolf, and Fox* (first edition 1539, and probably not more than twenty years before) has eight in 540 lines. This trick of using one rhyme for two couplets is by the seventeenth century almost entirely illegitimate.

The first of Sachlikis's poems, *Friendship* (II 1 - 203), is the dullest and most pedestrian. He is in prison, and seems genuinely surprised at the way his old «friends» and drinking-companions, and even his kinsmen, have fallen away from him in his disgrace. The surprise is bitter and prompts him

...γράψε γράμματα, Στέφανε, διὰ τοὺς φίλους II 3

The result is not good. Except for a Theophrastan touch about the relatives crowding at the death-bed of a rich man, it is repetitive and tediously moral. Achilles and Patroclus are brought in rather tastelessly, and the poem is very inferior to the next, *Prison*, written at the same time.

Here Sachlikis begins to show some power in describing his captivity

duce strikingly larger figures, and make larger groups of very many couplets.

...τὴν πόρταν τῆς φαρμάκιν
 τοὺς τοίχους δίστοιμον σπαθίν, τὸν πάτον τῆς μαχαῖριν,
 τὸ σκέπασμάν τῆς θάνατον. II 235 - 237

but even here seems a slight inappropriateness in the use of the folk - song cadence, and the effect is happier when his satirical touch comes in

οἱ ψεῖρες τῆς, τῆς φυλακῆς ὡσὰν κορεοὶ δακάνουν,
 κ' οἱ ψύλλοι τῆς μοῦ φαίνονται ὡσὰν χοντροὶ μυρομίγκοι.

The description of the habits of warders (again a suggestion of Theophrastus, and an even stronger one of Prodromos) leads naturally to the short poem, *On his Warder*; this, however, is written after Sachlikis has left the prison, because the warder is referred to in the past tense.

...τὸ πῶς τὸν εἶχα αὐθέντη μου, καὶ τεῖντα τάξιν εἶχεν II 345

This is the poem in which Sachlikis really reveals himself, far more than in his autobiography.

Ἴδὲ τὸ ποῦ σ' ἐπέσωσεν ἡ μοῖρά σου, Σαχλήκη,
 εἰς ποίαν κούρτην κάθεσαι κ' εἰς ποίαν λότζαν εἶσαι.,,

We suddenly see the man of small fortune and high talent, disgusted with the way his vanity has led him after false friends, to the Duke's court and the loggia of the nobles Venetii.

The three poems are homogeneous in style and provided with links; their combined length is perhaps not too long for continuous performance, but that they were conceived separately is fairly clear. The line in *Friendship*

ἡ φυλακὴ τοὺς φίλους δὲ δείχνει ὡς τὸ ποιάμι II 184

is almost repeated in *Prison*

ὅτι τοὺς φίλους τοὺς καλοὺς ἡ φυλακὴ τοὺς δείχνει. II 263

And his own warder is a quite different conception from the generalised «warders» of the second poem.

All his high friends were not completely forgetful. The next time we meet Sachlikis it is as an advocate at the law - courts, a position procured for him by the Duke himself. We may take with a pinch of salt the suggestion of a very close personal friendship. It was Venetian policy to support, even financially, the Cretan upper class: the archives of the period are full of documents remitting tax - debts to impoverished families⁸¹.

⁸¹) H. Noiret, *La domination vénitienne en Crète de 1380 a 1485*

Sachliki's *Autobiography* is all the better for being a little dry to modern taste. The prodigalities of his youth, his bat-like hoverings by the gates of Candia, his hunting over Psiloritiss - the narrative carries us swiftly and easily over all these. It is only when he gibes at the peasants · his villeins · and their boorish amusements, that we begin to feel the beginnings of an antipathy. Is the veneer just a little thin? Is this the jeer of a man between two worlds? But we are not allowed to hesitate on this point. The scene moves back to the city, and Sachlikis becomes an advocate. (It is not long after this time that the citizens of Candia urgently petition the Venetian Senate not to appoint any more young men who are corrupt and utterly inefficient)⁸². But he is not entirely happy, as he ends this poem; his colleagues disgust him by their rapacity, and he returns to his old theme of the contrast between rich and poor.

We cannot imagine him to have been a lawyer long. Our next meeting is again in prison. But this time there is no prolonged whining. The self-pity is perfunctory, almost formal. The feeling is of a man perhaps physically confined, but mentally released, as he passes from his short appeal for help, to *The Assembly of the Whores*. Wagner has stigmatized the transition as «abruptissimum», and suspects a lacuna⁸³. It is sudden; but it is the joyful suddenness of a release, as he starts his invective against the women of the town

κατὰ καιρὸν πηδᾶτέ τις, συχνὰ μηδὲν ὑπᾶτε II 402

Above them all looms the figure of Koutayiotena, the Arch-whore, elected their queen to the triumphal song

γαμίζεται Κουταγιώταινα κι ὁ σκύλος της γαυγίζει
καὶ κλαῖσι τὰ παιδάκια της καὶ κείνη χαχανίζει. II 579-580

The new certainty and driving-power that the poet has attained is shown in his rhyme-scheme. The poems of his first imprisonment had been unrhymed, with a handful of odd couplets and repetition-rhymes. The *Autobiography* had been largely in

(Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d' Athènes et de Rome 61 (1892), See pp. 457, 458, 465, 501 etc. One of the persons so helped (in 1458) is a Manoles Sclavos.

⁸²) F. Cornelius (Cornaro) *Creta Sacra* Venice 1755 vol. 2, p. 398. Dated 23 Dec. 1490.

⁸³) W. Wagner, *Carmina graeca...* p. 92.

couplets with many unrhymed lines and groups. The Assembly of the Whores is in complete and perfect group-rhymes, nearly all in fours, with some fives, threes and couplets. The names tumble over each other with a Rabelaisian vigour. Only towards the end does the pace drop slightly, and it is soon restored by a dreadful battle between two parties of Koutayiotena's army. As it stands, this Battle of the Whores is fragmentary. It has no end, nor does its beginning have any obvious connexion with the Assembly. But the style is so much the same, and the Battle would give so much point to the end of the longer poem that it may be possible to consider them part of the same narrative.

To this period too, *Pothotsoustounia*⁸⁴ belongs, in spirit if not in form. Here, the lack of rhyme must certainly be ascribed to its status as a parody of older poems.

Our last view of Sachlikis is in the three poems grouped as *Advice to Franciscin*; advice to abhor, in turn, wanderings by night, gambling, and prostitutes. Again the poems are homogeneous, and can be performed together; the second and third are introduced by the words *δεύτερον* and *τρίτον*. At the same time they are easily capable of independent performance, and at one point, at least, the link seems inept, where the gnomic conclusion of the advice against gambling would seem far better suited to be a summing of the three sections together.

In these poems the advice is conventionally given to the son of an old friend with whom Sachlikis had had

δείπνουσ καὶ γίωματα πολλὰ, σπλάγγνος καὶ ὀμιλίαν I 29

The tone is more sober. There is almost a return to the moralising of the first poems. It must be admitted that nowhere in the *Advice* does the poet name himself, and that the name Stephanos Sachlikis occurs only in the Montpellier manuscript's false ending⁸⁵. But this is not a reason for assigning this group

⁸⁴) I have with some reluctance decided in favour of the form *Pothotsoustounia*, and not *Pothotsoutsounia*. The latter plays on the word *τσουτσοῦνι*, *membrum virile*. But the former, which occurs more frequently in the manuscript, probably combines this with a real name *Τσουσιούνια*, the Italian Giustinia.

⁸⁵) Which mentions the *malfrancese*, and has the only example in Sachlikis of a false rhyme in which the accented vowel is not maintained, i. e. *χώραν - ἡμέραν* (I (M) 344 - 345).

to a different poet. The character-drawings, first of the irrepres- sible gambler, and then of the young prostitute pretending to fast, are so like the earlier descriptions of the jailer, or the villeins, or the advocates, that they are unlikely to come from a different pen. The old rake is tired, but still powerful.

Whether he was conscious of it or not he had, in the first perfect couplet - poem known to us, set a standard of craftman- ship that was to be rare until the great works of the seven- teenth century. In the *Advice*, he uses only three double - cou- plets, and his rhymes are, with one exception, perfect⁸⁶. From the musical viewpoint, our admiration of this skill must be em- bittered by the knowledge that the establishment of such regu- larity in the use of the couplet had the corollary that couplet - tunes became overwhelmingly the main vehicle of musical nar- ration. When we read *Advice to Franciscin* we are wit- nessing the death of the link - tune; or at least its wounding so deep that it can today bear only the short ballad. But this is an Olympian anticipation. Even this work with its neat couplets was sung to the old one - and - a - half line tunes as we may see from the repetitions and half - lines in it⁸⁷, and from the fact that the free handling of de la Broue's minstrel actually produc- es two triplets in its otherwise unblemished structure. The sa- me man sings the *Alphabet of Devotion* in the same style...

εὖρε μνημεῖον, -μεῖον ἄνοικτον, καὶ πρόσκνυψε εἰς αὐτον 37 (M)

and

οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὰ χροῖματα διανέμουν γὰ σωθοῦσιν,

εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς, ὦ ἄνθρωπε,

καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν τὸν ἀγαθὸν αὐτεῖνον τὸν δανείζουν. 84 - 85 (M)

Belisarius and *The Plague of Rhodes* have the same signs in their manuscript: the interjection and repetition

γαλιότες καὶ πλοιάρια (πολλά!) κι ἄμετρος ραιζιβοῦδες

ἄνδρας καλοὺς, καλοὺς πολεμιστές, γεννάδες καὶ ἀλκίμους.

Belis. 124 - 125

ἄκουσας Βελισάριος εὐθὺς κατὰ, -τὰ τῆς ὥρας 295

τόσ' ἔπραξεν, τόσ' ἔποικαν, τόσα, τόσα ἐπολεμίζαν 304

τὴν Ἀφρικὴν ἐσκύλευσε, (ἐκατάλυσε) καὶ ἐκατάλυσε τὴν 562

⁸⁶) I 174 - 175, *τρωῶ τες - πόρτες.*

⁸⁷) See above.

οἱ φαντασίες οἱ πολλὰς κ' οἱ γὰ, γαλανταροσύνες Plague 57
νὰ τὲς σηκίωσω ἀφ' τήν, τήν γῆν, σιὰ ὕψη νὰ τὲς θέσω 97

and this most perfect indication of the link - tune, exactly the form in which Col. Leake would have written it down in Epirus³⁸.

*Ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐσιόλισεν ὄλα τὰ παλάτια
 παννία χρυσοῦφανα.*

Παννία χρυσοῦφανα ἐκρέμασεν εἰς τοίχους 657 - 658

This is the end. After 1498 we see no more signs in the manuscripts. Choumnos and Acontianos in 1500 write firmly in couplets. Manoles Sclavos in 1508 counts his words in couplets³⁹, not in lines, and it is clear that when this happens they are sung to a couplet - tune, forerunner of the narrative - tunes to which *Erotocritos*, or *Daskaloyannis*, or *Liapis* are sung today.

Be this as it may. To return to Sachlikis himself, we can say that his poetic work, as we know it, was over by 1495. The staid, avuncular Sachlikis of the last poems demands at least ten or fifteen years of development from Sachlikis in jail. As we have seen, the evidence of form would demand a much greater interval. The gamut of his styles corresponds to a series of changes which in other poems we know to extend from 1455 to 1498. If within this time a choice of dates had to be made, perhaps the most likely period would fall between 1470 and 1495. It was from 1470 onwards that Venetian troops were regularly stationed in Crete⁴⁰. A decree of the Venetian Senate in that year decides to send out «Ballistarii, sclopeterii, et lanzaroli». The crossbowmen and musketeers would have been Lombards, the pikemen Germans. These, and not individual merchants and engineers, would have been the men whose acquaintance Sachlikis made in prison.

³⁸) See above, chapter 2.

³⁹) ...τοῦτα τὰ δίστιχα ἔβγαλα διὰ θρηνον τῶν ἀνθρώπων.
 Ὡς ἔδεπὰ τελειώνονται, μισὸ καὶ κιντινάρι (a hundred and fifty)
 τὰ βέρσα τοῦτα ποῦκαμα μὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν χάρη. 280 - 282

⁴⁰) H. Noiret, op. cit. pp. 509, 546, 547, etc. Note especially the troops «diversarum linguarum», p. 548.

CHAPTER 4
ΤΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΩΝ Ο ΧΑΡΟΣ

*He hadde a book that gladly, nyght and day,
for his desport he wolde rede alway :
he cleped it Valerie and Theofraste,
et which book he lough alwey ful faste.
And eek ther was somtyme a clerk at Rome,
a cardinal, that highte Seint Jerome,
that made a bock agayn Jovinian;
in which book eek ther was Tertulan,
Crisippus, Trotula, and Helowys,
that was abbesse nat fer fro Parys;
and eek the Parables of Salomon,
Ovides Art, and bookes many on,
and alle thise were bounden in o volume.*

(Wife of Bath's Prologue 669 - 681)

Before going on to examine, or rather to search for, the sources and precedents for Sachlikis's poetry, mention should be made of two other poems which in date and content can easily be treated with his¹. It should be stressed that there are in fact two poems. Krumbacher seems occasionally to realise that there is a considerable difference between them; but on the whole he accepts their homogeneity, and the mistake has been perpetuated by later scholars. The two works are quite different in form and inspiration. The first poem has lost its end, which presumably contained the stories of Avicenna, Orlando, Hector, Achilles, and Rinaldo, which have been promised, and when we compare it with its model we may suspect that yet other references have been lost. The abrupt break has been concealed by a transition-piece (which, incidentally, has a memory of Sachlikis)², and the text continues in a different metre, with different

¹) Published in K. Krumbacher, Ein vulgargriechische Weiberspiegel (Sitzungsberichte K. B. Akad. der Wiss. Philos. - Philol. - Hist. Klasse 1905, pp. 335 - 432). A happy title in its memories of Nigel Wireker's *Speculum Stultorum* and the iambics of Semonides of Amorgos. Later bibliography is given in Φ. Κουκουλές, *Περὶ τὸ στιχούργημα Συναξάριον τῶν εὐγενικῶν καὶ τιμιωτάτων ἀρχόντισσων* (ΚΧ 7 (1953) pp. 55 - 60).

²) Cf. *Pothotsoustounia* 905 ff.

ideas, and even with a different language³. The first of these poems will now be referred to by the title in the manuscript—«*Συναξάριον τῶν εὐγενικῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τιμιωτάτων ἀρχόντισσων*», the Register of Noble Women⁴; and the second by the sarcastic note at the end—«*Ὁ ἔπαινος τῶν γυναικῶν*», the Praise of Women.

The Register is in 475 fifteen-syllabled verses, mostly in couplets. Since we have been discussing the use of rhyme in poetry of this time, it may be as well to note that the Register has one group of ten, one of eight, six of six, and three of five rhyming lines: thirteen quatrains, two triplets, one hundred and fifty couplets, and forty-nine unrhymed lines. That is to say, that the progress towards the couplet is well under way, and that on this criterion the work to which it shows most affinity is Picatoros's poem. The handwriting of the manuscript is of the first half (perhaps even the first third) of the sixteenth century. The only other evidence for dating is in the mention of Orlando and Rinaldo

*Ἦλα Ὀρλάντε φοβερὸν καὶ Ἐκτωρ ἀδρειωμένε,
καὶ Ἀχιλλὲ φοικιότατε, Ρινάλδε παινεμένε.* 169 170

Krumbacher uses this to place a *terminus post quem* at 1516, when Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* was first published⁵. But Ariosto's poem was a sequel to Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato*, which was published in part in 1484 and 1486, and in full in 1506. Since these were all Venetian editions they are inherently more probable to have found their way to Crete than Ariosto's early publications. In any case the *terminus* must

³) One of the most reliable tests is the form of the negative as it passes through the sequence *οὐδὲν* (*οὐ*)*δὲν* (where the *οὐ* blends with a preceding vowel · *δὲν*). The figures for these two poems are:

	Register	Praise
<i>οὐδὲν</i>	7	1
(<i>οὐ</i>) <i>δὲν</i>	4	—
<i>δὲν</i>	14	31
Total	25	32

In other words, in the second poem the change is almost complete.

⁴) *Συναξάριον* has two meanings: 'ritual', the description of an order of ecclesiastic ceremony; and 'register', of the life of a saint. Perhaps neither is quite appropriate. See E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine periods* Cambridge (Mass.) 1914, s. 1.

⁵) K. Krumbacher, *op. cit.* p. 371.

be pushed back at least to the publication of Books I and II of Boiardo in 1486".

The Praise of Women is in 735 octosyllables; the rhyme is irregular. For this metre there is not enough material to establish the sort of chronological sequence that has been possible in political verse, but there is a presumption that the progress of rhyming would be about the same in both forms. Making generous allowance for the poet's rather sketchy ideas about rhyme, it seems that the Praise has passed beyond the stage of having unrhymed lines, and that there is a very strong tendency to use groups of four and six among its couplets. There is also a clear reminiscence of Sachlikis:

*Ἐβαλεν κ' ἡ Λασκαρίνα
τὸ φουσιάνι, κ' ἡ Μαρίνα.
τότεες λεγ' ἡ Κατερίνα
«ὦ, τὸ τὶ σᾶς πιάνει φίνα!»
· · · · ·
Ἦλθεν κ' ἡ κυρὰ Μαριέτα
κ' ἔρωιᾷ διὰ τὴν Ζαμπέτα.
· · · · ·
ἔφθασεν ἡ Φραντζεσκίνα
κ' ἔρωιᾷ το, «Τ' εἶναι κεῖνα;»...*

568 · 573. 584 · 585

Although this passage does not lie perfectly in the course of the poem, there is a real connexion with what goes before. The style is so similar to that of its context that we must regard it not as an interpolation, but an imitation: and so date the Praise of Women after the Assembly of the Whores.

Linguistically, both works are Cretan, though probably copied in the Ionian islands¹. Xanthudides makes an odd mistake in thinking that they were exported from Crete after the Turkish conquest²: but in fact the manuscript - illustration at the end of Krumbacher's edition is missing in the offprint (now in the Museum Library at Candia) from which he worked.

The element that is common to Sachlikis and these poems

¹) For all these dates see J. - C. Brunet, Manuel du Libraire Paris 1860.

²) Φ. Κουκουλές, op. cit. p. 56.

³) Σ. Ξανθοουδίδης, Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὸν Weiberspiegel (BZ 16 (1907) pp. 470 - 478) p. 478.

is misogyny. It is in the misogynous poems of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance that we must look for their sources⁹. The vastness of the search is soon realised: woman-baiting is one of the great themes of Mediaeval poetry, a theme emphasized and embittered as if in conscious antithesis to the deification of women implied in the code of courtly love. Neither is it possible to limit the search to Italian writers, however much more probable it is that Cretan poets should draw upon them, than upon German, or English, or French. Mediaeval literature had a unity which it is hard for our age to understand. While the flow of writing was, by modern standards, so small, the proportion of it that was translated into other tongues was very much larger than we are used to. To these translations, of every degree of accuracy and often not acknowledging the original author's name, were added imitations sometimes so close that in our time they would unhesitatingly be called plagiarism. No work in a European language can be excluded on the grounds that it could not have been read in Crete: an Italian translation can easily have existed. Even when the invention of printing began to take the output beyond the capacity of translators, the unity of literature did not die quickly. As late as the seventeenth century it is possible to say that, although we know and recognise the French *Paris et Vienne* and the Italian *Paris e Vienna*, the source of *Errotocritos* must have been a version - presumably in Italian - with characteristics of both; and completely unknown to us in print or manuscript¹⁰.

This does not deny the existence of national schools independent and distinct. Perhaps the most distinct was the literature of Byzantium, but it is a great mistake (and this is the most radical criticism that can be made of Krumbacher and his successors) to treat the Byzantine writing as something separate from that of Western Europe. The repertoires of West and East

⁹) An introduction to the subject may be found in A. Wulff, *Die frauenfeindlichen Dichtungen in den romanischen Litteraturen des Mittelalters bis zum Ende des XIII Jahrhunderts* (Romanischen Arbeiten 4) Halle 1914. See also P. Lehmann, *Die Parodie im Mittelalter* Munich 1922, pp. 142 ff, and numerous references in Robinson's edition of Chaucer.

¹⁰) G. Morgan, *French and Italian elements in the Errotocritos* (KX 7 (1953) pp. 201 - 228) pp. 227 - 228.

were almost identical; and this not only after the Crusades, although Byzantine popular poetry received at this time possibly a more direct stimulus than learned literature. Just as it would be ridiculous to consider Florios and Platziastora and the Old Knight separately from Floire et Blanchefleur and Lancelot du Lac, so it is, if not ridiculous, at least unwise, to consider Prodromos and Glykas separately from the Wandering Scholars of Western Europe: while Manuel Philes's beautiful and almost unknown poem "The Rose" has no counterpart in any other Byzantine writing, but might easily be the product of some Greek Benediktbauern.

Mediaeval misogyny is the direct descendant of patristic writing. The Church fathers, and especially, it seems, the Fathers of the Eastern Church, preached against women with all their power. Their sermons (such is the continuity of the tradition) are often essential to the understanding of later works: they are quoted in detail and at length, the name of Chrysostom standing out amongst those of his colleagues. But it is not until the tenth and eleventh centuries that more popular works begin to have the same ferocity. In 1140, Bernardus Morlanensis screams

*Femina res rea, res male carnea, vel caro tota;
strenua perdere, nataque fallere, fallere docta.
Fossa novissima, vipera pessima, pulcra putredo;
semita lubrica, res male publica, praedaque praedo.
Horrida noctua, publica ianua, dulce venenum*¹²

and so on for page after page. In the East, two hundred years later, Joannes Pediasimos joins the chorus

γυνή πονηρὰ νανάγιον ἀρρένων,
ἀρρωστία σύννοικος οὐκ ἰωμένη,
· · · · ·
νὺξ ἀσέληνος, χειμερινὴ πικρία,
ὑπουλον ἔλκος, ἐνδομαχοῦσα φθόγη,
πονηρὰ φύσις, ἀκατάλλακτος μάχη¹³.

¹¹) Printed in B. Thorslacius, Prolusiones et opuscula academica Copenhagen 1815, vol. 3, pp. 63 - 4. See also H. Waddell, The wandering scholars (7th edition) London 1954, especially pp. 215ff. and 248ff.

¹²) T. Wright, The Anglo-Latin satirists and epigrammatists of the twelfth century: vol. 2, London 1872 p. 57.

¹³) J. A. Fabricius, Bibliothecae Graecae vol. 13, Hamburg 1726 p. 576.

and though he has the grace to balance this with a poem on «the good woman», his heart is only in the first.

But with Bernardus, Woman was only one rogue in a gallery of enormous vices. It must be admitted that other villains of his come in for treatment almost as severe. It was left to another Englishman to write the first poem which dealt with the subject separately, in a more restrained, and perhaps more effective style. The poem *De conjugē non ducenda*¹⁴ by Walter Mapes, which circulated under the pseudonym «Goliard» (the personification and eponymous hero of the *goliardi*, the vagabond clerks) achieved a tremendous popularity and left its mark on all the genre. Of this poem we note three things: that its author was a cleric (later even a bishop); that it is based openly and immediately upon authority,

*Sit Deo gloria, laus, benedictio,
Johanni pariter, Petro, Laurentio,*

in other words upon the misogynous writings of S. John Chrysostom, Petro de Corbolio, and Laurence of Durham; and that, as far as I can make out, Mapes was the first to add smoke to the Vulgate's scolding wife and dripping roof - «*tecta perstillantia in die frigoris et litigiosa mulier comparantur*»¹⁵. Goliard has

*Fumus et mulier et stillicidia
expellunt hominem de domo propria*

and so establishes the tradition (and perhaps this example of continuity will suffice) in a papal sermon of Innocent III, «*Tria sunt enim quae non sinunt hominem in domo permanere, fumus, stillicidium, et mala uxor*»¹⁶,

in the England of Langland, and then of Chaucer

. . . dropping houses, and eek smoke,

¹⁴) T. Wright, *The Latin poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes* (Proceedings of the Camden Society, 1841) pp. 77-85. See also the introduction.

¹⁵) Proverbs 27, 15 The Septuagint version is fuller: «*στιαγόνες ἐκβάλλουσιν ἄνθρωπον ἐν ἡμέρᾳ χειμερινῇ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, ὡσαύτως καὶ γυνὴ λοιδόρος ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου*».

¹⁶) PL 217, 710. But the dates are so close (Innocent's work cannot be more than ten years after Mapes) that it seems likely that the phrase was already established.

*and chiding wyves maken men to flee
out of his owene hous...*

(Wife of Bath's Prologue 278 - 280)

in Spain

*humo y gotera y la muger parlera
echan al hombre du su casa fuera*¹⁷

in fifteenth century Crete

*τρία κακά εἰσὶν τὰ διώχνουν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους
καὶ ἐβγαίνουν ἀπὸ τὰ σπίτια τους καὶ ἔχουν πίκρες μεγάλες,
ἡγοῦν ὁ καπνὸς καὶ ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἡ σκληρὴ γυναῖκα.*

(Register 285 - 287)

in Elizabethan England

*. . . O he is as tedious
as a tired horse, a railing wife,
worse than a smoky house*

(Shakespeare, Henry IV part 1, Act 3, Scene 1)

and back again in modern Crete

*ἡ σταλαγόνα καὶ ὁ καπνὸς καὶ ἡ κακὴ γυναῖκα
τὸν ἄντρα ἐπορίσανε ἀπὸ τὸ σπίτι μέσα*¹⁸.

An Italian version will be quoted later; French and German examples could no doubt be found.

Nearly all the elements of Mediaeval anti-feminine writing are found in *De conjugē non ducenda*. Most important is the convention of «authorities», the collection of alleged misogynists from unfortunate Homer down through the ancients and the Old Testament to the latest (foreign) royal cuckold. This «catalogue poem», is the principal subdivision of the genre. The next most frequent form is the convention of «advice to a young man about to marry», which, however elaborate, does not amount to much more than Mr. Punch's opinion on the same matter. The third convention (not in *Goliath*) which occurs frequently enough to be classified is the dialogue between the attacker and defender of Woman, of which *Pediasimos*'s poem may be regarded as a rudimentary example. This dialogue form was common in late Latin poetry, and was the normal one for the *Dances Macabres* which have much in common with

¹⁷) Quoted in A. Wulff, op. cit. p. 182.

¹⁸) Φ. Κουκουλές, *Περὶ τὸ στιχοῦργημα...* p. 57.

misogynous poetry. It fitted naturally to the tensons, the poetical contests, of Provençal poetry¹⁹.

The Register of Noble Women sits squarely in this tradition. The poet sets out to call upon all the resources of «authority»

. . . να λάβω τὴν σοφίαν,
μνήμην καὶ λόγον καὶ σπουδὴν ὀρθῶς να ἐρμηνέψω

2 - 3

to compose a formal «Nature of Women»

. . . να πῶ καὶ να συνθέσω
τὰ φυσικὰ τῶν γυναικῶν . . .²⁰

5 - 6

He starts with what is perhaps the commonest theme of all, that Eve is the source of all man's evil, and the root of death²¹. Then to another point which one might think equally essential to the work of any misogynous cleric, but which in fact is comparatively rare - that the Virgin must be excluded, for she was not really a woman but a divinity.

ἡ Θεοτόκος ἡ Παναγία δὲν ἦτον ἀπὸ τοῦτες,
ἤγουν γυναικ' ἀληθινὴ κι ἀπὸ σποράν ἀνθρώπου.

71 - 72

This is perhaps the best evidence for Xanthudides' notion that the author was a Cretan Catholic²². The poem continues through the Bible fairly steadily, with occasional appeals to such names as

. . . Σωκράτη,
καὶ φυσικέ μου Γαληνὲ καὶ μέγα Ἴπποκράτη
'Αριστοτέλη, διάκρινε τοῦ Πλάτωνος τὰς τάξεις,
καί, 'Αβιζέννα, . . .

157 - 160

Solomon naturally takes a high place. John the Baptist completes the Biblical list. There now comes a series of anecdotes: Jason and Medea, quoted from Ovid; Semiramis; the Matron of Ephesus, quoted from Aesop!; the story of Aristotle and Roxana²³, and three short notices of Hippocrates, Homer, and Plato.

¹⁹) E. Hoepffner, *Les Troubadours* Paris 1955 pp. 9, 12 ff.

²⁰) «Nunc mala femina fit mihi pagina, fit mihi sermo» (Bernardus Morlanensis, loc. cit.).

²¹) Compare the Lines on Adam and Paradise (BGV vol. 1) pp. xi - xiv.

²²) Σ. Ξανθοῦ δίδης, op. cit. p. 478.

²³) It is very hard to locate this story of Aristotle being ridden by Roxana. It is not in W. Hertz, *Aristoteles in den Alexanderdichtungen des Mittelalters* (Abhandlungen der philos. - philol. - Classe der kön.

Here the poem breaks off without fulfilling the programme it has set itself.

The sources of this poem might easily include the whole of mediaeval misogynous literature: in fact for part of the work we are able to identify an immediate source. This is the essay of «Advice not to get married», of which no edition is known, but which had a considerable circulation in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries²⁴. It was often under the name of Theophrastus; but it has now been established fairly certainly that the author was Antonio Pucci, the Florentine poet of the mid-fourteenth century who, as author of an *Apollonio di Tiro*, has another claim to be remembered by students of Cretan poetry.

Here are some parallel passages from the two works: with most of them it would always be possible that there was a common source in the vast confusion of mediaeval writing. But in two examples it may be claimed that Pucci's essay is referred to.

a) Plato, «*per cierte femmine che piangieano un altra ch'era morte*», disse: Il male si contrista del male che è perduto. 40

Ἔλα καὶ σὺ, Πλάτωνα φοβερόε, ἄξιε, παινεμένε

.
ἄνοιξε καὶ τὸ στόμα σου . . .

.
«Ἐγὼ εἶδα κάπου ἀνάλυτες γυναῖκες πὸν ἐκλαῖαν,
καὶ μοιρολογοῦσαν μιὰ γυνήν, νεκρὴν, ἀποθαιμένην,
καὶ εἶπα· «Ὅλες οἱ κακὲς τὸ ἄλλον κακὸ συγκλαῖσιν
διατὶ τὸ ἔχασαν, θλίβονται, τὰ μοιρολόγια κλαῖσιν».

454, 458, 460 - 463

b) Avicienna 40

καί, Ἀβιζέννα . . .

c) Santo Agostino disse: 41

καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ὁ διδάσκαλος, ὁ μέγας Ἀὐγουστῖνος,
ὁ βίβλος Πόλη τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ μαρτυρεῖ καὶ κείνος 39 - 40

d) Salomone disse: la mala femmina è disfacimento della ca-

bay. Akad. der Wissenschaften 19 (1892) pp. 3 - 105), which has all the other Aristotle - myths. But see J. W. Spargo, *Virgil the Necromancer* (Harvard Studies in comparative literature 10) Cambridge (Mass. 1934, pp. 40 (quoting from John Gower), 254, 256.

²⁴) Printed in A. d'Ancona, *Una poesia ed una prosa di Antonio Bucci* (Il propugnatore 2 (1869) pp. 397 - 438, 3 (1870) pp. 35 - 53).

sa. Et ancora disse: E' nonn' è ira sopra quella della femmina; e meglio sarebbe istare co'dragoni che con la femmina adirata. 41

*Ἀκόμη λέγει ὁ Σολωμὼν εἰς τούτην τὴν δουλείαν,
εἰς τὴν ὀργὴν τῆς γυναικὸς κ' εἰς τὴν ἐπιβουλίαν
καὶ λέγει ὅτι κανεὶς ἐράθυμος τοῦ φιδίου ὑπερβαίνει,
μόνον τῆς ἄνομης γυνῆς, ὅπου τὸ ὑπερβαίνει.*

*Ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὅτι εἶναι κάλλιον, διὰ τὰ ὑπομένη
μὲ δρόκαιναν ὅταν πεινᾶν κοὶ λέαιναν ἀγριωμένην
παρὸν μὲ τὴν γυναικᾶν του ὅταν εἶναι θυμωμένη. 251 - 257*

e) Ancora disse: . . . e se la femmina avesse signoria sarebbe contraria del marito. 41

*Διὰ τοῦτο λέγει: «Ἡ γυνή, ἂν εἶχεν δεσποτείαν
ἀπάνω εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα της, χωρὶς καμμίαν αἰτίαν,
θωροῶντά τον εἰς τὰ κάρβουνα καὶ μέσα εἰς τὴν ἰστίαν...»*

281 - 283

f) Aristotle disse: ²⁶ Tre cose caccia l' uomo di casa sua: il fummo, el tetto scoperto e la mala femmina. 41

*Ἀκόμη λέγει: «Τριὰ κακὰ εἰσὶν τὰ διώχνουν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους
κ' ἐβγαίνουν ἀπὲ τὰ σπίτια τους κ' ἔχουν πικριὲς μεγάλες,
ἤγουν ὁ καπνὸς καὶ ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἡ σκληρὴ γυναικα». 285 - 287*

g) Iprocras, per una femmina che portava il fuoco in mano, disse: L' uno fuoco porta l' altro. Omero per una femmina inferma disse: Il male ista col male. 41

*Ἀκόμη εἰς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν λέγει καὶ ὁ Ἱπποκράτης
διὰ μιὰ γυναικα ὅπου ἐβάσταζε φωτιά εἰς τὰ χέρια της.*

«Ἰστία βασιάζει τὴν φωτιά καὶ πλέον εἶναι πυρωμένη

.

ἤγουν ἐκείνη πὸν τὸ βασιᾶ παρὸν τὸ βασιταμένο.

Καὶ σὺ, Ὅμηρε ξακουσιέ, εἰπέ μας καὶ σὺ μοιράδι

ἀπὸ τὰ κακὰ τῶν γυναικῶν ὅπου ἔχουν πουρνὸν καὶ βράδυ.

«Ἐγὼ εἶδα μιὰ γυνή βαρεῖα σινημένην,

Κι εἶπα τους «Τὸ εἶνα τὸ κακὸν μὲ τ' ἄλλο μὲ τυχαίνει».

This juxtaposition of Hippocrates and Homer is not merely chance.

h) Maestro Ciecco d' Ascoli disse così:

.

Lo fuoco e la femmina e la terra

²⁶) The obvious emendation to «Ancora disse» is here supported by the Greek.

*l' abisso inferno mai non dice basta,
ma senza fine appetito serra.* 44

*Ἄκομη λέγει «Τίποτε τέσσερα δὲ χορταίνου,
ἀμμή γὰ τρωῶσιν πάντοτε θέλουν καὶ ν' ἁμαρτάνουν·
ἢ γῆ καὶ ὁ Αἴδης κ' ἢ φωτιά κ' ἢ φύση τῆς γυναίκας.* 301 - 303

This is the most convincing instance of all, for only in this pamphlet is Ciecco d' Ascoli's poem quoted in this form. As it is printed in the editions, it runs

*Il foco della femmina disserra
l' abisso interno che mai dice: basta
ma senza fine l' appetito serra*²⁶.

In Pucci, as in the Register, this aphorism is followed first by a reference to

i) . . non contenente serva dell' uomo 45

Ἡ γυνή τὸ θέλημά σου οὐ κάμνει 305

and the story of John the Baptist.

j) Taida fu concubina, cioè bagascia, di Sansone. *μπαγάσα*, at line 413, is as far as I know a *hapax legomenon* in Greek poetry.

This accumulation of likenesses surely makes it certain that the Register is largely based upon Pucci's essay. The same author also wrote a *contrasto* in ottava rima on the same subject²⁷, and it is worth noting that this too contains three themes found in the Cretan poem: the riding of Aristotle by Alexander's queen; the sin of Semiramis; and the deliberate exclusion of the Virgin, which, as I have said, is not as common as might be thought likely—

*La Nostra Donna, si come tu sai
d' alcun difetto mai non portò peso.* Ixix

In Pucci's time, misogynous writing was changing rapidly. The terms are always dangerous, but here we can with more confidence than usual describe the change as being from the Mediaeval to the Renaissance. It is the change, in a strictly literary sense, from «authority» to «personality»; the process that was so obviously in Chaucer's mind at the beginning of the wife of Bath's prologue—

²⁶) d' Ancona op. cit. p 44.

²⁷) This is the «poesia» printed by d' Ancona.

*Experience, though noon auctoritee
were in this world, is right ynogh for me
to speke of wo that is in marriage . . .*

I · 3

In adopting as his model Pucci's *Contrasti*, the writer of the *Register of Noble Women* was much out of date²⁸. But even in the *Register* there are signs of the Renaissance style. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries anti-feminist writers turned from comprehensive vituperation to the more individual satire of the novella²⁹. The old forms persist; but the now the cutting-edge is in *Bandello* and *Boccaccio* and their followers, in hundreds and thousands of little stories illustrating the weaknesses (it must be admitted) of men as well as women. The impression remains, in this sad world of male authors, that the women come out worse.

This tendency towards the novella is already seen in Pucci, where the bare epigrams of his authorities are given a little context and solidity. Even more is it seen in the anecdotes with which the Cretan poet adorns his moralising—of the *Matron of*

²⁸) But it seems that the production of these old-fashioned misogynist writings lingered on in Greece long after they were quite out of fashion in Western Europe. The very rare *History of Good and Evil Women*, published in 1549, is a pedestrian poem based upon «authority», though in this case the authority is entirely biblical and patristic. Of its 296 lines, in rhymed couplets, the first 210 deal with evil women, forty with the good, and the rest with advice on the bringing-up of daughters.

The pamphlet, of which only one copy exists, in the library of Munich (and so probably belonging to Martin Crusius's collection) is written by Zane Vendramos of Nauplion and has recently been published by B. Knōs, *Un miroir des femmes du XVIIe s.* (*Ελληνικά* 14 (1955-6) pp. 123-157). Vendramos was also the author of another recently-discovered moral poem. See Γ. Θ. Ζώρας, *Τζάνε Βεντράμου ιστορία Φιλαργυρίας μετά τῆς Περηφανείας* (*ΕΕΒΣ*) 24 (1954).

²⁹) The primitive novella was common to East and West. We have at least four examples of Byzantine stories, (expansions of Aesopic and Oriental themes), which seem to precede their counterparts in *Bandello* and his contemporaries. See E. Rohde, *Eine griechische Novelle* (*Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 31 (1876) pp. 628-630) and A. Hausrath, *Ein spätgriechischer Schwank und ein byzantinisches Volksbuch* (*Ibid.* 87 (1938) pp. 85-94). Compare also the anecdotes in *Barlaam* and *Ioasaph* of which a translation into Cretan dialect awaits editing in the Bodleian. See R. M. Dawkins, *A Cretan translation of Barlaam and Ioasaph*. (*Medium Aevum* 1 (1932) pp. 190-125).

Ephesus, and of Aristotle. The second sign of the new feeling is the increasing use of obscenity; of which the Register has only one or two startling examples, but which in the Praise of Women is one of the chief components.

The Praise of Women sets out to describe the ills of women in three classes; unmarried, married, and widows;

*Πρῶτα λέγω τὰς παρθένες,
δεύτερο τὰς παντρεμένες,
κ' ὕστερα τὰς κουρεμένες
τὰς χηράδες τὰς σπασμένες.*

492 · 495

The execution of this plan is not by invective, or authority, as it would have been in Mediaeval poetry, but by description, and anonymous anecdote. It is entirely in the spirit of the novel. An interesting comparison may be made with Boccaccio's *Corbaccio*⁸⁰, though that is on a very much higher plane of achievement. In *Corbaccio* the author finds himself mysteriously in a strange country, seeking his (ideal) love. He is persuaded by an almost gentle and quiet description of the vices of women that there is no such thing as an ideal love; and that if men regarded them as they ought,

«...non altrimenti andrebbero a loro, nè con altro diletto o appetito, che all' altre naturali e inevitabili opportune cose vadano».

Or, as Sachlikis said,

κατὰ καιρὸν πηδᾶτέ τις, συχνὰ μηδὲν ὑπᾶτε.

II 402

Noone could say that the description of vices in the Praise is gentle or quiet: but the comparison of the two pieces shows not only the immense superiority of the Italian work, but also the basic similarity of both.

Boccaccio is talking of the vanities of cosmetics—

«...con mille unguenti e colori dipignendo, e or con solfo a quando con acque lavorate e spessimamente cò raggi del sole i capelli neri della cotenna prodotti simiglianti a fila d' oro fanno le più divenire: e quelli ora in treccia di dietro alle reni, ore sparti su per li omeri, ora alla testa

⁸⁰) G. Boccaccio, *Il Corbaccio* (Opere volgari vol. 5) Florence 1828, pp. 155 - 255.

rauvolti, secondo che piu vaghe parer credono, compongono..»

187

The Cretan parallel is cruder and rougher :

. . . τὰ μαλλιά τους τὰ ξαθαίνουν
κι ὅλα τὰ κακὰ μαθαίνουν.

*Έχουν ἀκόμη κι ἄλλον ἕνα
ὅτι τὰ φρούδια τὰ καμένα
θέλουν πάντα νὰ τὰ ἐβγάξουν
κ' ἔμορφα διὰ νὰ φτειάνουν,
ὡσὰν γατάνι νὰ τὰ κάμνουν.
ἔδε προῶμα τὸ μαθάνουν.

*Άλλες μὲ τὰ μαχαιράκια
καὶ μαδίζουν τὰ φρουδάκια,
ἄλλες βάνουν τὴν κλωστήν
κι ἀπαιτοῦσιν τὸ δασὺ

.
τὰ πρόσωπά τους πλουμίζουν
καὶ καλὰ τὰ ζωγραφίζουν,
μερικές, διὰ νὰ τ' ἀσπρίζουν,
κι ἄλλες νὰ τὰ κοκκινίζουν·
κι ὅταν θέλουν νὰ φτειαστοῦσι
ἤγουν διὰ νὰ σιολισιοῦσι,
πιάνουν προῶτα καὶ θωροῦσι
τὸν καθρέφτην, νὰ πλακοῦσι,
καὶ θωροῶντά τον, τὸν πινοῦσι
κι ἀλλέως θέλουν νὰ φτειαστοῦσι 514 · 525. 542 · 551

Again,

«La loro lussuria è focosa e insaziabile, e per questo non patisce nè numero né elezione: il fante, il lavoratore, il mugnaio, e ancora il nero etiopo...» 190

and

μόνον ἔιοῦτο ἔχει χάριν
νὰ γυρεύη, ποῖον νὰ πάρη,
κι ἄς ἔν καὶ ράφτης ἢ τζαγκάρης
ἢ καμένος κατεργάρης. 638 · 641

But the closest analogies to the Praise are found in an Italian work that is—and this is a difficulty we shall hear more of—of a later date than the Cretan poem. The *Ragionamenti*⁹¹

⁹¹) P. Aretino, *I Ragionamenti* ed. Anon., Paris 1882.

of Pietro Aretino, of which part achieved a wide notoriety under the name of *Pornodidascalus*, were published in 1534. The description in the *Praise of Women* of the way in which brides strive to appear virgin on their wedding night—

...καὶ παρθένες γὰ φανοῦσι,
βάνουν, κλείουν, καὶ ματώνουν

.

τότε λέγει ὅτι «Πονεῖ
πιάσειέ τον, τὸν φονέα
διὰ γὰ λάβω πομονήν»

.

κ' ὕστερα, σὰν τῆς τὸ κάμη

.

λέγει του ὅτι «Σφαξές με
καὶ αἱματοκύλισές με».

665 · 680

is a rather less artistic version of the story of Nanna, who appealed to her husband

«...non senza pianto. «Io non voglio far le
tristitie; lasciatemi stare» . . . che i gridi fecero
correre su le fenestre i vicini . . .»

Many other resemblances may be found in the story²².

Again, Nanna's account of the priest:

«Madonna, stando in villa, lo vide un di pisciari
disavedutamente sotto la finestra sua...»

22

is of the same inspiration as

κι ὅταν ἐκεῖνοι κατοικοῦσι,
ἐιοῦτες βιγλίζου κ' ἐρωτοῦσι
μέσα ἀπὸ τὰ παρεθύρια...κ.λ.π.

610 · 612

where the *ζαφείρια* of the Cretan text corresponds with the *carbanchio* of the Italian.

Finally it may be noted that the threefold division of the *Praise* is the fourfold division of the *Ragionamenti*, with the omission (which may perhaps be seen as typical of Cretan tastes) of the Nuns:

«Non ci son de le Suore, de le Maritate, de le Vedove,
e de le Puttane buone?»

84

²²) *Ibid.* pp. 12 · 14 (Rag. 1, part 2).

These similarities with Corbaccio and Pornodidascalus in the one case cannot show, and in the other are not intended to show, that there is a direct connexion between the Cretan work and either. They do indicate, however, that the *Praise of Women* is part of the Italian antifeminist literature of the day; and that if it originally had a direct source, it is very likely to have been a popular work of the fifteenth century. It is likely again that if such a source were found it would be manuscript, or in a very rare early printed book.

When we attempt to investigate the sources of Sachlikis's poems we are forced to abandon the comparative simplicity of treatment that has been possible for comparatively simple poems like the *Register of Noble Women* and the *Praise of Women*. Now we are faced with much more complicated works by a much more complicated man. In Sachlikis the process of poetic digestion is more complete. It is impossible to find raw lumps of earlier works, of the sort served up to us by the misogynist poet of the *Register*. Nevertheless, traces of imitation can sometimes be seen; and from these, and even from general similarities of theme, we can get a result which, if not so roundly satisfying, is of more real value. From them we can see Sachlikis more easily in his age: know why De la Broue saw fit to take his works to France, and why Martin Crusius knew of his work and took an interest in it⁸³.

At the outset we are faced one major difficulty, that the works of Dellaporta are not yet edited⁸⁴. There are striking similarities in the details of the lives of the two men, so striking that they seem in some cases to go beyond coincidence. Della-

⁸³) In 1581 Stamatios Donatos, a learned Cypriot, explained the meaning of various words asked him by Martin Crusius. Among them is the significant group *γιβένιζαν, κοῦρβα, πολιτική, πόρνη, μανλίστρια, μπουπούνι*, etc., all from Sachlikis. See M. Crusius, *Turcograecia* Basle 1584 pp. 208 - 9.

⁸⁴) All the following details and quotations are taken from the announcement of Dellaporta's discovery, made by Professor Manousakas to the Athenian Academy. Μ. Μανούσας, *Περὶ ἀγνώστου Κρητὸς ποιητοῦ πρὸ τῆς ἀλώσεως ὁ Λεονάρδος Ντελλαπόρτιας καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ*, *Πρακτικὸ Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν* 29 (1952) pp. 32 - 44) Much of the information is repeated in «Τὸ Βῆμα» of 17 January 1954, and twelve lines of Dellaporta's verse are printed in Σ. Ἀλεξίου, *Κρητικὴ ἀνθολογία* Hera. cleion 1954, p. 23.

porta, when he was a young man in Candia in 1364, was thrown into prison for a month; though in his case the offence was that he had spoken insulting words against the state. But after redeeming his honour in the service of Venice, he gained the office, around 1385, of advocate at the ducal court. He seems, admittedly, to have had more success than Sachlikis, and to have distinguished himself as a diplomat; but his good fortune was not to last. In the early years of the fifteenth century, Dellaporta was cast again into prison, and this time for a longer spell, for, like his brother-advocate three-quarters of a century later, he was able to say

*οἱ τεθλιμμένοι σίχοι μου, τοὺς ἔγραψα μὲ λύπην,
μὲ συμφορὰν ἀβάστακτον καὶ πόνους ἀμειψήτους,
μέσα εἰς τὴν μαύρην φυλακὴν καὶ τὴν οκοιεινισμένην* 3 · 5

And when his friends came to see him, they asked

*«Καλέ, καὶ πῶς σοῦ ἐγένετον καὶ πόθεν σοῦ ἐσυνέβη
νὰ συγκλιθῆς εἰς ἔρωταν μιᾶς πενιχοῦς γυναίκας
καὶ νὰ σ' εἰλκύσῃ ὁ πόθος της, νὰ σὲ καταποντίσῃ;»* 1178 - 1180

In short, some woman had fathered a child upon him, and most of his Dialogue (with the figure of Truth) is an elaborate attempt to show how unjustly he has been treated, and how evil is the race of Woman. His editor's words ring strangely familiar...

«In answer to his dilemmas, Truth recounts various histories of personages from Scripture, the Ancient World, and even of Contemporary date».

Though, apparently, Dellaporta quotes extensively from Byzantine authors, he is in the direct stream of Western mediaeval tradition.

From this bare account we can see the great likeness between Dellaporta and Sachlikis; and we are told, tantalizingly, that it is very probable that Sachlikis knew Dellaporta's work and to a certain degree imitated it. It is clear that it will not be possible to make an exhaustive study of, at least, the autobiographical part of Sachlikis's work before his predecessor's poetry is published.

The commonest of Byzantine moralising poems was the work known currently as *Spaneas*. It exists in more versions even than *Acritas*, and the variety of its forms attests to its po-

pularity. Sachlikis, and probably every other literate Greek of the fifteenth century, would certainly have read it in some shape or another⁸⁵. Yet there is no marked resemblance between his work and *Spaneas* on the only major theme where they coincide, on «friendship». The Byzantine poem is strictly a matter of injunctions, the Cretan approaches satire. But it is presumably from *Spaneas* that the whole convention comes of a nouthetic poem addressed to the son of some great man. Whereas it used to be a prince, or a nobleman's son, now it is

...μεγάλου ἀνθρώπου υἱός, ἀκριβοαναθροεμένος

Another convention adopted by Sachlikis is found only in the most popular version of *Spaneas*⁸⁶ (which may well have come from Crete). There the advice takes the form of a letter to a young man who is away

Ὡς γέος ἐπλανήθηκεν, ἄφηκεν τοὺς γονεῖς, του,
σιὰ ξένα ἐδιάβηκεν, τὴν ξενιτειὰν ἐπῆρε

.....
πιτιάκια τὸν ἔγραψεν, κ' ἔπεβε τον εἰς τὰ ξένα I

This is the same idea as the beginning of the *Advice to Franciscin*:

Πολλὰ ἐκόπιασ' εὐκαιροα πολλὰς φορὰς γιὰ σέναν
γὰ σὲ διατάξω, Φραιζησκή, γὰ λείπησ' ἀρ' τὰ ξένα I 1 - 2

The idea of a letter is maintained in both works:

Καὶ σέναν πάλιν διαταγὴν καὶ παιδευσιν γὰ γράψω I 31
...τὰ σὲ ἔγραψα ἔχε τα εἰς τὸν τοῦ σου,
καὶ τοῦτα πάλι γράψω σε, υἱὲ ἀγαπημένε 7

From the Ptochoprodromic tradition Sachlikis inherits some of the mechanics of his poems. The transition from one section to the next is identical in both. In *Prodromos*⁸⁷

Ἦκουσας, πάντα ἤκουσας, τὴν ἔξοδον τοῦ οἴκου II 62
in Sachlikis

Ἦκούσατε τῆς φυλακῆς τοὺς πόνους καὶ τὰς θλίψεις II 341

⁸⁵) The Oxford manuscript belongs to a group of six, parts of which seem to have been perhaps a school exercise.

⁸⁶) The Oxford version I quote from the manuscript (Bodl. Misc. Gr. 284) because I have been unable to find the edition of it made by F. Hanna in *Jahresbericht über das Akad. Gymnasium in Wien*, 1896.

⁸⁷) Citations from D. C. Hesselring - H. Pernot *Poèmes prodromiques en grec vulgaire*, Amsterdam 1910.

The resemblance serves to emphasize a more radical similarity. We have seen that the divisions of *Advice to France-scin*, (and the fact that *Friendship*, *Prison*, and *My Warder*, though combined into a roughly continuous text are really separate poems), are due to the requirements of performance. Exactly the same phenomenon occurs in *Prodromos*. It is especially noticeable in Poem IV, where it has even forced the editor to put a line of division, so irreconcilable are the passages; in Poem III there is a clear division at line 116. We may imagine too that if Sachlikis had held the public interest for a century or so his text would have looked very much like our manuscripts of *Prodromos*. Certainly the interpolated ending to the *Advice* in the Montpellier MS, and its occasional groups of inserted lines, show the beginnings of the individual variation which has led, in *Prodromos*, to the chaos of Poem II.

Other Prodromic characteristics can be seen in Sachlikis; they will be mentioned later. But the superficial resemblance between the Byzantine poet's description of his gourmandising superiors and the picture of the jailers of Candia does not last more than one reading. It is as if the same cadences, the same rhythms of complaint, have come down through the centuries, changing so little that they obscure the real gulf between the poets: Sachlikis is always superior to his circumstance; Ptocho-prodromos is a beggarpoet amusing and facile, often more dangerous, never noble. If we are to find the roots of Sachlikis's nouthetic poetry it is in the thought of a later epoch, which (perhaps for historical reasons) is not represented in Byzantine literature.

For dice - playing there are two loci classici in Italian literature. The famous simile that opens Book VI of the *Purgatorio* has left no trace in Sachlikis. But Petrarch's *De remediis utriusque fortunae*, (which was translated into Italian as early as 1427, with the title *De' rimedii dell'una e dell'altra fortuna*)⁸⁸, contains a chapter «Del giuoco de' dadi prospero», on which it seems clear that the Cretan poet has drawn. Petrarch talks of the bestiality that seizes gamblers when they are at play—

⁸⁸) F. Petrarca, *De' rimedii dell'una e dell'altra fortuna*, volgarizzati... Bologna 1867.

...e le faccie degli uomini sono possedute da iracundia e da tristizia, e incrudelite per grida confuse; e già non paiono faccie d' uomo. Dove, non è convenevolezza di costumi, non modestia di parole, non amore verso gli uomini, non reverenzia verso Idio; ma sono ivi contese e rancori et inganni e spergiuri e rapine; alla fine, alcuna volte fedite e omecidii e biastemmie del nome di Dio...

p. 143 (I. 27)

Compare Sachlikis—

Ὁ ζαριστῆς ὁρέγεται πάντα νὰ ζηγανεύγη,
καὶ ἀδικιὰν ψιλοκοπᾷ πάντα νὰ μηχανεύγη.
ὁ ζαριστῆς ἀγανακτᾷ, θυμώνεται, μανίζει,
τὴν πίστιν τοῦ καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ὑβρίζει·
ὁ ζαριστῆς οὐδὲν ψηφᾷ, ἂν ἔν κὶ ὁμώση ψόμαν,
ὁμνεῖ καὶ παντ' ἀφιορκᾷ τὸ δολερόν τοῦ σιόμαν

I 126 - 131

There are other passages, for instance on the evanescence of gambling profits, which show resemblances. Finally, Petrarch ends the chapter

«Imperò, quale cosa è più mirabile che quello, che per proverbio, s' è detto per tutti, ma per continua esperienza si comprende meglio? civè: che tutti i maestri di questo giuoco sono nudi, poveri e mendichi».

The cretan poet expresses this in one couplet, and then expands the ideas of «nudi, poveri, e mendichi», though in this case it is not the gambler, but his children, who are forced to beg—

Θέλεις νὰ δῆς στὸν ζαριστὴν ἓνα καλὸν σημάδι;
Ὅπό 'ναι πλέα μάστορας, ἔναι καὶ πλέα ρημάδι.
.
ἔτότες γίνεται πτωχός, τέλεια ἔρημάδι.
Ὅ μάστορας ὁ ζαριστῆς...
.
τὲς ἔσοδιές καὶ πραγματειές ὅσες κὶ ἂν ἔχει τρωῶτες,
καὶ τὰ παιδιὰ τοῦ πιάνουσιν τῶν Χριστιανῶν τὲς πόριτες.

I 168 - 175

In his chapter «Dell' abbondanza degli amici», Petrarch writes

«...l' abbondanza degli amici viene coll' abbondanza dell' altre cose...così, partendosi la fortuna da te, si mostrano quali erano i tuoi amici, e quali della fortuna... l' avversità caccia via l' amico simulato e fitto».

(I 50)

This might serve as a *précis* of much of Sachlikis's poem on Friendship.

τινὲς καὶ ἐπλουτήνασιν κ' εἶχαν μεγάλους φίλους
 κ' ὕστερον ἐπιωχάνασιν κ' ἐχάσασιν τοὺς φίλους II 105 - 106
 ἢ φυλακῇ τοὺς φίλους δὲ δείχνει ὡς τὸ ποιάμιν,
 καὶ ὡς τὴν πέτραν τοῦ χρυσαφιοῦ ἐκείνη τοὺς χωρίζει II 184 - 185

and

ὅτι τοὺς φίλους τοὺς καλοὺς ἢ φυλακῇ τοὺς δείχνει II 263

It may be recorded that Latin incunabula of the *Rimedi* appeared in 1471, 1474, and 1492. (The Italian first edition came out in 1549)³⁹. But it would be a fallacy in this case to use 1471 as a *terminus post quem* for Sachlikis. After Dante, there were probably more manuscripts in existence of Petrarch than of any other Italian writer.

It is highly likely that Sachlikis knew the outstanding example in Byzantine poetry of a prison - poem, «Verses of the Grammaticos Michael Glykas», which he wrote when he was imprisoned at the instance of a malicious enemy⁴⁰. This poem was written in 1156, and might be better known than it is, on two counts. Firstly, for evidence that it gives of the influence of the Ptochoprodromic poems, to which it is very close; secondly, for the use it makes of folk - motifs. Short of actual existence in a manuscript there can be no better proof of the antiquity of a folk - song than one which we find in Glykas's *Imprisonment*⁴¹.

No direct references to Glykas's poem may be found in Sachlikis, but there is a general similarity in the sequence of ideas which may be the result of more than the similarity of theme. Both poems start with a condemnation of the vanities of the world and their deception, both go on to the horrors of prison, and both pass from generalities to the particular iniquity of gaolers; so that Glykas says that the worst imprecation he knows is to wish someone —

εἰς χέρσια ἐγκρούσης στοματᾶ, μωροῦ καπικλαοίου 249

which may be compared with Sachlikis's failure, after running the gamut of wolves, crows, mad dogs, and Cynocephali, to

³⁹) Ibid. vol. 1, pp. 41 ff.

⁴⁰) BGV 1, pp. 18 - 37, and xiv - xx.

⁴¹) See above, chapter 1.

find anything bad enough to compare with - gaolers.

The poem *Battle of the Whores*, as it now stands in only one manuscript, is a fragment which has been tacked on to the larger *Assembly*. But it may be a fragment simply because it has in transmission lost its beginning and end, or because it was conceived as a fragment, as a short *jeu d'esprit*, an example of parody. Parody it certainly is; the whores, now divided in two parties, ride chargers and grasp lances, charge and countercharge.

The greatest parody in Renaissance Greek was Demetrius Zeno's translation of the *Battle of Frogs and Mice*⁴². In some ways it can be said that it is one of the best translations of all time; for as the Homeric poem perfectly exposed the latest ridiculousness of the early Greek epic, so Zeno's poem perfectly exposes the rather less latent ridiculousness of late Byzantine romance. There is a distinct resemblance between some parts of the two battles, and the way in which the champions are introduced. In *Sachlikis*

Ἦλθε κ' ἡ Τζαβούλαινα μὲ τὸ φαρὶν τὸ μαῦρο,
καὶ πιλαλεῖ μετὰ θυμοῦ σὰν θυμωμένον ταῦρον. II 696 - 697
Καὶ ἡ Μανοῦλα ἔφθασε τοῦ Νίκολο Ἀμπράμω,
μὲ βισταμένα ἔφθασε ἀπὸ τὸν ἄμμον ἄμμον. II 700 - 701

In Zeno

Ὁ Ψωμοφάγας ἔφθασε μὲ τ' ἄγριόν του ἦθος
κ' ἐμπῆκε χωρὶς τήρηση σιῶν βορθακῶν τὸ πλῆθος. 175
Ὁ Κραμβοβάτης ἔφθασε, τινὰς δὲν τὸν υποδίζει,
παίρνει πηλὸν ἀπὸ τὴν γῆν, τὸν γρόθον του γεμίζει. 197

But it is unlikely, on chronological grounds, that *Sachlikis* had the *Battle of Frogs and Mice* in mind. Demetrius Zeno was working as a typographer at Venice from 1524 to 1543⁴³; so that unless he lived very long, and his poem was written when he was very young, it would have been after the likely date of the *Battle of the Whores*.

Another Cretan parody may be mentioned here, not because

⁴²) M. Crusius, *Turcograecia* pp. 372 - 382. For the same subject in Western Europe see P. Lehmann, *Die Parodie im Mittelalter* Munich 1922, p. 41... «It can be said that the animal-fables of the Middle Ages are parodies of the romances of chivalry and adventure».

⁴³) F. Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellénique... XVe et XVIe Siècles* Paris 1885 etc. Vol. 1, pp. 180 etc. (see index).

it has any immediate reference to Sachlikis, but because it shows the existence of the genre towards the close of the fifteenth century. In 1909 was published from a Mount Athos codex a poem of 139 lines⁴⁴, whose language and the state of its rhymes suggest the period of Picatoros and the Register of Noble Women. It was published as a riddle, or a series of riddles; other scholars suggested it was a nonsense - rhyme, and compared prose nonsense - tales of today⁴⁵. The poem is in fact a parody of the genre of mystic poetry, (of which the greatest example is Dante himself), where the poet finds himself in a mysterious landscape, and, after various strange things have happened to him, is given a vision of Heaven or Hell. The Greek example of this style is Bergadis's *Apokopos*. Where Dante meets a greyhound and a leopard, Bergadis hunts a hind that disappears from his sight. The Cretan poem is not an immediate parody of *Apokopos*. Indeed it almost certainly precedes it. Nevertheless, coincidences in the two works are striking enough to show at least that the nonsense - poem is alluding to something very similar to the opening of Bergadis's work.

Bergadis is fully armed

κ' εἶχα σιὴν ζῶσιν μου σπαθίν, σιὸ χέριν μου κοντάριν 7

The oaf's equipment is rather more eccentric

*ἔβαλα εἰς τὸν νῶμόν μου τὸ ξύλινο δισάκκιν,
ἐπῆρα κ' εἰς τὸ χέριν μου τὸ τρίχινο ραβδάκιν* 53 - 54

The poet is riding across a

. . . λιβάδιν ὠραιομέριον 5

The oaf

*Κάμπον ἐπεριπάτουνα πολλὰ πλατὺν καὶ μέγα
καὶ μέσα ἔγεμε νερὰ . . .* 55 - 56

They both come to a tree: which in Bergadis's poem shakes under the attack of two mice; and in the other scatters dust in all directions because it contains a whole threshingfloor, complete with thresher. They both come to a well—

...εἰς φροῦδιν ἐγκροεμοῦ κ' εἰς σκοτεινὸν πηγάδιν 56

Ἄκομη δὲν ἐγύρισα, θωρῶ ξεροπηγάδιν. 65

⁴⁴) Α. Παπαδόπουλος - Κεραμεύς, Δημῶδες βυζαντινὸν ἄσμα αἰνιγματῶδες ἐκτιθεμένον διηγηματικῶς παραβολήν τινα. (Λαογραφία 1 (1909) pp 567 - 573).

⁴⁵) Κουκουλες and Κυριακίδης, in Λαογραφία 2 (1910) pp. 195 - 198.

And in the end Bergadis descends to Hell, where the guards ask him

«πόθεν καὶ ἀπὸ ποῦ; τίς εἶσαι; τί γυρεύεις;» 77

The oaf climbs a beanstalk (or to be more precise, a gigantic marrow plant) to the gates of Heaven, where he is asked

«Τίς εἶσαι; πόθεν ἔφθασες; τί θέλεις; τί γυρεύεις;» 138

and here the poem breaks off.

To return to the Battle of the Whores: it is in my opinion a parody of part of Theseus and the Marriage of Emilia, itself a translation of Boccaccio's *Teseide*⁴⁶. There is nothing to indicate whether the original or the Greek translation is referred to. The only edition of the Greek work came out in 1529⁴⁷, but this shows a form very different from that of the Paris manuscript, which is probably earlier. The Italian editions start from 1475⁴⁸, but in this case we have very good evidence that the translation was not made from a printed book; for no edition known to us has a group of six obviously genuine stanzas that the Greek has translated⁴⁹.

The Battle satirizes the great contest in Book VIII of the *Teseide* between the supporters of Palemon and of Arcitas, the rivals for the hand of Emilia. Arcitas's party prevails, but in the hour of triumph his horse throws him and he is badly hurt. Theseus, as master of the tournament, comes to him

Τότες τὸν ἐξαομάτωσαν ἐκεῖ κατὰ τῆς ὥρας
καὶ τὸ χλωμόν του πρόσωπον ποῦτιον ἀλλοχοριασμένο
σιγὰ τὸ ἐκατάβρεξαν μὲ δροσερόν γαρ ὕδωρ.

.
καὶ τότε ὤρισε Θησεύς, ὅλοι νὰ συναχθοῦσι
αὐτοὶ πὺν ἐπολέμισαν, καὶ τότε πάλι δρίζει
τοὺς ἄλλους πὺν ἐβροίσκονταν καὶ οὐκ ἐπολεμοῦσαν
χωρὶς ν' ἀογήσουν τίποτες οἱ πάντες νὰ μισέψουν.

.
Ὦρισε καὶ συνάχθησαν πολλοὶ γιαιτροὶ σιὸν τόπον,
καὶ κεῖνοι τὸν ἐπλύνασιν . . .

IX 13, 22, 23

⁴⁶) Treated in chapter 5

⁴⁷) E. Legrand, *Bibliographie...* vol 1, pp. 206 - 7.

⁴⁸) F. Zambrini, *Le opere volgare a stampa dei secoli XIII e XIV* Bologna 1878, col. 173.

⁴⁹) J. Schmitt, *La Théséide de Boccace et la Théséide grecque* (*Bibliothèque de l' école des hautes études* 92 (1892) pp. 279 - 345) pp. 321 - 322, 340 - 341.

In the Battle, Arcitas is played by the wife of Antonis Gou-naris; she is thrown

ἐγκρέμισέν την τ' ἄλογον καὶ λακτοπάτησέν την II 707

Mistress of the tournament is, of course, Koutayiotena,

πεζεύει Κουταγιώταινα κ' ἐξερομάτωσέν την,

φέρουν νερόν, δροσίζουν την, ὄλην καὶ βρέχουσίν την.

Ὅριζει Κουταγιώταινα τὰ στρέφουν εἰς τὴν Χώραν,

οἱ λαβωμένες οἱ ἴλενές τὰ γιαιτρευτοῦν στήν ὥραν,

κ' οἱ ἄλλες τὰ ψικεύσουσι τὴν κερὰν τὴν προῶραν II 708 - 712

Here the poem breaks off. We may divine the end from the fact that Arcitas makes his triumphal progress through Athens on a *carro*, no doubt a close relative of that cart at whose tail the whores of Candia were whipped around the town; and which Sachlikis wished to see used for Koutayiotena herself⁵⁰—

...τὰ δῶ τὴν Κουταγιώταινα σιῆς Βλάσταινας τὸ κάροσ,

καὶ τὰ τὴν δέρονη κι ὁ φουτρῆς διὰ τὰ ἴχη μέγα βάρος II 437 - 438

Since the Battle is a parody, it would be natural to expect that the Assembly of the Whores is also a parody. But it has not been possible to find a prototype: and perhaps it may be thought that a poem of this sort, so closely connected with its surroundings, is more likely to have been an independent work. Certainly it seems to stand on its own in Mediaeval and Renaissance Greek, and we cannot point to any real precedents.

The idea of a council of women, which Aristophanes established so firmly in satiric writing, is almost completely absent in Mediaeval literature. There are of course some Provençal courts of love; but they have no connexion with our subject. The one well-known example of a satirical «council of women» is the *Concilium in Monte Romanico*⁵¹, where the

⁵⁰) For this whole business of the *γιβέντισμα* see Φ. Κουκουλές, *Βυζαντινῶν βίος καὶ πολιτισμὸς* vol. 5, appendix, Athens 1952, pp. 6 - 9. It is a common theme, and the ends of both Assembly and Pothotsoustounia recall passages in the Liturgy of the Beardless Man (BGV 2 pp. 28 - 47)—

Ἀκούσατε, ἄνθρωποι, κακοῦ σπανοῦ τὴν διήγησιν. Τὸν σπανὸν τὸν παράσημον καλὸν τὰ τὸν βρίζωμεν ὅλοι αὐτὸν πάντες... 393

Δεῦτε οὖν πάντες, τὴν γενειάδαν του πτύσσις 408

Οἱ Τοῦρκοι τὰ σὲ πάρουν καὶ ψωλέας τὰ σὲ δώσουν, εἰς τὸ ἀμάξιν τὰ σὲ κάτζουν... 567

⁵¹) ed. G. Waitz (*Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum* 7 (1849) pp. 160 - 167).

satire is of a Church Synod. The council opens with a reading from a Father of the Church—

...*Praeceptor Ovidii* *doctoris egregii*
Lectrix tam propicii *fuit evangelii*
Eva de Danubrio *potens in officio*
artis amatoriae *ut affirmant aliae.* 26 · 29

The Concilium does not seem to have left any progeny, but in one thing at least it may be compared with the Assembly: the ladies mentioned in it are real persons.

The same tradition of personal satire is seen in *Les évangiles de Connoilles*⁵². The parody of ecclesiastic writing is of the slightest. The six old women who are the «Évangélistes» have obscene and fanciful names. They produce capitula of «advice to women», «adventures of women» and so on; and at the end of each item is a learned comment by some real woman, presumably of the anonymous author's acquaintance.

In Byzantine literature, *Mazaris*⁵³ gives us certain interesting, but perhaps superficial resemblances to *Sachlikis*. *Mazaris* descends into Hell, and various characters from Byzantine public life, recently dead, come to question him. Each is given a rude, and often unintelligible, reference—

Σὺν τούτῳ ἦκεν ἐκ Γαλαξίου Πόλου καὶ ὁ τὰς αἶγας πρότερον
 Μεγγούζης . . . Καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν ὁ ἐκ ποταμίων
 ῥευμάτων Ἰαπειτὸς ἐκεῖνος Ποτάμιος, ὁ πρὸς ὕβρεις
 ῥήτωρ δεινὸς . . . Σὺν τούτῳ ἦλυθεν ὁ Κλαυδιώτης
 ἐκεῖνος ὁ χοίρων σούπαις⁵⁴ . . . 14

It is not impossible that some memory of this might have been in *Sachlikis*'s mind. Certainly the Italian words of his gaoler's companions,

να τραγωδοῦν λατινικὰ καὶ νὰ μὲ πεσκανιάρουν,
 καὶ τότε λέγουσι κ' εὐε «Βαίνη μπέβρε οὖν τράτιον». II 369-370

ring rather like *Mazaris*;

. . . ὁ ἐκ Λατίνων Βαρθολομαῖος Ντεαλαγάσκος ἐκεῖνος,
 καὶ λατινικῶς μὲ προσαγόρευσας «Μπεβένια μισέ». 15

⁵²) *Les évangiles des Connoilles* (Quenouilles) Lyon 1893 (edition of 66 copies).

⁵³) A. Ellissen, *Analekten der mittel- und neugrichischen Literatur* vol. 4 Leipzig 1860, pp. 187 - 362.

⁵⁴) Σούπαις - sub · pasha ! DC s. 1.

This habit seems quite popular in Greek demotic poetry. We remember Ptochoprodromos's Rumanian

ἠροξάμην κράζειν συνεχῶς τὸ «Δέμνε κυριδαῖτον»
τὸ «Σάμνε» καὶ τὸ «Νιόμυρε» καὶ τὸ «στειροποριέω».

II 251 · 252

But the most striking analogy to the Assembly is found yet again in a work that appeared years after it. The notorious *Tariffa delle puttane di Vinegia* has been attributed in turn to Aretino and Veniero; neither attribution can be correct⁶⁵. It was published not long after 1535; only two copies are known. The piece is in the form of a dialogue between a Stranger and a Venetian Gentleman who advises him on the whores of Venice, describing in turn the talents, and the price, of each. (Our thoughts may turn to Nufrena,

. . . ὁπού ἔναι δία γρόσοο).

The more expensive are naturally given more space; but when we come down to the half scudo range, the list sounds remarkably like Sachlikis;

Molte puttane in piccol passo abbraccio
Valeria, Bernardina, Sigismonda,
Elena Pantalon, degna di laccio,
Malgherita, la Sarda, e quella monda
d' ogni gratia, Vignona, e la Schiavona,
la Greca, la cui polla sempre inonda . . . p. 48

The succession of names, the variation with little phrases of description,

ἡ Ἀγγελίνα ἐπέσωσεν ὁπὸν τὴν ἐζητιοῦσαν,
ἐπέσωσεν κ' ἡ Λαμπριανή, σύρνει καὶ τὴν Πειτοῦσαν,
ἔφτασεν κ' ἡ Σταυράκαινα κ' ἐρῶτιάν τεσ τὸ ποῦ ἔσα,
κ' ἡ Βαρελλοποῦλα τρέχοντα, τ' ἀιζιά της ἐκτυποῦσα II 486 - 489

the use of geographical names — Ἐγριπιώτισσα, Γλαρέντζαινα, Ἀσιουπαλιώτισσα — all these are the same, and show, not only how close Sachlikis was to the writing of his age, but how he may even have been in its forefront.

Pothotsoustounia presents us with a complicated problem. The opening is an Acritic parody.

⁶⁵) La tariffa delle puttane di Vinegia ed. Anon. Paris 1883 (edition of 150 copies). See p. vi.

Προπὲς ἀργὰ σιὸ σπίτιν τῆς, τῆς κούρβας τῆς μαυλίστρας,
πέντε μεγάλες πολιτικὲς ἔμειναν μετ' ἐκείνην.

Παζάριν ἐκρατήσασιν ἓνα ἡμερονύχθι,
καὶ τότε ἀπὲν ἐσχόλασεν ἐκεῖνο τὸ παζάριν,
ἔκατσαν καὶ καυχίσθησαν διὰ τὲς ἀνδραγαθὲς τους·
καὶ μιὰ ἀπ' ἐκεῖνες ἤρχισε νὰ λέγῃ τὰ καλά τῆς·
«Οὐκ ἠῦρηκα πολιτικὴν κάλλιαν παρὰ ἐμένα».

Ἄλλη εἶπεν «Οὐκ ἠῦρηκα μαυλίστριαν νὰ μὲ διάβῃ».

Ἄλλη εἶπε «Πίνω τὸ κρασίον παρ' ἄνδρα ἢ γυναῖκα».

Ἄλλη εἶπε «Πίνω τὸ κρασίον, μαυλίζω καὶ μεθύω»⁵⁶. 814 - 823

In the Escorial *Acritas*, the young *Digenis* goes to seek out the lairs of *Philopappous* and the *Apelates*. The old robber questions him, and then invites him to eat—

«Σύρατε ἀργυρὸν σελλὶν νὰ κάτζη ὁ κύριος Βασίλης».

Τραπέζιν ἤστισαν ὀμπρὸς νὰ φάγουν καὶ νὰ πίνουν,
καὶ καλά ἔφαγαν, καλά ἔπιαν, καὶ ἐκαλοψυχῆσαν.

ἄλλος ἔλεγε «Ἐγὼ ἀπαντῶ πενήντα»,

ἄλλος ἔλεγε «Ἐγὼ ἀπαντῶ ἑβδομηντα».

ἄλλος ἔλεγε «Ἐγὼ ἀπαντῶ διακοσίους». E 678 - 683

Sachlikis, in parodying *Acritas*, was following a path already cut in the *Prodromic* poems: not only in the wellknown lines

᾿Ω τίς ᾿Ακρίτης ἕτερος ἐκεῖ νὰ εὐρέθη τότε,
καὶ τὰς ποδέας του νὰ ἔμψηξε, νὰ ἐπῆρε τὸ ραβδὶν του⁵⁷

III 164 - 165

but also in such things as

καὶ τότε νὰ εἶδες, δέσποτα, πηδήματα νεωτέρου, III 193

and

καὶ ἀποκοιτήση ὡς ἄγουρος καὶ ἐπιλαλήση εἰς μέσην,
καὶ σείση τὸν κοντάριν του, καὶ εἰπῆ τὸ «Ἄλλ σαλέτσι»,
καὶ κατεβῆ, τὸ λέγουσίν τινες, εἰς τὸ πεδίον. III 373 - 375

(where the mysterious words conceal «*Alim allah*», — «*God is*

⁵⁶) «The women of the medieval times appear to have spent much of their time in these estuves (later stews) They met there as a place of amusement, and often clubbed together provisions to make a banquet... The earlier French popular literature introduces us to the scenes that occurred on these occasions, but they are so coarse and disreputable that I will not venture to describe them here». (T. Wright, *Womankind in Western Europe*, London 1869 p. 270).

⁵⁷) This, with other examples, in A. Χατζῆς, *Εὐστάθιος Μακρεμβολίτης καὶ ᾿Ακριτής* (᾿Αθηνᾶ 54 (1950) pp. 134 - 176) pp. 146 - 148.

great»—the warcry of the Saracen raiders).

Perhaps, too, Sachlikis had his tongue in his cheek when he produced the enormous list of «impossibilities» at the beginning of *Advice to Franciscin*⁵⁸. Read seriously they seem grotesquery quite out of place in the poem. Consider them as a skit of the *adynata* of the love-poetry of the time, and they become quite amusing⁵⁹.

But after the Acritic opening, what shall we say of the figure of Pothotsoustounia, the Archwhore? She and Koutayiotena are heroic, gargantuan figures. The adjective is used deliberately, because it is to Rabelais that we automatically look for characters of this sort. But Rabelais wrote well after Sachlikis. Searching back into previous centuries there is only one figure of any stature; and she, the Wife of Bath, is so different from the flamboyance of Pothotsoustounia that we must discard any wild ideas of a connexion.

In Byzantine poetry there is one title, *The Beldam*⁶⁰, that attracts our notice. But this fourteenth-century poem by Manuel Philes is of the wholly critical and vituperative kind, and is of interest only insofar as it shows, with Philes's other poem, *The Rose*, a style familiar in some Late Latin lyrics. Boccaccio's very rare poem *La Ruffianella*⁶¹ has a promising title, and a promising beginning

Venite, pulzelle e belle donne

Quando ne sedici anni era in etate . . .

but it is an account only of a first lechery and not a career.

A historical notice provides one striking note to compare with Sachlikis's

ἀπέσω καὶ ἔξω καὶ παντοῦ κάμνω τὸ κάμουμά μου

828

⁵⁸) But compare an interesting parallel in the *Ballades des contre-vérités* of François Villon, a poet with whom Sachlikis has been compared; in my opinion, very wrongly.

⁵⁹) D. Pétropoulos, *La comparaison dans la chanson populaire grecque* Athens 1954. See pp. 98 - 103 for a study of the *adynata* and an introduction to their bibliography.

⁶⁰) *Ἡ γραῦς ἀσελγῆς* attributed to Manuel Philes, edited in B Thorlacius, *op. cit.* vol. 3, pp 65 - 68.

⁶¹) G. Boccaccio, *La Ruffianella* «Lucca 1559» (actually about 1850, in an edition of 25 copies purporting to be an exact reprint of the original).

A Venetian document of 1438 mentions at Candia

«μιά πολιτικὴ ποὺ κάνει τὸ κάμωμα ἔξω καὶ ἀνοιχτά»⁶².

Finally, here again we are faced with a mystery; for the only work that can be directly connected with the boastings of Pothotsoustounia is a «New Farce» played at Rouen in the year 1515⁶³.

The *sottie*⁶⁴ is a form of dialogue between four or five persons, usually played on a scaffold in the open air at carnival time in fifteenth — and sixteenth — century France. It probably dates from the early fifteenth century, but the examples we have are nearer 1500. Here is the opening of a *Farce nouvelle à cinq personnages c'est assavoir: Troys Brus et deulx Hermites*.

La Vielle Bru commence :

*Je suis nommee la Vieille Bru,
de toutes aultres gouvernante;
tant a Meulenc comment a Mante,
par tout j'ey moulu orge et gru.
J' ey eu l' esperit si agu* 5
*l' ey porte lance sy mennante,
homme ne craignois plain d' argu.
Je suis nommee la Vieille Bru,
de toutes aultres gouvernante;
gouvernee me suys en temps deu;* 10
*j' ey par tout combat alendu,
j' ey este a l' assault entrante
sans poinct demarcher, je me vante
ne doubtant corps grand ne membru.
Je suys nommee la Vieille Bru,* 15
*de toutes aultres gouvernante.
Tant a Meulenc comment a Mante,
j' ey par tout moulu orge et gru.
Je suys nommee la Vieille Bru.
Sa, filles, parles a moy dru,* 20

⁶²) Γ. Ἀραμπατζόγλου, Φωτίειος Βιβλιοθήκη part 2, p. 244. (Part 1 was printed at Constantinople in 1933). I have not been able to consult this work, and quote from Koukoules.

⁶³) E. Picot, *Receuil général de sotties* (Société des Anciens Textes Français) Paris 1902, vol. 3, pp. 79 · 97.

⁶⁴) *Ibid.* vol 1, introduction.

*faictes record de vostre affaire,
quel train voules tenir et faire.
Parles, vous, la plus cognoissante.*

La premyere Bru

*Ma foy, dame la gouvernante,
tant que je soys fille vivante* 25
je tiendray l' estat de brurye.

La Vieille Bru

Et vous?

La IIe. Bru

*Soublx votre seigneurye
de brus porteron le guydon;
mais a vous nous recommandons,
qu' il vous plaise nous gouverner,* 30
*nous instruyre et nous enseigner
la ou bien pour nous puissions estre*

.

La Vieille Bru

*Taisses vous, ma petite fille.
Je ne suys pas sy incensee
que vous ne soyez bien pencee* 65
cheulx l' oste ou je vous logeray

La IIe. Bru

*En tout lieu je vous suyviray
aussi, dame la gouvernante.*

La Vieille Bru

*Je suys assez recongnoissante
pour vous bien loger, par Saint Bon.* 70
*Moy je scay bien ou il faict bon;
j' ey este bru en tout pays,
la ou les brus sont obays.
J' ey este bru gasecongante,
bru bretaonne, bru bretonnante . . .* 75

and so on for twentyfive lines of towns where, as Crete is a small place, we shall not follow her.

In the Cretan poem the resemblance is clear. For the recurring couplet

*Je suis nommee la Vieille Bru
de toutes aultres gouvernante*

we have the exact equivalent

*Ἐγὼ ἔμαι ἢ Ποθοισουσιουνιά, ἐγὼ ἔμαι ἢ ψωλοπόθα,
ἐγὼ ἔμαι ἀπάνω εἰς ὅλες σᾶς, ἐγὼ ἔμαι ἐδὰ κερά σας.* 829 - 830

and

*Ἐγὼ ἔμαι ἢ Ποθοισουσιουνιά, ἐγὼ ἔμαι ἢ ψωλοπόθα,
ἐγὼ ἔμαι πρώτη πολιτική, ἐγὼ ἔμαι ἀρχιμανλίσιτρα.* 852 - 853

For the account of the Old Whore's prowess and recklessness, we have

*καὶ κλέπτω ἐπιδεξιώτερα παρὰ τὲς κοῦρβες ὅλες 831
ἔχω τιμὴ μου εἰς τὸ κακό, χαίρομαι νὰ μανλίζω 872
ἔχω καὶ τέτοιαν χάριαν, ἔχω καὶ τέτοιαν τάξιν 875*

and many other lines. The plot of the French poem, that the two young prostitutes are coming as apprentices to the old woman, is echoed in Sachlikis—

*ἂν θέλετε τὲς τάξεις μου νὰ σᾶς τὲς ἐρμηνεύσω,
ἂν θέλετε νὰ κάμνητε, νὰ μάθητε νὰ ζῆτε . . .* 833 - 834

ἂν θέλετε νὰ μάθητε πῶς ἤμουν μαθημένη . . . 854

The wanderings of the Old Whore as she follows her trade, find their equivalent, on a smaller scale, in Rethymno and Candia.

*Ἐμένα εἰς τὸ Ρέθεμνος ἐγεβεντίσασι με
.
καὶ πάλιν ἐπιδεξεύτηκα, γυρίζω εἰς τὴν Χώραν.* 884 - 887

These, and the whole spirit of the two poems, are much more than coincidence. But, (and I quote the acknowledged authority on the subject), «la sottie est un genre tout français, et qui paraît n'avoir eu que peu d'influence sur les théâtres étrangers⁶⁵». He goes on to mention vague similarities in Holland and England, hardly going beyond the bare name; and specifically to deny any connexion in Italy.

So we have another problem. I suggest that the link between Rouen and Candia lies somewhere in the Feast of Fools for which there is evidence in mediaeval Italy⁶⁶: and that the *Commedia dell'Arte* did not spring to light as fully - armoured as is sometimes assumed. It is a suggestion that is at least very difficult to disprove.

⁶⁵) *Ibid.* vol. 1, pp. iii ff.

⁶⁶) A. d'Ancona, *Origini del teatro Italiano*, Turin 1891, vol. 2, pp. 206 - 207.

CHAPTER 5
THESEUS AND EMILIA

Βιβλιοπώλης

. . . Ὁμήρου τοῦ σοφώτατου Βατραχομυομαχία.

Φιλομάθης

Δὲν κάμνει τοῦτο γιὰτ' ἐμέ, ὅτι μιλεῖ βαθεία.

Βιβλιοπώλης

Μᾶλλον μιλεῖ ἀπλούσιατα, γιὰτὶ ἐμεταγλωττίσθη,

καὶ ἀπὸ στίχον ἔμμετρον τῶρα ἐριμαρίσθη.

Φιλομάθης

Σὲ ρίμα εἶναι; Τὸ λοιπόν, δός μου το, μὴν ἀργήσης . . .

This conversation is from a little dialogue printed at the head of Demetrius Zeno's translation of the *Battle of Frogs and Mice*¹, published at Venice in 1539. Even making allowances for the advertising techniques of the day, we can see that a new personality has entered Greek culture; the man with inclination and money enough to wander into a bookshop and ask what the latest novelties are, and yet not educated enough to read ancient works in the original. The bookbuying habit has arrived.

As far as Greek demotic poetry was concerned, it had arrived very late. By 1485 an Italian of the same interests would have been able to buy *The Art of Palmistry*, *Poggio's Jokes*, *The Triumphs of Virtue*, *The Wonders of Jerusalem*, or any one of hundreds of other popular works for eight or ten soldi² — two or three days' pay for an ordinary soldier. Yet it was not until 1515 that the first book in popular Greek appeared, the *Apocopos* of Bergadis. For his first venture Stefano di Sabio had found a best-seller, which was continually reissued for two hundred years; and with this encouragement he and his colleagues went on printing modern

¹) M. Crusius, *Turcograecia* Basle 1584, p. 372.

²) H. F. Brown, *The Venetian printing - press* London 1891. Appendix VIII is the day - book of a Venetian printer - cum - bookseller from 1484 to 1487.

poetry until, by the end of the century, twenty · two different titles had emerged.

This may not seem a very impressive total, but when the economic difficulties are considered we may think it surprising that it is high as it is. Even in Italian works an edition of a thousand copies was a rarity until well into the sixteenth century. In 1492 a popular edition of the Bible, which may after all be considered a certain long · term seller, was printed in only 930 copies³. The venture of printing books for a much smaller public in a time of constant stress and disturbance must always have been financially hazardous. Even so it is very likely that our lists are far from complete. Of the thirty · nine sixteenth century editions recorded, no extant copies are known of four, several are noted from a single exemplar, and all are rare.

About the mechanics of the book trade in Greek lands it is next to impossible to find any details. The printer's manuscript of a portolan from the first half of the sixteenth century has a publisher's note suggesting that the price of the completed work would be «a few soldi»⁴. We can only guess that there were one or two bookshops in the larger towns, and that perhaps the more popular works formed part of the stock of the pedlars who wandered in the more remote districts. *Errotocritos* is distributed in this way even now⁵.

The economic stringency which afflicted the Greek printers of Venice has left its mark in the extreme conservatism of their products. The printing is mean, proof · reading unknown. The texts follow on, each one copied from the last edition, until each original error is magnified into complete nonsense. A real revision, like the Gradenigo *Errophile*, is quite outside the normal course of events. Even the layout, the number of lines to the page, is often followed exactly from edition to edition. I have before me an edition of Bertoldo printed in Athens about the beginning of this century. It has illustrations identical

³) H. F. Brown, op. cit. p. 26

⁴) A. Delatte, *Les portulans grecs* Liege 1947. See pp. xiii - xiv. The dialect may be Cretan.

⁵) Γ Σεφέρης, *Ἐρωτόκριτος* Athens 1946. For interesting information on Venetian books in Crete as late as 1912, see Λ. Ἀλεξίου, *Ἡ Φυλλάδα τοῦ Γαδάρου* (Κ. Χ. 9 (1955) 81 - 118) pp. 81 - 2; his praise of Venetian typography is confined to that of religious works.

with those of the first Venetian editions. The original woodcuts must have worn out two or three times in the centuries; their descendants are just hacked - out reproductions of the already coarse originals.

More damaging was the publishers' practice of «levelling» their texts. Their potential customers, few as they were, were divided into different dialect - groups. The instinct was to avoid anything that might be not understood in any part of their market, and to level away the local characteristics of any work. Fortunately by far the larger proportion of the market was in the Ionian islands and Crete, whose dialects are very alike, so that not as much damage was caused as might have been expected. In the absence of any standard demotic Greek, the levelling tended towards the use of out of - date forms, but where signs of dialect remain they are almost inevitably Ionian. It is a reflexion of the state of the Greek population of Crete in the sixteenth century that it was considered so much less important than the Greek population of the Heptanese - a precedence exactly opposite to that of the economic value to Venice of the two halves of her dominion. Apart from Bergadis, the notable names of the chap - books are Ionian—Dephanaras, Trivolis, Zeno. In the seventeenth century the situation is entirely reversed. Now it is Cretan works that dominate the Venetian book - trade. Throughout the century there is only one new Ionian name⁹, and the only rivalry to the Cretan poets is from the first minor productions of the Danubian provinces - Michael Voivode and The Murder of Stamcos Dacos. But by this time the publishers are more sure of their status, and no so reluctant to admit non - standard forms. Seventeenthcentury texts are on the whole good linguistic witnesses: from those of the sixteenth century it is next to impossible to obtain any reliable fact.

The same economic necessity is seen in the extent to which publishers played safe. The proportion of best - sellers in the works printed in the sixteenth century would make any modern publisher very envious. Of the twenty - two poems ten only were never reprinted, and among these are some—Spaneas, for example—whose failure after long popularity must have puzzled their sponsors. The other twelve were reprinted frequent-

⁹) Michael Sumakis, translator of *Pastor Fido*.

ly, and by 1800, the date to which detailed records are available, had achieved between them eighty editions. One at least (The King of Scotland), was being reprinted as late as 1848⁷.

The easiest formula for success was to put into rhymed couplets a story which was already known and popular. The avidity with which rhyme was seized upon has already been mentioned, and is illustrated in the quotation at the head of this chapter. It was the fashionable thing. The poet was a little proud of his new achievement, he took pleasure in mentioning it:

. . . καὶ γὰρ τ' ἀναδιβάλλω

τὸ ἄδα γραμμένον πούπειας, κ' εἰς ῥίμα γὰρ τὸ βάλω, AT 27 · 28
and

Τὸ εἶχα δεῖ καὶ μῶτιγεν ἀπλᾶ διαγεγραμμένον,
βούλομαι γὰρ τὸ βάλω γὰρ εἰς τὸ ῥιμαρισμένον⁸. (Imperios)

Of the eight sixteenth-century publications that can roughly be called romances, five—Alexander, Apollonius of Tyre, Belisarius, Imperios, and Susanna,—follow this formula of an old story rhymed anew. One, Jacob Trivolis's *Tagiapiera* (which had a sixth edition in 1782)⁹, had an original theme; and the other two, *The King of Scotland* and *Theseus and Emilia*, were taken from the works of Boccaccio.

The Cretan contribution to this collection consisted of the most successful and the least successful: Apollonius of Tyre was the paragon of the new rhymed romance, *Theseus and Emilia* lay almost entirely outside it. Apollonius had thirteen editions from 1534 to 1805. *Theseus* appeared only once, in 1529, and is known in six copies¹⁰, one of which has

⁷) ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ | ΤΟΥ | ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ | ΤΗΣ | ΣΚΩΤΙΑΣ | ΜΕ ΤΗΝ ΠΙ-
ΓΗΣΑΝ | ΤΗΝ | ΙΓΚΛΗΤΕΡΑΣ. | ΕΝ ΒΕΝΕΤΙΑ | Ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Τυ-
πογραφίας Νικολάου Γλυκῆ 1848 The last popular edition recorded by
Irmischer in his new study of Trivolis is dated 1806. See J. Irmischer,
Ἰάκωβος Τρίβολης, Ποιήματα (Berliner byzantinische Arbeiten 1) Berlin
1956, pp. 5 - 10.

⁸) Quoted in Ἐρωτόκριτος ed. Σ. Ξανθοῦδίδης Introduction, p.
CLXXXIII, where the subject is treated in some detail.

⁹) J. Irmischer, op. cit pp. 1 - 3.

¹⁰) Two in the British Museum, one at Copenhagen, one in Cephalonia, (perhaps destroyed in the 1963 earthquake), and two at Athens.

had all the pictures (and of course the verses on the back of them) cut out.

*Theseus*¹¹ is a close translation of Boccaccio's poem of the same name, in twelve books and over twelve hundred stanzas *ottava rima*. The Greek poet has attempted to imitate this by using an eight-lined stanza of which the last two lines rhyme. The prologue, of 262 lines, and the arguments which are prefixed to each book, are in rhymed couplets.

Apart from the edition, there are two manuscripts. One, now in the Vatican, is a simple copy of the edition. The other, at Paris, contains very considerable differences from the printed text. The relationship between them is obscure. But both contain a rather curious mixture of Heptanesian and Cretan forms, which, combined with an uneven archaism, make the linguistic form of *Theseus* a very strange matter indeed. The Heptanesian forms predominate, especially in the edition.

As always with texts of this period, there is only one way to test the genuineness of dialect-forms. In the general course of the work words of one dialect may be substituted for words of another without leaving a trace. Only in the rhymes can it sometimes be shown which is the original and which the intruder. *Theseus* provides us with 1467 couplets to investigate.

The normal rhyme is a combination of vowel + consonant (consonants or absence of consonant) + vowel (vowel with consonant), which may be symbolized as VCV, a «three-element» rhyme. In *Theseus* there are no less than 353 rhymes which depart from this norm, as shown in the following table, where «*» is a faulty element:

* C V	177
V * V	112
V C *	15
* * V	46
* C *	2
V * *	1

This ignores the final *ν* in accusative singulars, which by abundant evidence is purely artificial: it also ignores the forms of *ἀ-*

¹¹) The bibliography is very small. See J. Schmitt, *La Théséide de Boccace et la Théséide grecque* (Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études 92 (1892) pp. 279 - 345).

μνω, printed for κάνω, and rhymed regularly with ἀποθάνω, καταλαμβάνω, etc.; προᾶγμα for προᾶμα, rhymed frequently with ἀντάμα; βλάπτει for βλάφτει, rhymed with αὔτη; and some other pedantic spellings of the same sort, and two or three obvious misprints.

The rhyme is clearly based (against the stress) on the last vowel, and only eighteen couplets are at fault here. This is so small a proportion compared with the free treatment of the first vowel and the consonant, which fail 225 times and 157 times respectively, that these eighteen cases must be suspect. In them we find the following instances which are corrected by the use of a Cretan form :

σιτέρω — καιτέρων	(Cretan καιτέρω)
στερκιέο — βασιλέων	(Cretan βασιλέω)
ἡμέρα — φέραν	(Cretan φέρα)
παραινίκα — ποϊκαν	(Cretan ποϊκα)
παραινίκα — μπῆκαν	(Cretan μπῆκα)
ξύσου — θελήσουν	(Cretan θελήσου)

The confusion of unaccented «ο» and «ου», which as we have seen, was very easy in Cretan at this time, accounts for

πλέο — Θησέου (twice)
ἀποδιαβάσω — περάσου
ὀπίσω — ποίссουν (Cretan ποίссου)
ἄλλον — ἐβγάλλουν.

Most significant of all these changes is the form of the third person plural of the verb without the final ν. This Cretan characteristic has completely disappeared from the body of the text, and shows only in rhyme. As well as the instances quoted already, where it has been concealed, the correct form is printed in the couplets

τόσα — ἔσηκῶσα,
τόσα — ἀφηρῶσα,
ἀλαζονιά σου — τάσσου,
κουριέσσα — συντροφεῦσα,
ἐμπρός σου — δώσου,
καρδιά μου — κάμου,
ἔργου — λέγου.

Adverbs in ω are found in the rhymes

ἀπάνω — καταλαμβάνω,

ἀποκάτω — ἀρμάτω,

(Cretan genitive plural; this rhyme occurs twice).

ἀπάνω — ἀπεθάνω,

and five other cases. In the text generally the Heptanesian forms in *ου* are more common; but the failure to use the obvious rhymes of *κάτου* and *χάμου* with the frequent possessives in *του* and *μου* seems a very strong argument against Heptanesian origin¹².

In the same way the Cretan form of the present participle without *ς* is preserved twice in rhymes; (elsewhere it is very rare);

ἐσφαζόντα — περνῶντα.

ἐχαιρόντα — μιλῶντα.

Finally may be noted the following miscellaneous instances where a Cretan word improves the rhyme:

ρεότης — ὀμματιῶν της (ὀμματιῶ της)

δικός σου — ὀμματιῶν σου (ὀμματιῶ σου)

φεύγουν — δοξεύουν (δοξεύουν)

δοῦκα — πίκρα (πρίκα)

(The manuscript has *παρανίκα*, which may derive from *πρίκα*)

λέγει — μισσεύει (μισσεύγει)

συντροφιά του — συναπαντεῖ του (συναπανιᾶ του)

λέγει — Θηβαῖοι (Θηβαῖγοι)

πλῆθος — ἄνθος (ἄθος)

φεύγει — λιγοστεύει (λιγοστεύγει)

σμίξουν — καρτερέσουν (καρτεροῦξουν)

διαλέξαν — ἀκλουθῆσαν (ἀκλουθῆξαν)

λέγει — ἀκούει (ἀκούγει)

ἐκάναν — βάλαν (βάναν)

When we consider the laxness of rhyme in *Theseus*, these last examples must be considered as indications rather than proof. But a three - element rhyme is still three times more likely than a rhyme of two elements; and two elements over eight times more common than one. In these circumstances, the accumulation of probabilities comes very near proof, and there

¹²) *Χάμου — πολέμου* occurs in the edition, where the manuscript has *χάμω — πολέμο*. Also in the edition we have the rhyme «*ἀπάνου — ἄνου*».

is an overwhelming case that *Theseus* was written in Crete and suffered in Venice or the Ionian islands a treatment far more heavy and deliberate than usual, but differing only in degree from the treatment of many other Cretan poems.

But it might seem that the very deliberateness of this treatment would make easy the task of deciding the original form of the text; for after all, with *Theseus* we have the immense advantage that it is a close translation; and armed with a copy of *Teseida* and the knowledge that the poem is basically Cretan we should be able to produce a text very close to its first state, especially if we can show that the versions we possess are the products of measured and consistent recension. This is what we cannot show. Consistency is the last virtue that can be attributed to either manuscript or edition. Generally as Schmitt has shown, the manuscript is much closer to the Italian. Yet in some cases it is the edition that preserves Boccaccio's lines:

. . . *tra le donzelle*
a piè con la sua spada furioso
coperto dello scudo . . . I 74
 . . . *μὲ τὸ σπαθί του ἀπεζὸς ὄλος θυμοῦ γεμᾶτος,*
μὲ τὸ σκουτάρι ἐσκέπειον, σιὴν πρόσαν ἔμπαιναν ὄλες (P)
 . . . *μὲ τὸ σπαθί του ἀπεζὸς ὄλος θυμοῦ γεμᾶτος,*
μὲ τὸ σκουτάρι σκέπειον, σιὴ μέση μπῆκε σ' ὄλες. (V)

Generally the manuscript does not have the intrusive and meaningless particle «*γὰρ*» which is so characteristic of much of Byzantine poetry and appears as a frequent line-filler in the edition. Yet both produce the phrase

ἔροηξαν γὰρ τὲς σκάλες τους I 50

which seems to be sheer perversity for

ἐροήξασιν τὲς σκάλες τους,

a verb-form which is found only two stanzas below.

In the treatment of dialect forms the two versions are quite random. On the whole it is the manuscript that keeps more Cretan tendencies:

<i>γη ἀρμυρά</i>	P	<i>ἦ ἀρμυρά</i>	V
<i>ἐπᾶ</i>	P	<i>ἐδῶ</i>	V
<i>τότες</i>	P	<i>τότε</i>	V

But compare

<i>νά 'νιαι</i> ¹⁸	V	<i>νά εἶναι</i>	P
<i>μακρὰ</i>	V	<i>μακρειὰ</i>	P
<i>ἄθῆ</i>	V	<i>ἄνθῆ</i>	P

Still more disturbing is the evidence that both our versions have consciously moved from a demotic original. The most notable is the confusion between *τοὺς* and *της*. There are two instances in the same stanza (I. 90);

<i>τοὺς θεοὺς της παρακαλοῦν</i>	P
<i>θεοὺς τους γαρ παρακαλοῦν</i>	V

and

<i>διὰ ὄφελον τοῦ κάστρου τους</i>	P
<i>γιὰ ὄφελον τοῦ κάστρου της</i>	V

The only reasonable explanation is that both versions are confusing the Cretan pronouns *τοι* and *τοῆ*, and that the lines must read

τοι θεοὺς τοι παρακαλοῦν,
and *γιὰ ὄφελον τοῦ κάστρου τοῆ.*

In this stanza both forms could bear a possible meaning. Sometimes however the confusion is due to carelessness;

Ma poi che l'ira alquanto fu affreddata *Teseida* (I. 22)

<i>Κι ἀφοῦ πολλὰ θυμώθηκε κι ἀπέρασέν τους πάλαι</i>	P
<i>. . . κι ἀπέρασέ της πάλαι</i>	V
(from) <i>κι ἀπέρασέ τοῆ πάλαι.</i>	

As if this were not enough, we have another example showing that the edition, at least, has not confined itself to the transformation of dialect into demotic, but has actually substituted archaic forms for common Greek. A glimpse of this has already been seen in the intrusive *γὰρ* quoted above (I. 90). Now we have

Οὐ τράπεζαν ἀκαριτερεῖς μηδὲ φωτιὰ 'ξεμένα V I. 60

where the manuscript's mistake

μὲ τράπεζαν ἀκαριτερεῖς,

shows that the original was the common and obvious

μὴ τράπεζαν ἀκαριτερεῖς.

This naturally invalidates all chronological tests based on the series *οὐ(κ) — οὐδὲν — δέν*. Indeed, the proved random variation

¹⁸) Cretan form used only with *νά* Cf. *The Rebel*

. . . *νά 'νιαι δίχως μανάδες*

of forms in our two versions invalidates completely all such linguistic tests not supported by rhyme, (as we have seen), or—and this is rarely possible—by metre. The only metrically - supported linguistic test must be one in which the change of form involves a difference in the number of syllables. The one test that fulfils this requirement and at the same time provides enough material to be significant involves the ratio between occurrences of a disyllabic *διὰ* and monosyllabic *διά, γιά*. On this test *Theseus* is placed in the same group with Choumnos's poem (written before 1493)¹⁴, Apollonius of Tyre (1500), *The Mirror of Women*, and *Ass, Wolf, and Fox*. If we accept as a valid test the related figures of the change from *ὡς διὰ* to *ὄγιά* *Theseus* is close only to Choumnos in this group, and shows more affinity to Picatoros, who seems to come slightly earlier. On this linguistic evidence, it seems best to consider the date of *Theseus* as within a decade on either side of 1480.

Our other indications (we can hardly call them evidence) coincide quite well. It has been shown that the text used by the Cretan poet was a manuscript, for it has six stanzas appearing in no edition of the Italian¹⁵. It is likely, therefore, that the translation would not have been made very long after Boccaccio's poem became easily accessible in the printed copies which started from 1475. Again, Sachlikis's *Battle of the Whores*, which as we have seen parodies *Theseus*, cannot be dated very much after 1480: and there is a presumption, if no proof, that the parody was based upon a native, and not an Italian, work.

It is hard to know what hopes of success the publishers of *Theseus* could have had. They were sending out upon their new reading - public a book vastly longer and more expensive than anything they had encountered before; adorned with obviously second - hand illustrations (they are from Lucanis's *Iliad* published three years before); and almost wholly lacking the rhyme which was so important an attraction to the sixteenth - century reader. To cap it all, they were presenting the work in

¹⁴) M. Μανούσας, 'Ο ποιητής Γεώργιος Χοῦμνος, νοτάριος Χάνδακος (ΕΕΒΣ 21 (1951) pp. 280 - 282).

¹⁵) J. Schmitt, op. cit. pp 321 - 322, 340 - 341,

a version that tried to change its popular language into a jargon that must have been acceptable only to the most arrant pedants. From our vantage - point *Theseus* seems destined to have been a financial failure. It was not a complete aesthetic failure, though its faults are egregious and painful.

The outstanding vice of *Theseus* is that it did not make any attempt to assimilate Western and Greek poetic qualities. The other close translation in Cretan poetry, *Zeno*, makes this attempt; and by eliminating, for instance, classical allusions, and introducing echoes of demotic ways of speech, *Zeno* goes a long way towards making a marriage of Simon's macabre tragedy with the Cretan muse¹⁶ *Theseus* fails completely on this count. Every proper name is religiously reproduced, so that «the help of Hymen» at a wedding (*l'aiuto d' Imeneo*) becomes «the help of Minos» (*l'aiuto di Mineo*)¹⁷. There is almost no echo of demotic poetry.

In the verse, too, the failure is extensive; the translator does not make full use of the synizesis for which the Cretan dialect is so apt¹⁸, and which is the greatest natural asset of Cretan verse; and generally there is the strained groping quality of a Byzantine verseform trying to follow the freedom of an Italian poem. Only when *Theseus* abandons the self - contained line of the Greek political and uses the free enjambement of Boccaccio's verse, does the Cretan work rise to felicity, and occasional beauty. The opening stanza of the second book is

*Il sole avea due volte dissolute
le nevi en gli alti poggi, e altrettante
Zeffiro avea le frondi rendute
e i be' fiori alle spogliate piante,
poi che d' Attena s' eran dipartute
le greche navi, Africo spirante,
da cui Teseo co' suoi furon portati
nelli scitichi porti conquistati;*

¹⁶) Φ. Μπουμπουλίδης, *Λαϊκά στοιχεία ἐν τῷ «Ζήνωνι»*, (Κ. Χ. 7 (1953)) pp. 127 - 137.

¹⁷) Presumably another indication that the model was manuscript, not edition.

¹⁸) Apt because of the number of forms ending in a vowel: *ισῆ*, *τοί*, genitive plurals in *-ω* 3rd person plurals in *-ου* and *-α*, *τὸ* as a relative, etc.

The Cretan shows the translation at its greatest strength and its greatest weakness :

*Εἶχεν ὁ ἥλιος δυὸ φορὰς τὰ χιόνια ἴνα λυγώσῃ
ἀπάνω στὰ ψηλὰ βουνά, καὶ ἄλλες τόσες πάλι
ὁ Ζέφυρος τὰ φύλλα του τῶν δένδρων εἶχε δώσει,
καὶ τὰ λουλούδια ἰσομορφα τὴν γῆν καταστολίσαν,
ἀφῶν ἐμίσησεν ὁ Θησεὺς ἐκ τὴν λαμπρὰν Ἀθήνα
μὲ τὰ καράβια τὰ πολλά, καὶ πρὸς τὴν Σύθια διέβη
μὲ τὸν λαόν του τὸν καλόν, καὶ κέρδησε τὸν τόπον
τῶν Ἀμαζόνων γυναικῶν, οὐχὶ μὲ λίγον κόπον.*

The running grace of the beginning is followed by the halting banality of the rhyme.

At its best moments *Theseus* comes near the qualities of the Cypriot translations of Italian lyrics¹⁹. But these qualities were of no account in Cretan poetry for a full century after *Theseus* was written. It is a poem out of its time; yet it is not impossible that its rare moments of success showed later Cretan poets, even Cornaros himself, the capabilities of their language, and helped to produce the courant verse of the seventeenth century.

Cornaros is mentioned deliberately; because whatever our opinions may be about the influence of *Theseus*'s style upon *Errotocritos*, it seems certain that some ideas found in Cornaros's poem are taken from the earlier work. It is significant that these resemblances are nearly all found in the parts of *Errotocritos* which diverge most from *Paris e Viena*, the tournament and the battle before Athens.

The central episode of *Theseus* is the great tourney where the princes of Greece array themselves alongside Arcitas and Palamon in their contest for the hand of Emilia. The sixth book is devoted entirely to the arrival of these princes and a description of the appearance and pomp of each. This seems the inspiration of the similar description in the second book of *Errotocritos*. In *Theseus* the treatment is more varied; some of the warriors are dismissed in a single stanza or less, while the more important characters are given five or six. Cornaros's account is more even, for his contestants are few enough for all

¹⁹) Th. Siapkarakas - Pitsillidès, *Le pétrarquisme en Chypre: poèmes d' amour en dialecte chypriote* Athens 1952.

to be treated individually, whereas Boccaccio's are only fodder for a confused Homeric battle. But the comparison of the Aphentopuli with the more famous of Theseus's guests shows a striking similarity.

The headings which appear only in this part of *Erōtocrītos*—«*Ἀφεντιόπουλος τῆς Μυτιλήνης*», «*Καραμανίτης*» and so on—are a regular feature throughout *Theseus*—e. g. «*Ἦλθεν ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων, καὶ ὁ Μενέλαος καὶ Πόλος καὶ ὁ Νέστωρ*». After each title the hero is named with his place of origin, his arms and his horse are described, and some account is given of his escort and the effect they make upon the onlookers. Often this is followed by some anecdote from his history: this is the part developed by Cornaros into the stories of desperate love represented on the princes' helms.

As an example of *Theseus*'s method, we may take the description of Nestor, in some ways the most magnificent of the contestants:

*Ἀπὲ τὴν Πύλον ἔφθασεν ὁ Νέστωρ τοῦ Νελέου.
Ἄκόμα νιὸς εὐρίσκειον, καὶ τρυφερῆς ἱλικίας.
Τὰ κόκκινά του μάγουλα ἐγέμασιν τὸ ἄνθος
τὸ πρῶτον πὺν τὸν ἔπαινε, ὀλίγο ἴτον σπαρμένο
τριγὰς σγουρὰς καὶ νόστιμας, τὸ χρῶμα χρυσαφίου,
τὰ ποῖα ἐπολυπλάσιαζαν τὴν ἐμορφιὰ τοῦ νέου.
Μὲ τέτοιαν τάξην ὁ κύρης του τὸν εἶχε στολισμένο
οἱ στολὴ οὐκ εὐρίσκειον νὰ μοιάζῃ μετ' ἐκεῖνον.*

*Ἡ φύση σ' πᾶσαν ἐμορφιὰν τὸν εἶχε στολισμένον,
ὅσο νὰ ἔναι δυνατὸν νὰ πεθυμᾷ κοράσιο.
Εὐγενικὸς ἦτον πολλὰ ἐξ αἵμα βασιλέως,
καὶ τὴν ἀξιά του τὴν πολλὴν νὰ κούρη οὐκ ἠμπόρει,
οὐδὲ τὴν τολμηρὴν καρδιά, τὴν δόξαν ἣνπερ εἶχεν
ἐκεῖσε νὰ δοκιμασθῇ, νὰ δείξῃ τὴν ἀνδρειάν του.
Ἡ Τύχη π' ὄλα τὰ καλὰ πὺν δίδει καὶ βεργεταίει
πολλὰ τοῦ εὐεργέτησε, κι ἄλλα τοῦ μελεταίει.*

*Ἐτοῦτος ὀλοσίδερος ἦτον ἄρματωμένος,
καὶ μετ' ἀσῆμι τ' ἄρματα ὄλο ἴσαν σκεπασμένος.
Μάλιστα τὸ λουρίκι του ἦτον ὄλο χρυσαφί,
καὶ ὄλη του ἡ ἄρματωσιὰ ἔλαμπεν ὡς τὸν ἥλιον.
Ἀπὸ λιθάρι' ἀτίμητα κι ἀπὸ μαργαριτάρι*

ἔγεμαν ὀλοράντισια ὡς ἔπρεπεν καθένα,
καὶ τόσο λάμπαν τ' ἄρματα, ἴτι καθ' ἐκάστην ὥραν
εἰς πᾶσα τόπον σκοτεινὸν ἔφεγγαν ὡς ἡμέραν.

Εἰς φαρὸν μέγα, θαυμασιόν, μαύρης τριχᾶς ὠραῖον,
χωρὶς ἀνάπαυση ποτὲ ἐκ τὸν χλιμιτριισμόν του,
ἐκάθειτον ὁ Νέστορας κουριέσικα στήν σέλλαν.
Ἐβάσια κ' εἰς τὸ χέριν του σίδερον πελατίκι.
Ὡς χυμίζεται φάλκονας ὅταν ξεβῆ κτήν σκούφια,
ἐχυμίζετον ὁ Νέστορας ὄλο χαρὰ γεμᾶτος,
καὶ μὲ πολλοὺς καβαλλαριοὺς ἀπ' ἀπᾶσαν μερία,
— ἔμορφοι καὶ εὐγενικοὶ τῶκαμαν συντροφία.

Μὲ τέτοιαν γὰρ τὴν παρορησιάν, στήν πόλιν τῶν Κυκλόπων
ὀλόχαρος ἐσέβηκεν ὁ Νέστορας μὲ δόξα.

Ὁ καθεὶς ἐθαύμαζεν ἀπὲ τὴν παρορησιάν του,
ὄλοι τὸν ἐπαινούσασι, πολλὴ τιμὴν τοῦ κάμνουν.

Καὶ πάλι αὐτὸς ὡς ἤξευρε καὶ ἦτιον παιδευμένος
τιμητικὰ ἐπροσκύνα τους κ' ἔδειχνε τὴν ἀξίαν του.

Ὅλους εἶμα ἔμορφα, ὄσους κι ἂν ἐβλέπει,
καὶ μὲ τοὺς ἄλλους ὁ Θησεὺς ἐδέχθη τον ὡς πρόπει. I 30 - 34

The closest correspondence to this is the most magnificent of Rotocritos's adversaries, the Prince of Byzantium. Here is his description rearranged in the same order.

τοῦ Ρήγα τοῦ Βυζάντιου ὁ γιὸς ὁ κανακάρης II 368

ἐφάνηκε ὡς ἐπρόβαλεν ἡ ἀφεντεία τὴν ἔχει,
καθέννας τὸν ἐγνώρισε κι ἄς μὴν τότε κατέχη
πῶς εἶν' Ἀφέντης Βασιλιὸς ψηλοῦ δέντρου κλωνάρι 403 - 405

Ἦτιονε δράκος στήν καρδιά, στή δύναμι λιοντάρι,
ποτὲ δὲν ἐφοβήθηκε πεζὸ γη καβαλλάρι,
ἐφόρειε κάποια φορεσιά, π' ὄσοι κι ἂν τὴ θεωροῦσι,
εἶντά 'ναι, πῶς νὰ γίνηκε, δὲν ξέρουνσι νὰ ποῦσι!
Ἦλαμπε τόσο, κ' ἦσιτραφιε, πὸν κάθε φῶς θαμπώνει,
κι ἡ λαμπιράδα τζ' ἡ πολλὴ τὴν ὀμορφιά τζι χώνει
γιατὶ δὲν ἦτο μπορετὸ κιανεὶς νὰ τοῦ σιμῶση,
καὶ βγῆ ἡ ἀχτίνα τῶ ρουχῶ νὰ μὴν τότε θαμπῶση. 413 - 420

τ' ἄλογο π' ὁ Ρηγόπουλλος ἦτιονε καβαλλάρις 390 - 391
εἶχε μεγάλη δύναμη, ἦτο μεγάλης χάρης

εἰζίνα κι ἀγριεύουντον κι ὡς θεριὸ μουγκορίζει 394

ἔτιοῦτα ὄλα τᾶκανεν ᾿Αφέντης πὸν τ᾿ ὀρίζει, κι ὀποῦ τὴν γνώμη του γροικᾶ, τοὶ πράξες του γνωρίζει	397	398
μὲ καβαλλάρους εἴκοσι κ᾿ εἴκοσι πεζολάτες		369
κ᾿ οἱ καβαλλάρ᾿ ὀπίσω ντεν ὀμορφοστολισμένοι		373
᾿Ολοι τὰ μάτια ντως σ᾿ αὐτὸ στρέφουν καὶ συντηροῦσι		435
ἄδειάσαν ὡς τὸν εἶδασι κ᾿ ἐκάμασιν του τόπο		401
Πάει στοῦ Ρήγα τὸ ζιμιό, μὲ γνώση χαιρετᾶ το, λίγα σαλεύγει τὸ κορμί, λίγα τὸ κλίνει κάτω, ἐπέτειο κ᾿ ἐρέμπειο σιτὴν ἀφεντιὰ τὴν τόση.	407 -	408

But in any catalogue of knights there must be contrast and variety. Immediately before the Prince of Byzantium comes the Caraman, dressed in his lionskin upon his ferocious horse that does not neigh, but bellows: immediately before Nestor comes Cromis, upon his monster that later is to end the battle by mauling Palemon in its teeth and causing his capture:

*Εἰσὲ δερμάτι λιονταριοῦ χασδίον ἐντυμένον
ἤλθεν ὁ Κρωμῖς Θηρίκεος, ἔμορφο στολισμένος.
᾿Αλλοιτες τὸν πατέρα του εἶδαν πὸν τὸ ἐβάστα,
ἀπὲ τὸν ὀποῖον ἔλαβε τὸν θάνατον ὁ λέων.
Μὲ πελατίκι φελλωτὸν ἔμορφο καὶ μεγάλο
καὶ ἄρματα πολλὰ ᾿μορφα ἦτιον ἀρματωμένος.
Εἰσὲ φαρὶν τὸ λέγασι Στρουμῶνε τοῦ Διομήδη,
πὸν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἔτρωγε ὡσπερ νὰ ἦτιον φίδι.*

*ἔιζει γαρ τὸ κεφάλιν του ἔπαιρνε δῶ καὶ κεῖθεν
ὡσπερ τὸ κάμνει μὲ χολὴ ὄνταν κεντοῦσι ταῦρον,
καὶ δίχως νὰ ᾿χη ἀνάπαυση καθ᾿ ὥρα χλιμιτρῶντα
ὑπάγαινε μὲ μιὰν φωνὴν πὸν ξύσπαζέν τους πάντας.
᾿Αλλοιτες ἐφαινέτο σου ὁ βαβισμὸς τῶν σκύλων,
ὄντα βαβίζουν σιτὸ νησι τῆς ᾿Ιλας εἰς τὰ σπήλια,
ὄντα φυσήσ᾿ ὁ ἄνεμος κ᾿ ἡ θάλασσα φουσκώνει
καὶ δέρνει καὶ τὰ κύματα ὄλα περικυκλώνει.*

I 27 - 28

In both works the third member of this sequence is a rough and ugly lord of the North, wearing crude and heavy arms; in *Ερωτοκριτος* it is the Albanian²⁰ lord of Patras, in *Theseus*

²⁰) I owe this suggestion to Mr. Hutchinson, who has now published an article pointing the connexion with the Albanian occupation of Pa-

it is Evander, King of Thessaly. Both are alone among their comrades in having rusty arms.

The parallelism of these trios of villain, paragon, and rude mountaineer, makes it certain that Theseus is the source of this part of Erotocritos. Apart from this, the main resemblance is in the account of the funeral of Aristos, which is influenced by the earlier description of the funeral of Arcitas.

Arcitas dies of the wound he has received in the tourney. He dies uttering his lady's name,

. . . μόνον τὸ παραλάλημα μὲ καθαρὸν τὸν λόγον
 ἄλλαξε, καὶ μὲ ταπεινὴν φωνίτζα τάδε ἔφη.
 «Ἐχε ὑγεία, Ἐμίλια μου», κι ἄλλο πλεὸ δὲν εἶπεν,
 ὅτ' ἡ ψυχὴ κιτὸ κοῦφός του μὲ δυνασκειὰν ἐβγῆκεν. X 113

just as Erotocritos is supposed to have died in the forest=

τότες μιὰ σιγανὴ φωνὴ μόνο τ' αὐτιά μ' ἀκοῦσα,
 κ' εἰπάσινε τὰ χεῖλη του «Ἐχάσα σε, Ἀρειτοῦσα». 5. 951-2

But a similar passage is found in Orlando Furioso, and it may well be a commonplace of Italian poetry²¹.

In his funeral the resemblance to the last rites of Arcitas is clearer;

. . . καὶ ὤρισε νὰ κάμουσι ἀπέσω σιτὸν δρυμῶνα
 ἓνα κρέββατο ξύλινο, τὸν κάλλιον ὁποῦ νὰ ἦτιον.
 Τότες ἐκίνησαν πολλοὶ μάστοροὶ νὰ τὸ ποίσουν,
 ἐκεῖ ὁ Θησεὺς τοὺς ὤρισε πᾶν προᾶγμα νὰ ἀφήσουν.

Τότε ἐποῖκεν κ' ἤφεραν τὸν κρέββατον τῆς ὥρας,
 βασιλικὸν καὶ ἔμορφον, πολλὰ γουργὰ ὀμπρός του.
 Μὲ χάσδιον ὀλόχρυσον ἐστόλισεν ἐκεῖνον.
 Τὸ ὄμοιον ἀκόμη ἔποικεν ἀπὲ κεῖνο τὸ χάσδιο,
 κ' ἔντυσαν καὶ στολήσασιν τὸ λείψανον τ' Ἀρκίτα,
 καὶ τότες ἀπάνω εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν ἔθεσαν ἐκεῖνον,
 στεφανωμένον ἔμορφον μὲ δάφνη στολισμένον,
 μὲ πλούσιον χρυσογάϊτανον ὄλον περιπλεμένον.

.
 Ἐκεῖσε ἄλογα φαριὰ ὁπού ἴσαν φυλαμμένα

tras. See R. Hutchinson, *The Lord of Patras* (K.X. 10 (1956) pp. 341 - 345).

²¹) E. Κριαρᾶς, *Μελετήματα περὶ τὰς πηγὰς τοῦ Ἐρωτοκρίτου* (TF 27) Athens 1938. See p. 133.

για τὸν Ἄρκιτα ἔμορφα ὄλα τὰ κουβεργιάσαν,
 ἄρματωμένα ἔμορφα ἐκ τ' ἄρματα τοῦ νέου.
 Καὶ εἰς καθένα κάθειον ἅπανου του σιογένιτης,
 ἐκεῖ τὲς πράξεις ἔδειχναν τῶν προεσιῶν ποὺ κάμναν,
 ὄλα καλὰ ὀρθώνοντας μὲ προσοχὴν μεγάλην.
 Ἐκεῖ δοξάρια ἤγεραν, τσρκάσια καὶ σαῖτιες,
 καὶ ροῦχα τὰ ἐβάσαιεν ὁ ἄθλιος Ἄρκιτας.

Οὐδὲν ἐσυναγγάζοντιαν σπουδαῖα τὰ περάσουν,
 μᾶλλον ἔμορφα, σιγανά, μὲ ἤθος λυπημένον,
 ὁ εἰς μὲ τ' ἄλλον πηγαινε σιμὰ ὡς ἤμποροῦσαν,
 ὡς τ' ὀρθωσαν οἱ προεσιτοὶ ὁποὺ τὸ πιμελοῦσαν.

Ἄπανω εἰς τοὺς νόμους τους οἱ βασιλεῖς οἱ προῶτοι
 τὸν κρέββατον ἐσήκωσαν, τὰ δάκρυα φοριωμένοι.

(XI 14 - 15, 35, 37 - 38)

... καὶ τὸ ζιμιὸν ὠρδίνιασε τὰ κάμη τὴν θαφὴν του,
 καὶ σὲ κιβούριον ἄργυρὸ τὰ βάλῃ τὸ κορμίν του.
 Μαστόροι τοῦ τὸ κάνουσι ζιμιὸν ἀπὸ τῆ Χώρα,
 κ' ἐξετελειώθη βιαστικὰ εἰσε λιγάκιν ὦρα.

καὶ τὰ πανιέσμα νι' ἄρματα, ὡς ἦσα ματωμένα,
 εἰς τ' ἄλογόν του τὰ ἔχανε, καὶ πάντα ὀμπρὸς τὰ πηαῖνα
 ὀχτιὸν τὸν παραβλέπασι, κι ὀλόμανρα φοροῦσα,
 ποὺ δίδαν πόνο καὶ καημὸ ἔς ὄσους κι ἂν τὰ θωροῦσα
 Τοῦ Βασιλιοῦ ὄλα τ' ἄλογα, θλιμμένα πορπατοῦσα,
 κ' ἐκεῖνοι ποὺ τὰ σέργασι ὀλόμανρα φοροῦσα,

Ἐμαζωχιτῆκαν κ' ἤρθασι τοῦ Ρήγα τὰ φουσοῖα,
 κ' ἐσυντροφιάσαν τὸ νεκρὸ κλαίοντας εἰς τὴ σιγράτα,
 τὴ θλίφι καὶ τὸν πόνον ντως ἔδειχνα μετὰ κεῖνα,
 κι ὀπίσω τὰ κονιάρια ντως κωλοσυρτὰ τ' ἀφίνα.
 Κι ὁ Ρήγας μὲ τὰ θλιφτικὰ μὲ δίχως τὴν κορῶνα,
 τὸ λείψανο συντροφίαζεν ἐκεῖ ποὺ τὸ σηκῶνα.
 Εἴκοσ' ἀπὸ τοὺς φρόνιμους τοῦ Ρήγα τιμημένοι
 σηκῶνουσιε τὸ νεκρὸ τὰ μαῦρα φορεμένοι.

(4. 1943 - 6, 1971 - 6, 1957 - 63)

Finally a word must be said about the famous similes of *Erotocritos*. Comparisons have been made between them

and the similes in (again) *Orlando Furioso*²²: and (again) it is probably a matter of *loci communes*. Yet in some ways it may be thought that on this point *Theseus* is closer to *Erotocritos* than Ariosto's poem is. Certainly the Cretan poem's preoccupation with images of wind and storm is already noticeable in *Theseus*. Four similes from the earlier poem, though far surpassed by Cornaros in power and imagination, may show how here too it is possible that *Erotocritos* has learned something from its predecessor:

Καὶ ὡς τὸ λονταροῦπουλον πὸν ἡ πείνα τὸ κεντάγει
καὶ γίνεται πλέον μανιακὸ καὶ πλέον ἐξαγοιωμένο,
κι ἅμα ν' εἶδη τίποιτες φαγὶ διὰ ν' ἀρπάξη
τὴν τρίχα τ' ἀναγοιώνει τὴν ἀπ' ὄρεξην τὴν ἔχει,
τὰ νύχια του, τὰ δόντια του, ὅλα τὰ ξακονίζει,
εἶτι ἔκαμνεν κι ὁ Θησεὺς ἐβλέποντα τὸν τόπον . . .

I 42

Οὐχὶ ἀλλεῶς σιὰ πρόβαια ὁ πεινασμένος λύκος
μπαίνει ἀπὲ τὴν πείνα του σὰν νὰ ἴτον λυσσασμένος,
δαγκώνοντας καὶ πνίγοντας, ποτ' ἔνα πότε ἄλλον,
ὡς νὰ χορτάσ' ἡ γοῦλά του κ' ἡ πεθυμιὰ ὀπὸ ἄχη.
Ἔτιζ' ἔκαμνε καὶ ὁ Θησεὺς πρὸς τὰ κοράσια τότιες.

I 74

Ἄν ἡ σκληριὰ καὶ ὁ θυμὸς, ἡ ἀνιάρρα καὶ τὸ κρότις
τῆς φουσκωμένης θάλασσας, ὄντια τὴν ἐφουσκώνουν
οἱ φουσιωμένοι ἄνεμοι, καὶ κατακόπτουσιν τὴν,
οἱ ναῦτες ὄντια πιάνουσι μ' ἀνιάρρα τὸν λιμένα
.
οὐκ ἤθελ' ἔσται τίποιτες πρὸς τὴν ἀνιάρρα τούτην
ὀπὸ ἄγινε σιὸ θέατρον, ὀπὸν ποτ' οὐκ ἠκούστη.

VIII 3

Κι ὡς γίνεται σιτὴν θάλασσαν ἐκ τ' ὄρος τ' Ἀπεννίνου,
πὸν βύθισε καὶ χώρισε ἐκ τ' ὄρος τοῦ Πελώρου,
ὀποῦ τὰ κύματα κτυποῦν μὲ δυνασκειὰ σιὰ βράχη
καὶ γίνοντι' ἀπὸ πράσινα ἄσπρα ὡσὰν τὰ χιόνια. . .

VIII 6

GARETH MORGAN

[Συνεχίζεται σιὸ ἐπόμενο τεῦχος]

²²) *Ibid* pp. 28, 30, etc.