
ΣΥΜΜΕΙΚΤΑ

ΔΥΟ ΑΛΚΜΑΝΕΣ;

(P. Oxy. 2802)

Ὁ ἐκδότης τοῦ 37ου τόμου (1971) τῶν Παπύρων τῆς Ὁξυρύγχου E. Lobel ἀποδίδει πολὺ πειστικὰ τὸν πάπ. 2802 σ' ἓναν Βίο τοῦ Ἀλκμάνου ἢ σ' ἓνα ὑπόμνημα στὸ ἔργο του. Τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Ἀλκμάνου ἀναφέρεται δύο φορές (στ. 5, 17), καὶ φαίνεται ὅτι στὸ ἀπόσπασμα γινόταν λόγος γιὰ τὴ χρονολόγηση τοῦ ποιητῆ σὲ σχέση με κάποιον ἄλλο πρόσωπο. Θὰ μᾶς ἀπασχολήσῃ ἐδῶ ἡ ἀνάγνωση τῶν πρώτων στίχων τοῦ παπύρου:

3]v.φληναφ.]

4]νοςενγ π'ε]

5]τι βαλκμα]

Γιὰ τὸν στ. 3 ὁ Lobel σημειώνει: «The ink is incompatible with any form of *φληναφάω* or any case of *φληναφός*. *φληναφεῖ*[α, for *φληναφία*, itself not strongly attested, may be acceptable». Ἡ ὀρθὴ ὁμῶς ἀνάγνωση πρέπει νὰ εἶναι *φληναφεῖ*. Ὁ τύπος *φληναφέω* εἶναι πολὺ συνηθισμένος στὰ μεταγενέστερα κείμενα, ἄσχετα ἂν οἱ ἐκδότες φροντίζουν νὰ ἀποκαθιστοῦν παντοῦ τὸν ὀρθόδοξο ἀττικὸν τύπον *φληναφάω*: Ἀριστοφ. Ἰππ. 664 *ἐφληνάφει* (ὁ κώδ. M), Ἀριστοφ. Νεφ. 1475 *φληνάφει* (οἱ κώδδ. M²U), Εὐσέβ. *Εὐαγγ. Προπ.* 5, 24, 5 *φληναφεῖν* (οἱ κώδδ. NVO), Γρηγ. Νύσ. *Πρὸς Εὐν.* 1, 116, 9 Jaeger *φληναφουμένον*, Πρόκλ. *Εἰς Πλάτ. Τίμ.* 1, 28 c *φληναφοῦσι* (ὁ κώδ. N), Θωμ. Μάγ. 376, 14 Ritschl *φληναφεῖν*¹.

Μετὰ τὴν ἀνάγνωση *φληναφεῖ* εἶναι πολὺ πιθανὸ τὸ κύριον ὄνομα ποῦ κρύβεται πίσω ἀπὸ τὴν κατάληξιν *-νος* τοῦ στ. 4 νὰ εἶναι τὸ ὑποκείμενον τοῦ ρήματος. Στὴ φωτογραφία ὁμῶς τοῦ παπύρου διαβάζω σχετικὰ καθαρὰ]μος. Ἀπὸ τοὺς συγγραφεῖς ποῦ τὰ ὀνόματά τους τελειώνουν με τὴν κατάληξιν αὐτὴ ἐκεῖνος ποῦ εἶναι πιθανότερον νὰ ἔχη ἀσχοληθῆ με τὸ βίον τοῦ Ἀλκμάνου εἶναι ὁ Δίδυμος.

Ὁ Ἀλεξανδρινὸς αὐτὸς γραμματικὸς εἶχε συμπληρώσει τὸ ἐξηγητικὸν καὶ κριτικὸν ἔργο τῶν προκατόχων του με πλούσιον ἱστορικὸν καὶ βιογραφικὸν

1. Γιὰ περισσότερα παραδείγματα βλ. στὸν *Θησαυρὸν* τοῦ Στεφάνου καὶ στὸ *Patriotic Greek Lexicon* στή λ.

ύλικό¹. Ειδικά στον τομέα τῆς βιογραφίας τῶν συγγραφέων ξέρουμε ὅτι τὸν εἶχε ἀπασχολήσει π.χ. τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς πατρίδας τοῦ Θεόγνη². Γενεαλογικὲς καὶ ἄλλες βιογραφικὲς πληροφορίες ἔχει δώσει καὶ γιὰ τὸν Θουκυδίδη³, ἐνῶ ἀπὸ τὸν Σενέκα μαθαίνουμε ὅτι εἶχε ἀσχοληθῆ με θέματα ὅπως «de patria Homeri... libidinosior Anacreon an ebriosior vixerit... an Sappho publica fuerit»⁴.

Κανένας ἀπὸ τοὺς γνωστούς τίτλους ἔργων τοῦ Διδύμου δὲν φαίνεται νὰ συμβιβάζεται με τὸ ἐν (τρίτω) περὶ εἰ τοῦ παπύρου. Καὶ τὸ νὰ ἐπιχειρῆ κανεὶς με βάση αὐτὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα νὰ ἀποκαταστήσῃ ἕναν ὑποθετικὸ τίτλο, προκειμένου γιὰ ἕναν συγγραφέα πού τὸ ἔργο του ἀριθμεῖ 3500 ἢ 4000 βιβλία, δὲν εἶναι παρὰ ἕνα ἀνώφελο παιχνίδι⁵.

Στὸν στ. 5 ὁ Lobel παρατηρεῖ: «Perhaps (δεύτερος) ἸΑλκμά[ν, implying a catalogue». Στους ἐπόμενους στίχους τοῦ παπύρου διασώζονται ἀρκετὰ σαφῆ ἴχνη τῆς προσπάθειας νὰ προσδιορισθῆ ἡ ἡλικία τοῦ ἸΑλκμάνα σὲ σχέση με κάποιον ἄλλο πρόσωπο: 6]. . υτερου περ[, 7 πρεσβ]ύτερος ὁ δ(ε) η[εώτερος (?), 9 τ]οῦ μ(έν) πρεσ[βυτέρου. Εἶναι ὅμως χαρακτηριστικὸ ὅτι ἡ ἀναφορὰ στὰ δύο πρόσωπα πού χρονολογοῦνται γίνεται ὄχι με τὰ κύρια ὀνόματά τους, ἀλλὰ με ἑναρθρα ἐπίθετα συγκριτικοῦ βαθμοῦ. Εἶναι φανερό ὅτι ἡ χρησιμοποίηση τῶν κυρίων ὀνομάτων θὰ ὀδηγοῦσε σὲ σύγχυση καὶ γι' αὐτὸ ἀκριβῶς ἀποφεύγεται. Κάτι τέτοιο μπορεῖ νὰ δικαιολογηθῆ μόνο με τὴν ὑπόθεση ὅτι τὰ ἀναφερόμενα πρόσωπα εἶναι ὁμώνυμα⁶. Συνεπῶς ἡ ἀνάγνωση τοῦ στ. 5]τι (δεύτερος) ἸΑλκμά[ν δὲν πρέπει νὰ ὑποδηλώνῃ τὴν ὑπαρξὴ καταλόγου

1. Βλ. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, Ὁξφόρδη 1968, σ. 276 κ.ε.

2. Σχ. Πλ. Νόμ. 630 α. Ἡ σχετικὴ πληροφορία ἀποδίδεται στὸ βιβλίον τοῦ *Περὶ λυρικῶν ποιητῶν*: M. Schmidt, *Didymi Chalcenteri fragmenta*, Λιψία 1854, σ. 388-9. L. Cohn, *RE* 5, 469 (λ. *Didymos*).

3. Μαρκελλίνου *Βίος Θουκ.* 3, 14 (;), 16, 32. Ὁ Schmidt, ὁ.π. 321-34, ὑποθέτει με βάση τις πληροφορίες αὐτὲς ὅτι ὁ Δίδυμος εἶχε γράψῃ καὶ κάποιον *Βίον Θουκυδίδου*, ἐνῶ ἀντίθετα ἀπὸ ἄλλους ὑποστηρίχτηκε ὅτι αὐτὲς προέρχονται ἀπὸ τὸ Ἰπόμνημα τοῦ Διδύμου στὸν Πίνδαρο (*Νεμ.* 2, 19· βλ. Cohn, ὁ.π. 460-1)· οἱ πληροφορίες ὅμως τῶν παραγράφων 16 καὶ 32 τοῦ Μαρκελλίνου πολὺ δύσκολα θὰ μπορούσαν νὰ ἔχουν θέση σ' ἕνα τέτοιο ὑπόμνημα. Ἡ πιθανότητα νὰ ἔχῃ γράψῃ ὁ Δίδυμος ἐξηγητικὸ ὑπόμνημα στὸν Θουκυδίδη, στὸ ὁποῖο θὰ μπορούσε νὰ προτάσσεται ἕνας *Βίος* (πράγμα πού ἀρνεῖται κατηγορηματικὰ ὁ Cohn), ἔχει ἐνισχυθῆ σημαντικὰ τὸν τελευταῖο καιρό. Βλ. A. Gudeman, *Phil. Woch.* 1927, 611-2, O. Luschnat, *Philologus* 98, 1954, 22-9, Pfeiffer, ὁ.π. σ. 225 σημ. 4.

4. *Epist.* 88, 37. Ὑποστηρίζεται (Cohn, ὁ.π. 471) ὅτι τὰ θέματα αὐτὰ συζητοῦνται στὸ βιβλίον τοῦ Διδύμου *Συμποσιακὰ* (ἢ *Σύμμεικτα*).

5. Ἡ συνηθισμένη ἀνάλυση τοῦ π' εἶναι *περὶ*. Θὰ πρέπει ὅμως νὰ ἐξεταστῆ καὶ τὸ ἐνδεχόμενο τὸ π' ε τοῦ παπύρου ὀλόκληρο νὰ ἀντιπροσωπεύῃ τὴν πρόθεση *περὶ*. Σὲ τέτοια περίπτωση δὲν θὰ μπορούσε νὰ ἀποκλείσῃ κανεὶς τὸ *Περὶ λυρικῶν ποιητῶν*.

6. Ἡ συζήτηση γιὰ τὴ χρονολόγηση τοῦ ἸΑλκμάνα συνεχίζεται καὶ στοὺς παρακάτω στίχους τοῦ παπύρου: 14 χρόν]ων καθ' οὗς ἐγένε/το (suppl. Lobel), 18 π]ρὸ αὐτοῦ πολὺ

ποιητῶν, ὅπως δέχεται ὁ Lobel· ἀπλῶς ὑπονοεῖται καὶ κάποιος πρῶτος Ἀλκμάν. Ἡ ἴσως εἶναι προτιμότερη ἡ ἀνάγνωση δ[τι (?) (δύο) Ἀλκμᾶ[νες¹].

Φαίνεται λοιπὸν ὅτι ὁ γραμματικὸς ποῦ ἀναφέρεται στὸν P. Oxy. 2802 (καὶ ποῦ δὲν ἀποκλείεται νὰ εἶναι ὁ Δίδυμος) ἐπιχείρησε νὰ ἐντοπίσῃ χρονολογικὰ δύο ὁμώνυμους ποιητές. Κάποιος μεταγενέστερος γραμματικὸς δὲν ἐνέκρινε τὴν ἐκδοχὴ τῆς ὁμωνυμίας καὶ κατηγόρησε τὸν πρῶτο ὅτι «φληναφεῖ». Ἄν πραγματικὰ πρόκειται γιὰ τὸν Δίδυμο, δὲν εἶναι ἡ πρώτη φορὰ ποῦ ἐπικρίνεται τόσο αὐστηρά. Ὁ Σύμμαχος, ἓνας μεταγενέστερος σχολιαστὴς τοῦ Ἀριστοφάνη, τὸν κατηγορεῖ συχνὰ μὲ δριμύτητα, καμιά φορὰ μάλιστα καὶ μὲ ἀνάλογες ἐκφράσεις: λ.χ. «λελήρηται ἄντικρυς» γιὰ τὰ ἐπιχειρήματα ποῦ προβάλλει ὑποστηρίζοντας μιὰ γραφὴ τῶν χειρογράφων στίς *Θεσμοφοριάζουσες*².

Τὸ ζήτημα εἶναι τώρα ἂν πραγματικὰ ὑπῆρξε ποτὲ αὐτὸς ὁ δεῦτερος Ἀλκμάν. Ἡδὴ ἡ παρατήρηση «φληναφεῖ» πρέπει νὰ ἀποτελῇ ἔνδειξη ὅτι ὁ γραμματικὸς ποῦ εἶχε δώσει τὴν πληροφορία γιὰ τὸν δεῦτερο Ἀλκμᾶνα δὲν εἶχε παρουσιάσει ἱστορικὰ στοιχεῖα γιὰ νὰ τεκμηριώσῃ τὴν ὁμωνυμία. Εἶναι θεμιτὸ λοιπὸν νὰ ὑποθέσουμε ὅτι ὁ δεῦτερος Ἀλκμάν δὲν προέρχεται ἀπὸ ἱστορικὴ γνώση, ἀλλὰ ἀποτελεῖ φιλολογικὸ πλάσμα. Σὲ τέτοια ὑποθετικὰ πλάσματα καταφεύγουν, ὅπως εἶναι φυσικὸ, οἱ γραμματικοὶ (ἀρχαῖοι καὶ νέοι), ὅταν οἱ βιογραφικὲς καὶ ἄλλες μαρτυρίες συγκρούονται μεταξύ τους. Ἄρκει νὰ ἀναφέρουμε παραδείγματα χάριν ἀπὸ τὴν ἀρχαία φιλολογία τὴ διχοτόμηση τοῦ Εὐήνου ἀπὸ τὸν Ἐρατοσθένη³, τοῦ Φερεκύδη τοῦ Σύριου ἀπὸ τὸν Ἄνδρωνα τὸν Ἐφέσιο⁴,

γε/ν- (suppl. Lobel), 19]τερος δ(ε) τ(ας ;) [[πρ.]]. Ἐδῶ ὅμως ἡ χρονολογικὴ συσχέτιση μπορεῖ νὰ γίνεταί καὶ μὲ κάποιο ἄλλο πρόσωπο, ὄχι ἀναγκαστικὰ ὁμώνυμο.

1. Ἡ ἀπόσταση ἀνάμεσα στὸ τι καὶ τὸ β εἶναι κάπως μεγαλύτερη ἀπὸ τὴ συνηθισμένη ἀπόσταση μεταξύ δύο γραμμάτων, ἀποκλείεται ὅμως νὰ δηλώνεται μὲ αὐτὸ ὅτι ἔχουμε ἀρχὴ μιᾶς νέας ἐνότητος. Ἴσως ἡ ἀπόσταση δικαιολογεῖται ἀπὸ τὸ γεγονὸς ὅτι αὐτὸ ποῦ ἀκολουθεῖ εἶναι ἀριθμὸς καὶ ὄχι συνηθισμένη λέξη. Πραγματικὰ καὶ στὸν προηγούμενο στίχο ἀνάμεσα στὸ γ καὶ τὸ π(ερὶ) ὑπάρχει ἡ ἴδια ἀπόσταση — αὐτὴ τὴ φορὰ μετὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸ.

2. Σχ. Ἄρ. *Θεσμ.* 162. Τὴν ἴδια βίαν ἐπίθεση δέχτηκε ὁ γραμματικὸς καὶ στὴν ἐποχὴ μας· βλ. Pfeiffer, ὁ.π. σ. 233, 276 κ.έ., ὅπου γίνεται ἀναφορὰ στὴν κριτικὴ τοῦ A. Roemer.

3. Ἄρποκρ. λ. *Εὐήνος*: ... δύο ἀναγράφουσιν Εὐήνους ἐλεγείων ποιητὰς ὁμωνύμους ἀλλήλοις, καθάπερ Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν τῷ περὶ Χρονογραφιῶν (*FGrHist* 241 F 3), ἀμφοτέρους λέγον Παρίους εἶναι γνωρίζεσθαι δὲ φησι τὸν νεώτερον μόνον. Ὅτι ὁ πρῶτος Εὐήνος ἐπινοήθηκε ἀπλῶς ἀπὸ τὸν Ἐρατοσθένη «als Nothelfer in einer chronologischen Schwierigkeit» (R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion*, σ. 57 σημ. 1) ἔχει ἀποδειχτὴ ἀπὸ τὸν Br. Keil, *Hermes* 23, 1888, 379 σημ. 1· βλ. καὶ F. Jacoby, *Kommentar ad loc.*

4. Διογ. Λαέρτ. 1, 119 Ἄνδρων δ' ὁ Ἐφέσιός (*FHG* 2, 347) φησι δύο γεγονέναι Φερεκύδας Σύριους, τὸν μὲν ἀστρολόγον, τὸν δὲ θεολόγον υἱὸν Βάβυος, φ καὶ Πυθαγόραν σχολάσαι. Ἐρατοσθένης (*FGrHist* 241 F 10) δ' ἓνα μόνον, καὶ ἕτερον Ἀθηναῖον γενεαλόγον. Γιὰ τὸ χρονολογικὸ πρόβλημα ποῦ ὀδήγησε τὸν Ἄνδρωνα στὴν εὐκολὴ λύση τῆς ὁμωνυμίας, βλ. Jacoby, *Kommentar ad loc.*, καὶ K. v. Fritz, *RE* 19, 2026 (λ. *Pherekydes* 4).

καὶ τῆς Σαπφοῦς¹. Τὴν εὐκόλη αὐτὴ λύση τῶν χρονολογικῶν ἢ ἄλλων προβλημάτων τὴν διευκόλυνε ἀκόμη περισσότερο ὁ μέγας ἀριθμὸς ὁμώνυμων συγγραφέων. Ἔτσι ξέρουμε ὅτι ὁ Δημήτριος ὁ Μάγνης ἔγραψε ἓνα βιβλίον μετὶ τίτλου *Περὶ ὁμωνύμων ποιητῶν τε καὶ συγγραφέων*, ἐνῶ στὴ Σούδα (α 3421, λ. Ἐπολλώνιος ἕτερος) ἀποδίδεται ἡ συγγραφή ἐνὸς ἐπίσης *Περὶ ὁμωνύμων* σὲ κάποιον Ἀγροσφῶντα (ἢ Ἀγροφῶντα). Στὴ μέθοδο τῆς ὁμωνυμίας καταφεύγουν συχνὰ καὶ οἱ σύγχρονοι φιλόλογοι. Ἐνδεικτικὰ ἀναφέρω ὅτι ὁ Reitzenstein ἐπινοεῖ ἓνα δεύτερο Θεόγνι², ὁ Wilamowitz ἓνα ἀκόμη Στησίχορο, ἀνάμεσα στὸν πρῶτο καὶ τὸν δεύτερο³, ὁ Lloyd-Jones ἓνα δεύτερο Πρατίνα⁴.

Εἰδικὰ στὴν περίπτωσιν τοῦ Ἀλκμάνα ὑπάρχει ἓνα ὀξύτατο πρόβλημα καταγωγῆς ποῦ ἀπασχόλησε πολὺ τοὺς ἀρχαίους γραμματικούς: ἦταν ὁ ποιητὴς Σπαρτιάτης ἢ Λυδός; Τὴ λυδικὴ καταγωγὴ ὑποστήριξαν ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης (P. Oxy. 2389 ἀπ. 9 στῆλ. 1 = Ἀλκμ. ἀπ. 13 Page), ὁ Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικός (Πολιτ. 2 = Ἀριστοτ. ἀπ. 611, 9 Rose), ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος (P. Oxy. 2389 ἀπ. 6 στῆλ. 1) καὶ ὁ Κράτης ὁ Μαλλώτης (Σούδ. α 1289, λ. Ἀλκμάν). Ἡ διαμάχη γὰρ τὴν πατρίδα τοῦ ἦταν γνωστὴ σὲ μεταγενέστερους συγγραφεῖς, τὸν Velleius Paterculus, 1, 18, 2, τὸν Αἰλιανό, *Ποικ. Ἰστ.* 12, 50, καὶ σὲ ποιητὲς ἐπιγραμματῶν τῆς Παλατινῆς Ἀνθολογίας, τὸν Ἀντίπατρο τὸν Θεσσαλονικέα, 7, 18, τὸν Λεωνίδα, 7, 19, καὶ κάποιον Ἀλέξανδρο (ἴσως τὸν Αἰτωλό), 7, 709. Τὸ πρόβλημα συζητεῖται καὶ στὸν P. Oxy. 2506 ἀπ. 1, ὅπου προσάγεται καὶ ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Αἰσχύλου (πιθανότατα τοῦ τραγικοῦ)⁵. Ἡ ἄποψη γὰρ τὴ λυδικὴ καταγωγὴ στηρίχτηκε ἤδη ἀπὸ τὸν Ἀριστοτέλη σὲ στίχους τοῦ ἴδιου τοῦ ποιητῆ (ἀπ. 16 Page):

οὐκ ἦς ἀνὴρ ἀγροεῖος οὐ-
δὲ σκαιὸς οὐδὲ ἴπαρὰ σοφοῖ-
σιν ἢ οὐδὲ Θεσσαλὸς γένος,

1. Ἀθῆν. 13, 596 e καὶ ἡ ἐξ Ἐρέσου δὲ τῆς <ποιητῆρας ὁμώνυμος> ἑταῖρα (ἑταῖρας A: em. Kaibel) Σαπφῶ τοῦ καλοῦ Φάωνος ἐρασθεῖσα περιβόητος ἦν, ὡς φησι Νυμφόδορος (Νύμφης A: em. Kaibel) ἐν Περίπλῳ Ἀσίας (FGrHist 572 F 6). Πρβ. Αἰλ. Ποικ. Ἰστ. 12, 19 πινθάνομαι δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἑτέρα ἐν τῇ Λέσβῳ ἐγένετο Σαπφῶ, ἑταῖρα, οὐ ποιήτρια, καθὼς καὶ τὸ ἐρώτημα τοῦ Διδύμου (Sen. Epist. 88, 37) an Sappho publica fuerit. Σούδ. λ. Σαπφῶ (σ 108): τινὲς δὲ καὶ ταύτης (δηλ. τῆς δευτέρας Σαπφοῦς) εἶναι λυρικὴν ἀνέγραψαν ποίησιν. Σχετικὰ μὲ τὴν ἐπινόησιν τῆς δευτέρας αὐτῆς Σαπφοῦς βλ. Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides*, Βερολίνο 1913, σ. 22 κέ. Ὁ Jacoby, *ad loc.*, τοποθετεῖ τὴν προσφυγὴν στὴ λύση τῆς ὁμωνυμίας παλιότερα ἀπὸ τὸν Νυμφόδορο.

2. *Epigramm und Skolion*, σ. 270-3.

3. *Sappho und Simonides*, σ. 233-9.

4. *Cuadernos de la Fundación Pastor* 13, 1966, 18.

5. Βλ. D. L. Page, *Alcman: The Partheneion*, Ὁξφόρδη 1951, σ. 167-70· M. Treu, *RE Suppl.* 11, 23-5 (λ. Alkman).

*Ἐρυσιχαῖος οὐδὲ ποι-
μῆν, ἀλλὰ Σαρδίων ἀπ' ἀ-
κοῶν.*

Τὸ πρόβλημα εἶναι ἂν ὁ Ἀλκμᾶν μὲ τὸ γ' πρόσωπο (ἦς: δωρ. τύπος τοῦ ἦν) ἀναφερόταν στὸν ἑαυτό του ἢ σὲ κάποιον ἄλλο. Ἴσως ἡ ἀπάντηση νὰ δινόταν ἀπὸ τὰ συμφραζόμενα τοῦ ἀποσπάσματος· ἀλλὰ καὶ μόνο τὸ γεγονὸς ὅτι ἡ καταγωγή τοῦ Ἀλκμᾶνα ἀποτελοῦσε ζήτημα ἀμφιλεγόμενο ἤδη στὴν ἀρχαιότητα, ὅταν τὰ συμφραζόμενα αὐτὰ ἦταν προσιτά, δείχνει ὅτι ἡ ἀπάντηση — ὅποια καὶ ἂν ἦταν — δὲν μποροῦσε νὰ εἶναι ὀριστική¹.

Ἐνεξάρτητα ὅμως ἀπὸ τὴν ὀρθότητα τῆς μιᾶς ἢ τῆς ἄλλης ἐκδοχῆς, εἶναι ἀναμφισβήτητο ὅτι τὸ πρόβλημα θυμίζει πολὺ τὰ ἀντίστοιχα προβλήματα ποὺ ἀπασχόλησαν τὸν Δίδυμο σχετικὰ μὲ τὴν καταγωγή τοῦ Ὀμήρου, τῆς Σαπφούς, τοῦ Θεόγνη. Εἶναι χαρακτηριστικὸ ὅτι καὶ τὰ τρία αὐτὰ προβλήματα σχετίστηκαν μὲ ὁμωνυμίες ἢ ἄλλου εἴδους διχοτομήσεις. Γιὰ τὸν Ὀμηρο δὲν εἶναι ἀνάγκη νὰ ποῦμε τίποτε. Τὸ ἐρώτημα ὅμως *an Sappho publica fuerit* ἀφορᾷ ὁπωσδήποτε τὴν καταγωγή τῆς ποιήτριας καὶ τὴν ὁμωνυμία της μὲ τὴν ὑποτιθέμενη ἑταίρα τῆς Ἐρέσου². Ἡ ὁμοιότητα τέλος μὲ τὸ πρόβλημα τῆς καταγωγῆς τοῦ Θεόγνη εἶναι ἐντυπωσιακὴ. Στὰ λεγόμενα τοῦ Πλάτωνα (*Νόμ.* 1, 630 a) ὅτι ὁ Θεόγνης ἦταν πολίτης τῶν Σικελικῶν Μεγάρων ὁ Δίδυμος (*Σχ.* Πλάτ. *ad loc.* καὶ Ἀρποκρ. λ. *Θεόγνης*) ἀντιπαραθέτει τὸ στίχο τοῦ ἴδιου τοῦ ποιητῆ (783) *ἦλθον μὲν γὰρ ἔγωγε καὶ εἰς Σικελίην ποτε γαίαν*, γιὰ νὰ ὑποστηρίξῃ τὴν καταγωγή του ἀπὸ τὰ Μέγαρα τῆς Ἀττικῆς. Δὲν ἔχει σημασία γιὰ μᾶς ἡ ἐπιμέρους ἐπιχειρηματολογία, ἀλλὰ τὸ γεγονὸς ὅτι ἕνας σύγχρονος φιλόλογος, ὁ Reitzenstein, ξεκινώντας ἀπὸ τὸ στίχο τοῦ Θεόγνη καὶ τὴν ἀρχαία ἀντιδικία, διχοτόμησε τὸν ποιητῆ, ἀποτελεῖ ἄλλο ἓνα παράλληλο γιὰ τὴν ἐπινόηση τοῦ δευτέρου Ἀλκμᾶνα ποὺ συναντοῦμε στὸν πάπυρό μας. Μπορεῖ λοιπὸν κανεὶς νὰ ὑποθέσῃ, ὅσο καὶ ἂν φαίνεται παρακινδυνευμένο, ὅτι ὁ γραμματικὸς ποὺ ἐπλασε τὸν δεῦτερο Ἀλκμᾶνα — ὁ Δίδυμος; — ἐπιδίωξε νὰ πάρῃ θέση στὸ ζήτημα τῆς πατρίδας τοῦ λυρικοῦ προτείνοντας μιὰ μέση λύση: Ὑπῆρχαν δύο Ἀλκμᾶνες — ἓνας Λυδὸς καὶ ἓνας Σπαρτιάτης.

Καμιὰ ἄλλη πληροφορία δὲν μᾶς ἔχει διασωθῆ ἀπὸ τὴν ἀρχαιότητα γιὰ τὸν δεῦτερο αὐτὸν Ἀλκμᾶνα. Τὸ ἄρθρο ὅμως *Ἀλκμᾶν* τῆς Σούδας (α 1289) τελειώνει μὲ τὴ φράση: *ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἕτερος Ἀλκμᾶν, εἰς τῶν λυρικῶν, ὃν ἠνεγκεν ἢ Μεσσῆνη*. Ποιὸς εἶναι αὐτὸς ὁ «ἕτερος Ἀλκμᾶν»; Καὶ εἶναι ὁ ἴδιος μὲ τὸν δεῦτερο Ἀλκμᾶνα τοῦ P. Oxy. 2802; Γιὰ νὰ μπορέσουμε νὰ δώσουμε

1. Βλ. M. Treu, *αὐτ.*

2. Βλ. παραπάνω σ. 110 σημ. 1. Γι' αὐτὸ πολὺ ἀμφιβάλλω ἂν τὸ ἀπόσπασμα τοῦ Διδύμου προέρχεται ἀπὸ τὰ *Συμποσιακά* του, ὅπως ὑποστηρίχθηκε (βλ. παραπάνω σ. 108, σημ. 4) ἐξαιτίας τοῦ εὐτράπελου χαρακτήρα τοῦ ἐρωτήματος.

ἀπάντησι, πρέπει πρώτα νὰ ἐλέγξουμε τὶς πληροφορίες τῆς Σούδας. Τὸ ἄγνωστο μας αὐτὸ πρόσωπο φαίνεται νὰ ἔχη ἀρκετὰ κοινὰ χαρακτηριστικὰ μὲ τὸν γνωστό μας ποιητὴ: (α) Λέγεται καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀλκμάν· (β) εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸς ποιητῆς, (γ) καὶ μάλιστα λυρικός. (δ) Ὁ τόπος τῆς καταγωγῆς του (*Μεσσήνη*) θυμίζει σκανδαλωδῶς τὴν ὀνομασία τῆς λακωνικῆς φυλῆς ἀπὸ τὴν ὁποία, κατὰ τὴν ἴδια τὴ Σούδα, καταγόταν ὁ Ἀλκμάν (*Μεσσοία*). Ἡ διατύπωση τέλος τῆς Σούδας μᾶς ὀδηγεῖ καὶ σὲ μιὰ τελευταία ταύτιση: (ε) εἰς τῶν *λυρικῶν* δὲν σημαίνει ἀπλῶς καὶ μόνο *λυρικός*. Ὁ δεύτερος αὐτὸς Ἀλκμάν πρέπει νὰ ἀποτελοῦσε μέλος μιᾶς συγκεκριμένης ὁμάδας πού ἀποκαλοῦνταν «οἱ λυρικοί». Καὶ ἡ ὁμάδα αὐτὴ δὲν μπορεῖ νὰ εἶναι ἄλλη ἀπὸ τὸν ἀλεξανδρινὸ κανόνα τῶν ἑνέα λυρικῶν ποιητῶν¹. Ἀλλὰ στὸν κανόνα αὐτὸν περιέχεται, ὅπως εἶναι γνωστό, μόνο ἓνας Ἀλκμάν.

Ἔτσι, ἂν γίνῃ δεκτὸ ὅτι ἡ γραφὴ *Μεσσήνη* ὀφείλεται σὲ φθορὰ τοῦ *Μεσσοία*, δὲν ὑπολείπεται κανένα στοιχεῖο πού νὰ συνηγορῇ γιὰ τὴν ὑπαρξὴ καὶ ἄλλου Ἀλκμᾶνα. Οἱ πληροφορίες τῆς Σούδας γι' αὐτὸν τὸν δεύτερον Ἀλκμᾶνα, ὅπως εἶναι αὐτονόητο, ἀποκλείεται νὰ ἀνάγωνται στὸν Δίδυμο ἢ σὲ ὅποιονδήποτε ἄλλον Ἀλεξανδρινὸ γραμματικόν. Ὅχι πὼς ἡ φθορὰ *Μεσσοία* → *Μεσσήνη* δὲν μποροῦσε νὰ εἶχε γίνῃ καὶ νὰ εἶχε ὀδηγήσει σὲ διχοτόμηση τοῦ ποιητῆ σὲ τόσο πρόωμη ἐποχῇ, ἀλλὰ ἡ γνώση ὅτι στὸν κανόνα τῶν λυρικῶν ποιητῶν περιλαμβάνονταν μόνο ἓνας Ἀλκμάν πρέπει νὰ ἦταν κοινὸ κτῆμα κάθε μορφωμένου ἀνθρώπου τὴν ἐποχῇ ἐκείνη. Τὰ στοιχεῖα πού δίνει ἡ Σούδα γιὰ τὸν «ἕτερον Ἀλκμᾶνα» ὑποθέτω ὅτι θὰ ἀποτελοῦν μεταγενέστερη προσθήκη στὸ ἀρχικὸ ἄρθρο Ἀλκμάν. Ἡ προσθήκη αὐτὴ μπορεῖ νὰ εἶχε γίνῃ ἤδη στὸ σχετικὸ ἄρθρο τοῦ Ὀνοματολόγου τοῦ Ἡσυχίου τοῦ Μιλήσιου, πού πρέπει νὰ εἶναι ἡ πηγὴ τῆς Σούδας², ἀφοῦ πρώτα εἶχε ὑποστῆ τὴ φθορὰ τοῦ τόπου καταγωγῆς, ὥστε νὰ μπορῇ νὰ θεωρηθῇ ὁ Μεσσήμιος ποιητῆς ἕτερος σὲ σχέση μὲ τὸν Σπαρτιάτη (ἢ Λυδὸ) ποιητῆ, ὅπως συμβαίνει στὸ ἄρθρο τῆς Σούδας.

Θεσσαλονίκη

Κ. ΤΣΑΝΤΣΑΝΟΓΛΟΥ

1. Πρβ. τὰ ἄρθρα τῆς Σούδας *Δείναρχος* (τῶν μετὰ *Δημοσθένους ἐγκριθέντων εἰς*), *Ἰσαῖος* (εἰς μὲν ἐστὶ τῶν ἰ' ἠητόρων), *Λυσίας* (εἰς τῶν μετὰ *Δημοσθένους ἰ' ἠητόρων*), *Ἰππεριδῆς* (τῶν πρώτων κεκριμένων δέκα εἰς), *Ἀλέξανδρος Αἰτωλὸς* (ὡς καὶ τῶν ἐπτὰ τραγικῶν ἓνα κριθῆναι), *Λυκόφρων* (ἔστι γοῦν εἰς τῶν ἐπτὰ οἵτινες *Πλειὰς ὀνομάσθησαν*), *Σωσίθεος* (τῶν τῆς *Πλειάδος* εἰς), *Βιαντος Πριηνέως δίκη* (οὗτος εἰς τῶν ζ' σοφῶν), *Κλεόβουλος* (εἰς τῶν ζ' ὀνομαζομένων σοφῶν), *Πιπτακὸς* (εἰς καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν ζ' σοφῶν ὢν), *Σόλων* (ἔστι δὲ καὶ οὗτος εἰς τῶν ζ' ὀνομαζομένων σοφῶν), *Χίλων* (εἰς τῶν ζ' σοφῶν), *Χαμικλῆς* (εἰς τῶν λ') κ.ἄ.π.

2. Βλ. H. Schultz, *RE* 8, 1322 κ.ἑ. (λ. *Hesychios Illustrios*) καὶ A. Adler *RE* 4A, 706 κ.ἑ. (λ. *Suidas*).

ΣΧΟΛΙΟΝ ΕἰΣ ΑΝΕΚΔΟΤΟΝ ΠΟΙΗΜΑ Μ. ΦΙΛΗ

Εἰς τὸ περιοδικὸν Ἑλληνικά 24, 1971, 336 δημοσιεύονται ἀπὸ τὸν κ. Ε. Θ. Τσολάκην δύο ἀνέκδοτα ποιήματα τοῦ γνωστοῦ βυζαντινοῦ ποιητοῦ Μανουὴλ Φιλῆ. Τὸ δεύτερον τούτων ἔχει ὡς ἑξῆς:

*Τῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς ὁ γλυκασμὸς ἀγγέλων,
ἢ χαρὰν ἐκβλύζουσα τοῖς λυπομένοισι,
τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἢ κραταῖα προστάτις,
μῆτερ Θεοῦ πάναγνε, σεμνὴ Παρθένε,
ἀντιλαβοῦ μου κατὰ τόνδε τὸν βίον,
καὶ βασάνων ῥῦσαί με τῶν αἰωνίων.*

Τόσον αἰ ἔννοιαι τοῦ ἑξαστίχου τούτου ποιήματος ὅσον καὶ αἰ χρησιμοποιοῦμεν λέξεις καὶ ἐκφράσεις ἐνθυμίζουσι πλήρως γνωστὸν ἑξαποστειλάριον, ψαλλόμενον κατὰ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τοῦ Μεγάλου Παρακλητικοῦ Κανόνος, τὸ ὁποῖον καὶ παραθέτω:

*Ὁ γλυκασμὸς τῶν Ἀγγέλων,
τῶν θλιβομένων ἢ χαρά,
Χριστιανῶν ἢ προστάτις,
Παρθένε Μήτηρ Κυρίου,
ἀντιλαβοῦ μου καὶ ῥῦσαι
τῶν αἰωνίων βασάνων.*

Ἄθῆναι

ΟΔ. ΛΑΜΨΙΔΗΣ

ANTONIO DA MOLINO IN GREECE

One of the most colourful characters in the literary circles of sixteenth-century Venice was Antonio da Molino, also known as Burchiella, a poet, playwright and actor, whose speciality was to mimic the idiosyncratic Italian of expatriate Greeks¹. Unfortunately, his plays appear to have been lost. But some samples of his work have survived, in particular a series of burlesque poems in which the central figure is a Greek stradiot or mercenary soldier, «Manoli Blessi da Napoli di Romania». The

1. See Louis Coutelle, *Le Greghesco. Réexamen des éléments néo-grecs des textes comiques vénitiens du XVII^e siècle*, Thessaloniki 1971 (*Ἑλληνικά*, Παράρτημα ἀρ. 22), and the review by A. L. Vincent in *Ἑλληνικά* 25, 1972, 480-5.

poems are written in what is supposed to be the stradiots' language; it is in fact Venetian dialect with a strong and easily recognisable Greek accent. Manoli and his friends commit amusing grammatical errors, and often supplement their Italian with modern Greek words and phrases. Despite this weird jargon, Molino's lines flow swiftly and fluently. His longer poems are a tour de force of wit and inventiveness.

As a young man, Molino travelled on business in the Levant, and stayed for some time in Corfù and Crete, among other places. It was no doubt during this period of travel that he acquired the considerable knowledge of modern Greek that he shows in his stradiot poems¹.

While in Corfù and Crete, Molino filled his leisure hours by taking part in performances of comedies. These are the earliest dramatic productions known to have taken place in Greece in the Renaissance period. We first hear about them from Lodovico Dolce, in the dedication to Giacomo Contarini which he wrote for Molino's *I fatti e le prodezze di Manoli Blessi Strathioto*, published in Venice in 1561. After describing how, as a boy, Molino showed remarkable talent in singing, dancing and instrumental music, he goes on (pp. 3-4): «Dipoi ne' piu maturi anni dandosi alla mercantia, andò in piu parti del Levante, non tralasciando però alcuna delle sovradette virtù. Onde avvenne, che per non istare otioso, in Corfu e in Candia cominciò a esercitarsi in recitar comedie»².

Molino himself apparently refers to these productions in the dedication to «Fabio da Canali, Capetagno dei cavalli sul Dalmatia» which he prefixed to his burlesque poem *Manoli Blessi sopra la presa de Margaritin*. The dedication, incidentally, is a good example of Molino's sensitive use of his «lingua greca»; without ever abandoning the burlesque manner, he convincingly conveys the impression of a sincere and affectionate relationship. The relevant passage is as follows: «ve la dedico e duno chesta mia fantiga fatta sul verso petrarcao a vostro honuri, pregandove chie in vostro tasca la salveu, in memoria della vostro Blessi arlevao sul Corfu al bun tempo comediesco, del Armeri Bailos». That is, in a literal translation: «I dedicate and donate it to you, this work of mine made in Petrarchan verse in your honour, begging you to keep it in your

1. Cf. Coutelle, pp. 44-5.

2. «Then, at a more mature age, devoting himself to commerce, he went to various parts of the Levant, without, however, giving up any of the above-mentioned accomplishments. Hence it came about that, in order not to be idle, in Corfù and in Candia he began to occupy himself by performing comedies». It is not clear whether Candia here means the island of Crete as a whole, or its Venetian capital, the modern Iraklion.

pocket, to remind you of your friend Blessi, who was brought up in Corfù in the good comedy time of Bailo Armeri». That is how the passage appears in the British Museum copy (shelf-mark 11431. d. 5) of the Venetian edition of 1571. However, when Sathas reprinted the dedication, he wrote *come diesco* instead of *comediesco*¹. Louis Coutelle, in his discussion of Molino's work, reproduces the passage from Sathas with this error, and hence misses the reference to comic performances². For the passage «arlevao sul Corfù al bun tempo comediesco» («brought up in Corfù in the good comedy time») must mean that the character of the Greek stradiot Blessi was in some sense developed or perfected by Molino in Corfù, at a time when comic performances were taking place there³. The next phrase enables us to date this «comedy time» with some precision. Throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, there was only one bailo of Corfù with a name like Armeri: Luigi Darmerio, who held the office from 1512 to 1515⁴. The slight difference in the form of the name should not discourage us from accepting the identification, for the name occurs in many variants, including Armer, Darmer, D'Armer, Armerio and Almerio⁵. I suggest, then, on the evidence of this dedication, that Molino was in Corfù in the period 1512-1515, and that comedies were performed there during these years. Moreover, it is reasonable to assume that Molino himself was involved in these performances — that in fact this is the period to which Dolce is referring when he writes that the young Molino, «in order not to be idle», began to act in comedies in Corfù and Crete.

A conceivable objection to this dating is that if Molino was already

1. C. N. Sathas, *Μνημεία Ἑλληνικῆς Ἱστορίας, Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au moyen âge*, vol. VIII, Paris 1888, p. 466.

2. Coutelle, p. 45 note 4.

3. It might be suggested that Molino means he himself, not the character Blessi, was «brought up» in Corfù. However, he is specifically referring to the time of «Armeri Bailos», a time when, as we shall see, he was at the very least approaching adulthood. He could hardly say that he himself was «brought up» in that period. Cf. Coutelle, p. 45 note 4.

4. C. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes inédites ou peu connues publiées avec notes et tables généalogiques*, Berlin 1873 (reprinted Athens 1961), p. 393.

5. For example, the British Museum manuscript Egerton 1155, which contains genealogies of noble Venetian families, has the forms Darmer, Armer and Almerio all on one page (f. 253^v); ms. Additional 22500 prefers Armerio (f. 7^{r-v}); William Miller, *The Latins in the Levant*, London 1908 (reprinted Cambridge 1964), p. 476 note 1 and 493, uses the form d'Armer. Molino's patron Luigi d'Armer is probably a brother of the more famous Alban d'Armer, who died in the battle for Lepanto in 1499; see Miller, p. 493, and ms. Egerton 1155, f. 253^v.

more or less adult in 1515, he must have been astonishingly old in the years 1568-1572, when he produced a spate of poems and songs. However, he himself writes in a song published in 1568 that he was already «past the septegenarian years» («passo 'l cronni setterari»)¹. If he was over seventy in 1568, he must have been at least seventeen, and was probably several years older, in 1515.

Naturally one would very much like to know what kind of plays Molino took part in — whether they were written by himself or not, whether they were in Greek or Italian, what genre they belonged to, where and for whom they were performed. On the evidence available so far, we cannot reach any very definite conclusions. The statement that Blessi was «brought up» on Corfù does not necessarily mean that Molino composed and performed there plays featuring this character. The character, as we see it in the burlesque poems, would hardly have been a success on Greek soil. It is designed to amuse Italians who had some experience of expatriate Greeks; Greeks themselves would find it difficult to appreciate, and might even be offended by it. It seems more likely that Molino began his imitations of a Greek stradiot as a kind of party-trick for the amusement of his Italian friends on Corfù. Or, possibly, the phrase may simply mean that while in Corfù he amassed the experience of Greek ways and the knowledge of the Greek language necessary to bring this character to life.

All we definitely know is that Molino performed in *comédie*. We must remember that in 1512-1515 the literary comedy of the Cinquecento was still in its infancy, and the *commedia dell'arte* did not yet exist. The *comédie* Molino took part in may have been translations or adaptations of Latin works, or they may have been farce-like plays resembling the dialect comedy of Venetian and Paduan writers such as Calmo and Ruzzante. The latter is perhaps more likely. The comments of Molino's contemporaries strongly suggest that his own plays were of this kind². As for language, there is no evidence that Molino ever wrote a work entirely in Greek, or that he knew enough Greek to perform in one. It is much more likely that the performances were in Italian. The audience would consist of Italian merchants, soldiers, clerks and officials, and, no doubt, Italian-speaking members of the Greek community.

1. Coutelle, p. 18.

2. On Molino's plays, see Coutelle, pp. 14-5. On the Italian theatre, especially in Venice, in this period, see A. D'Ancona, *Origini del teatro italiano*, Torino 1891 (reprinted Roma 1966), vol. I, pp. 111-122; I. Sanesi, *La commedia*, seconda edizione riveduta e accresciuta, Milano (1954), vol. I, pp. 183ff. and 459-94; K. M. Lea, *Italian Popular Comedy*, Oxford 1934 (reprinted New York 1962), vol. I, pp. 231-54.

Another question which must be considered is whether Molino's performances can be connected in any way with the Greek Renaissance theatre which reached its climax at the end of the sixteenth century. It has been suggested that the Cretan comedy-writers were significantly influenced by Venetian dialect comedy¹. If, as we have suggested, Molino's plays were of a similar kind, it would be reasonable to suppose that Molino was a connecting link between Venetian comedy and the Cretan theatre. However, it seems to me that the Cretan comedies basically follow the tradition of the *commedia erudita*, and contain nothing which could only have been inspired by the Venetian plays. Although they show a preference for simple plots, which is a feature of some (not all) of the Venetian comedies, this tendency is in fact a common characteristic of Cretan literature, not at all restricted to comedy; we find it, for example, in the pastoral drama *Panoria* and in the romance *Erotokritos*. The Cretans' liking for lively comic action can be paralleled in specific literary comedies which they are known to have read, such as G. B. Marzi's *La Fanciulla*². The two most striking characteristics of Venetian comedy, namely the use of a variety of dialects and the realistic portrayal of peasant and plebeian characters, are not present to any significant extent in the Cretan comedies; there the Cretan literary language is used throughout (except for the speeches of the Pedant, who speaks his usual macaronic hotchpotch), and the cast of characters is that of the *commedia erudita* adapted, where necessary, to suit a Greek milieu. In view of this, I do not think we should assume any specific link between Venetian comedy and the Cretan theatre. The same applies to the plays of Molino, if, as we have suggested, these were of a similar kind.

Nevertheless, Molino has the distinction of taking part in what were probably the first performances of Renaissance Italian theatre in Greece. Events of this kind undoubtedly had an effect on the Greek population. A growing interest in and admiration for the Italian theatre was no doubt one of the motives which led Greeks, later in the century, to set about creating a Renaissance drama of their own. Thus, indirectly at least, Molino and his colleagues can be regarded as precursors of the Cretan theatre.

Birmingham

A. L. VINCENT

1. Α. Πολίτης, *Γεωργίου Χορτάτση Κατζούρμπος, κωμωδία*. Κριτική έκδοση, σημειώσεις, γλωσσάριο, Ήράκλειον 1964, pp. μζ'-να'.

2. A. L. Vincent, «Μιά πηγή του Κατζούρμπου», *Κρ. Χρ.* 20, 1966, 7-16.

NOTERELLE KALVIANE

I 8 str. 11

Μὲ ὑπερηφάνους πόδας
καταφρονητικούς
δὲν πατοῦν τὸ χρυσοῦν
συντριφθὲν τῶρα ζύγωθρον
τοῦ ὀρθοῦ νόμου;

In forma d'interrogativa retorica il poeta dice che i piedi superbi e sprezzanti dei tiranni calpestano la giustizia: quella che le genti attendono, pendule sotto i piedi di Dio (str. 2). L' ὀρθὸς νόμος è conculcato, laddove il sole governa il mondo μὲ δίκαιον νόμον (str. 5).

L'immagine del χρυσοῦν ζύγωθρον τοῦ νόμου non s'intende se non s'accerta il valore semantico di ζύγωθρον. Si tratta d'uno dei così detti *nomina instrumenti*, come ἄροτρον, βάρθρον (il formante -τρο-, -θρο- appare anche in *nomina loci* come βάραθρον o θέατρον). Nei lessici si registra il significato di 'chiavistello, catenaccio', accogliendo il quale, l'immagine kalviana sarebbe plausibile: la legge è un vincolo, spezzare i vincoli o i serrami della legge significa violarla, forzarla; il part. συντριφθέν, cioè il verbo συντρίβω (anche τρίβω) va benissimo per rompere una porta o anche un μοχλός. Etimologicamente, questo significato di ζύγωθρον risalirebbe a ζυγῶ nel senso di congiungere, far combaciare. Ma la cosa non è così semplice.

La fonte d'una valenza ζύγωθρον = μοχλός è un luogo di Polluce (X 26), che spiega nel senso di 'chiudere, inchiodare' il verbo ζυγοθρίζω (derivato da ζύγωθρον), ch'è un *hapax* in Ar. *Nub.* 745. Quando Socrate si sforza di dare insegnamenti a Strepsiade, gli dice fra l'altro: 'sta' tranquillo; se non capisci, ἀφεις ἄπελθε, κἄτα τὴν γνώμην πάλιν /κίνησον αὔθις, αὐτὸ καὶ ζυγώθρισον. Polluce spiega «e chiudi». I commentatori hanno respinto recisamente tale interpretazione, intendendo, con lo Σ ad l., 'soppesa, esamina, valuta' e sim., e sostenendo che il verbo aristofanESCO (d'origine tragica secondo Hermann, protagorea secondo Kock) deriva sì da ζύγωθρον, ma questo va inteso come *librae examen* (Van Leeuwen); è parola derivata da ζυγῶ, a sua volta derivato da ζυγόν = *iugum librae*.

Poiché ζύγωθρον è un *hapax* come ζυγοθρίζω, c'è da chiedersi se Kalvos lo abbia trovato in Polluce (si può dimostrare la provenienza di molti termini kalviani da lessici) e lo abbia assunto nel senso di 'serrame', che è l'unico che Polluce gli attribuisca (l'immagine sarebbe allora quella che s'è detta), ovvero, interpretando lo ζυγώθρισον aristofanESCO come 'pesa, esamina' o sim., secondo le indicazioni dello scoliaste e dei commentatori moderni, abbia tacitamente corretto l'accezione offerta da Polluce.

La seconda ipotesi è verisimile per due motivi: 1) nel ngr., il verbo ζυγίζω assume il significato corrente di 'pesare', che nel gr. classico non sembra attestato (mentre è largamente attestato ζυγόν = bilancia). Kalvos può quindi avere agevolmente sentito ζύγωθρον = ζυγαριά, ch'è l'equivalente offerto per es. da Gartaganis ad. l. 2) dalla tradizione classica gli veniva l'immagine della bilancia della Giustizia (o della Legge). Questa è detta in genere τάλαντον (o τάλαντα): δίκης κατέκειτο τάλαντα *Hymn. Merc.* 324 *al.* (anche Bacchyl. 17, 25, ignoto ovviamente a Kalvos, Δίκας ῥέπει τάλαντον). Le bilance di Dike o di Zeus sono d'oro (χρύσεια πατήρ ἐτίτανε τάλαντα Hom. *Il.* VIII 69; XXII 209). Ora, τάλαντον = ζυγόν, anzi in Aesch. *Suppl.* 822 si ha ζυγόν ταλάντου, e ζυγόν non è meno connesso di τάλαντον con l'idea della norma (ζυγόν μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν insegnava Pitagora *ap.* Diog. Laert. VIII 18).

Si direbbe anche che Kalvos abbia contaminato in questo passo diverse immagini eschilee: le bilance della giustizia (ῥοπή Δίκας *Cho.* 61) e il basamento (o l'altare) di Dike contro cui l'empio scalcia (*Ag.* 384, *Eum.* 541) o che conculca coi piedi (λᾶξ πέδοι πατούμενον si dice del σέβας di Zeus in *Cho.* 642). Quanto all'espressione ὀρθὸς νόμος, è quasi tautologica, perché nel *nomos* è implicita l'idea della rettitudine; ma è espressione classica, non solo nel doppiato d'avverbi ὀρθῶς καὶ νομίμως (Isocr. VII 28), ma per es. in Soph. *Ai.* 350 ἐμμένειν ὀρθῶ νόμῳ.

I 10 str. 25

Πρόσεχε τώρα· ὡς ἄνεμος
σφοδρὸς μέσα εἰς τὰ δάση
ὁ ἀλαλαγμὸς σηκώνεται·
ἄκουε τῶν πλεόντων
τὸ ἔϊα μάλα.

Inutile sottilizzare su ἀλαλαγμός, esclamazione di gioia, acclamazione e anche grido di guerra e di vittoria o, come qui, di esortazione e incoraggiamento: ἀλαλά, ἀλαλάζω hanno larga documentazione in testi classici in prosa e in versi. Si può fare una curiosa constatazione: nei versi di Kalvos, accanto ad ἀλαλαγμός, c'è ἔϊα, altro grido del gr. classico (nella forma εἶα 'orsù'), che si ritrova in lat. *eia*, *eia age*, etc. Com'è noto, i gridi *eia* e *alalà* furono più tardi accostati nella *Canzone del Carnaro* da G. D'Annunzio ('Siamo trenta d'una sorte / e trentuno con la morte / eia, l'ultima, alalà').

Kalvos, a proposito del grido ἔϊα μάλα, fa la seguente annotazione nel suo Πίναξ: «cri des matelots qui s'encouragent à l'ouvrage et que les an-

ciens appelaient κέλευσμα¹. *La mer Égée, et tous les ports de la Méditerranée retentissent aujourd'hui de ce même cri; mais les matelots grecs prononcent le premier α de μάλα si ouvert, qu'on croit entendre ἔϊα μῶλα*». Il traduttore francese Julien ripeté in una sua nota una parte della nota di Kalvos (fino a κέλευσμα). Ora, si ha l'impressione che Kalvos sia incorso in un grosso equivoco: non è vero che l'*α* di μάλα somigli a un *o*, è vero il contrario: la parola del κέλευσμα non è μάλα ma μόλα ο μῶλα, e l'*o* è tanto aperto da apparire *a*. Kalvos ha probabilmente creduto di riconoscere in ἔϊα μάλα qualche cosa di simile al grido (di sbigottimento, peraltro) che Eschilo attribuisce al Coro delle *Coefore* (v. 870) ἔα ἔα μάλα. Ma i marinai del Mediterraneo parlano italiano e quel μόλα (μῶλα) non è che l'ital. *molla*, imper. di *mollare*, cioè 'allenta!' Qualche cosa come 'e e e molla' sento ancora dire da chi tira qualche cosa e poi lascia, seguendo la cadenza concorde d'un ritmo. Che il grido autentico sia ἔγια μόλα e non ἔϊα μάλα afferma anche, per es., Spyros Melàs (*Ελληνική Δημοιοργία* n. 148, p. 391), dicendo: «come avrebbero potuto capire, i marinai di Idra, che τῶν πλεόντων τὰ² ἔϊα μάλα era il loro grido ἔγια μόλα?».

Melàs non si pone il problema dell'origine di quel μόλα, ma osserva che il verso di Kalvos è tanto più incomprensibile in quanto i marinai dicevano, e forse dicono ancora, ἔγια μόλα nel remeggio, mentre i navigli di Kalvos vanno a vela. Non so se l'osservazione sia interamente valida: 1) che i navigli di Kalvos vadano a vela sembra chiaro dal fatto che nella str. sg. si parla di πτερωμένα ἀδράχτια, e ἀδράχτι(ον) è spiegato dallo stesso Kalvos nel Πίναξ come «*vergue, pièce de bois longue et ronde, qui est attachée en travers au mât pour en soutenir la voile*»: si tratta dell'*antenna*, cioè di quella «lunga pertica di legno alla quale è attaccata la vela triangolare dei Latini» (G. Bustico, *Diz. del mare*, s.v.)³ Non è però detto che non ci siano anche navi che vanno a remi: nella str. 17 Kalvos aveva detto πλοῖα... λάμνοντα ἀδόξως. 2) che ἔϊα μόλα sia solo un κέλευσμα del remeggio e non anche delle manovre di vela, dovrebb'essere accertato. Non c'è dubbio che anche queste ultime manovre si eseguano 'a comando': basti ricordare un passo della *Laus Vitae* (I 1026) di D'Annunzio: «Sciogli!

1. In Aesch. *Pers.* 397 ἔπαισαν ἄλμην βρύχιον ἐκ κελεύματος è probabile che Kalvos leggesse κελεύματος con tutti i codd. dett. (*recte* M).

2. La lez. autentica è τό, mutata in τὰ nell'ed. di Seferis.

3. Che gli ἀδράχτια siano le stesse vele è mostrato, nella str. 26, da ἔξαπλώνονται. Del resto anche in it., per es. *randa* è «quella verga girevolea poppavi a dell'albero che serve a distendere il fondo della vela aurica» (Guglielmotti); per estensione è poi la stessa vela aurica di poppa.

Allarga! / Su le scotte di randa! / Borda randa! Su le drizze di flocco! / Issa flocco!»¹.

II 2 str. 16

ἀνάπτονται
ταχεῖαι, συχναὶ ἢ δλύμπαι
ἀστραπαὶ

È forse casuale, ma va segnalato, un sorprendente contatto verbale con Dante, *Par. XXV 81* «...dentro al vivo seno / di quello incendio tremolava un lampo / subito e spesso a guisa di baleno».

II 2 str. 19

ὡσάν ἀκτῖνα οὐράνιος,
ὡς φλόγα εἰς δάση εὐάνεμα
καίει τὰς καρδίας.

Sconcerta la forma εὐάνεμα (per εὐήνεμα), ingiustificabile in ion.-att. e nella κοινή e attinta certamente di peso da un testo dorico. Il testo è senza dubbio Soph. *Ai.* 197, dove l' ὕβρις dei nemici contro Aiace ἡρμᾶτ(αι) ἐν εὐανέμοις βάσσαις (che è più o meno lo stesso di εἰς δάση εὐάνεμα). Tutto il passo sofocleo può essere stato presente a Kalvos, visto che due versi sopra si legge ἄταν οὐρανίαν φλέγων. Ma io ritengo di poter avanzare una curiosa ipotesi: che Kalvos abbia avuto sott'occhio un'edizione di Sofocle con scoli: infatti lo Σ ad l. dice ὡς πῦρ ἐν εὐανέμοις βάσσαις, spiega cioè l'espressione sofoclea con una similitudine. Si direbbe che Σ *Ai.* 197 sia il punto di partenza della similitudine kalviana.

Padova

FILIPPO MARIA PONTANI

SAINT CATHERINE, OR PRINCE YPSILANTIS?

(IIN. 2)

An oil painting on a wood panel the painter of which has as yet remained anonymous was reproduced as an example of «Romanian painting in the feudal period» by Dinu C. Giurescu in *Studii și Cercetari de Istoria Artei*, 2, 1960, Inst. de Ist. Artei, Ed. Acad. R.P.R., ill. 1, p. 74. We find the same illustration on p. 106 of *Romanian Painting in Pictu-*

1. È un passo contestato di termini tecnici (D'Annunzio aveva a portata di mano il suo Guglielmotti); purtroppo non vi si trova *molla*. Altri gridi analoghi, come «Orza! Poggia!» altrove in D'Annunzio.

res, Meridiane Publishing House, Bucharest, 1971, with the title «Saint Catherine and the Hetairists».

The subject of this painting is described by Giurescu as follows: «...the upper register of the composition shows two steps leading to a dais supporting a throne on which is seated a feminine saint bearing a halo of rays. She holds a sceptre in the right hand and a big rose in the left, and wears a fur-lined mantle on her shoulders. The rose could indicate a representation of the Virgin Mary, were it not for the lack of initials which might enlighten us. In a note, Virgil Drăghiceanu affirms that the figure represents Saint Catherine without mentioning on what he bases this assumption¹. To the left, a group of clergymen... the high prelates wear the costume corresponding to their office... To the right, two groups of boyars... the first wear a high black head-covering, the second, grey. A flag bearing a cross is seen in the background. In the upper corner left, a man wearing a large turban points to a lion in front of him. We cannot specify their signification... The lower register comprises five groups of *hetairists*. In the middle we see a special battalion in black uniform wearing a high, black, almost cylindrical cap distinguished by a skull and crossed shinbones. This group represents fighters of the «Sacred Battalion» also known by the name of *macrophoroi* or *hierolochites*, the picked corps of the Hetairia. On the left, two more groups, the first wearing high conical caps; the second group on the left are wearing what looks like peasant garb;... On the right of the battalion we distinguish two corps with three kinds of uniform. In the first row, fighters in fustanella; in the second, two different kinds of uniform» (p. 74.).

«We draw the conclusion that in the representation of these figures the anonymous painter closely follows the realities of his time. The whole composition features the idea that the various categories of the land participate in the movement of the Hetairia, and that is why we see the high clergy and the boyars taking part. Moreover, the painting represents once more under this aspect another historical fact: that is, the actual participation of Moldavia's reigning prince and that of Wallachian boyars in the movement of Ypsilantis which they at its beginning supported with funds, arms, clothing and provisions» (p. 77).

We will examine three points in order to attempt the identification of the principal figure, that in the left corner, and exclude identification with Saint Catherine.

Our approach being purely iconographical, more need not be gone

1. Catalogul Colectiilor Monumentelor Istorice nr. inv. 1229/7272.

into here than that the «Philiki Etaireia» or «Friendly Society» founded in Odessa in 1814 and moving later to Constantinople, had as its object the liberation of Greece and other Balkan states from under Turkish sovereignty. With the name of «Supreme Authority» its four founders initiated with solemn oaths at secret ceremonies seven classes of members, from «chiefs or initiates» to «adopted brothers». The oath was taken by rulers of provinces, klephts, clergymen, landowners, merchants, seamen and peasants. «The four chiefs of the society decided it was necessary to find a leader of standing and power... One of them, Emmanuel Xanthos, therefore approached the celebrated Prince Alexander Ypsilantis, a Phanariot Greek whose father had been hospodar of Moldavia and Wallachia, and was himself a Major-General in the Russian army and *aide-de-camp* to the Czar. His military experience was undoubted ... He accepted Xanthos's offer, resigned his army commission and became 'General Commissioner of the Supreme Authority'»¹.

We will start with the hierophantic vocabulary and imagery of the Hetairia, which lead to what we believe to be the wrong interpretation of the figure on the throne, pass on to the emblematic meaning of the man with the lion, then we shall try to show the improbability of representation of any saint and of Saint Catherine in particular, demonstrating the possibility of recognizing in the enthroned figure the personification of the Hetairia embodied by its elected chief himself.

When meeting with such terms as «initiated chiefs», «sacred battalion», «hierolochites», counting Bishop Germanos among the leaders, also considering that the cross-bearing standard had been raised at the monastery of Agia Lavra, and noticing the hierarchy of the sharply divided groups of the organization, it no longer seems so difficult to see at its top the deified chief set above the «Supreme Authority» itself embodying the Hetairia, and thus crossing the line of separation between mere humanity and near divinity!

On the other hand, it is much more difficult to imagine a collective featuring of the Friendly Society without its elected hero. Grouping of the separate cells of initiates around young Ypsilantis appears quite logical.

As to the figure of the turbaned man pointing to the lion, we believe he might stand for Ali Pasha, the «Lion of Janina», an Albanian and a provincial ruler in the Ottoman Empire whose almost autonomous despotate included in 1814 the whole of Epirus, Thessaly, western Macedo-

1. Kenneth Young, *The Greek Passion*, Dent, London, 1969, p. 115.

nia and the greater part of central Greece, who had moved to open revolt against Sultan Mahmoud II. This seems to have led Ypsilantis to proceed with a rebellion against the Turks based mainly on the Principalities Moldavia and Wallachia, plus expected Serbian support¹. In this light Ali Pasha would appear as an ally, for the imperial forces would be occupied with crushing the rebel's attempt. If we accept this interpretation, we gain a *terminus ante quem* for dating the picture in Ali's defeat at Janina in February 1822.

There can be no question of Saint Catherine, a feminine saint who might, together with Saint Barbara, have been chosen as patron saint by fighters at some time or other, for none of the known attributes is present: no spiked wheel for one, no cannon balls or tower for the other, while in exchange we have the sceptre of authority, the dalmatic, the ermine-lined mantle — and we know that in states under the suzerainty of the Porte the mantle was a token of investiture for their princes. The rose, emblematic for Paradise, becomes the symbol of supreme attainment promised to the cause.

The dilemma of the mediocre craftsman, more than probably used to the painting of icons according to rigid patterns, when suddenly confronted by a new theme to be executed to order, is all too evident. He quite naturally reverted to his own knowledge, transposing familiar groups traditionally figuring in representations of the Last Judgment — elect and doomed —, Synods with seated figures of kings, and in this particular case to a representation of Sophia, the Divine Wisdom, like that which may be seen sitting on a sumptuous and winged throne, wearing the dalmatic, crowned and aureoled, as on a late Russian icon dated 1823², with the misleading and ambiguous result³.

We well know that by recognizing a symbol explained at a certain moment, the spectator is aware of the particular emotional charge a re-

1. John Campbell and Philip Sherrard, *Modern Greece*, E. Benn, London 1968, p. 61-62. [Ypsilantis] «...believed he could not afford to miss the opportunity of a Balkan alliance with Vladimirescu's Romanians and Ali Pasha's Albanian Muslims», *ibid.* p. 65.

2. Heinz Skrobuche, *Icons*, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh and London, 1963, trans. from «Die Botschaft der Ikonen», Buch-Kunstverlag Ettal, Pl. 81.

3. Youthful saints represented like the archangels with rounded features and long hair gathered on the nape of the neck do not differ much from women, and we must bear in mind there is no question of realistic portraiture. I thank Professor Valakopoulos for his kindly advice.

presentation may carry, and we are tempted to ask if such a panel could have served to make oaths more binding when pronounced in front of it?

This we believe to be the way of reading the meaning of the picture which alludes to a historical fact, yet presents it allegorically for propaganda reasons, and which is no truly religious icon.

Eastbourne, Sussex

MARIA GOLESCU

Ο ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΓΡΑΦΕΑΣ ΠΑΛΙΑΣ ΛΙΘΟΓΡΑΦΙΑΣ

(ΠΙΝ. 3)

Στή μελέτη μου «Μιά άγνωστη λαϊκή λιθογραφία τοῦ άπαγχονισμοῦ τοῦ Γρηγορίου Ε΄» (*Ελληνικά*) 24, 1971, 390-396), εἶχα ἐξετάσει μιὰ παλιὰ λαϊκή λιθογραφία, ἡ ὁποία, ὅπως ἔδειξα, εἶναι ἐμπνευσμένη ἀπό τὸ μυθιστόρημα τοῦ Στεφάνου Ξένου *Ἡ Ἡρώϊς τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἐπαναστάσεως* καὶ τυπωμένη μερικὰ χρόνια μετὰ τὴν ἔκδοσή του. Μερικοὺς μῆνες μετὰ τὴ δημοσίευση τῆς μελέτης μου, ξεφυλλίζοντας τὴν ἔκδοση τῆς Ἐμπορικῆς Τραπεζῆς τὴν ἀφιερωμένη στὸν λαϊκὸ ζωγράφο Θεόφιλο¹, εἶδα ἀνάμεσα στὰ ἔργα του καὶ ἀντίγραφο τῆς γνωστῆς μου λιθογραφίας, καμωμένο στὰ 1928 στὴ Μυτιλήνη, ποῦ ἀνήκει σήμερα στὴ συλλογὴ Ε. Τέτιαδε, τοῦ γνωστοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ καὶ κριτικοῦ τῆς τέχνης Στρατῆ Ἐλευθεριάδη, ποῦ εἶναι ἐγκατεστημένος ἀπὸ νέος στὸ Παρίσι. Ὁ Ἐλευθεριάδης, ποῦ εἶναι καὶ συμπατριώτης τοῦ Θεόφιλου, εἶχε ἐπισκεφθῆ τὸν λαϊκὸ ζωγράφο στὰ 1929 στὴ Μυτιλήνη καὶ τοῦ ζήτησε νὰ ἀγοράσει μερικὰ ἀπὸ τὰ ἔργα του². Ἐνα λοιπὸν ἀπ' αὐτὰ ποῦ ἀγόρασε φαίνεται νὰ εἶναι καὶ ἡ εἰκόνα με θέμα τὸν ἀπαγχονισμὸ τοῦ πατριάρχη Γρηγορίου Ε΄.

Ἡ εἰκόνα τοῦ Θεόφιλου (Πίν. 3), διαστάσεων 1,55×1,255, εἶναι σχεδιασμένη με κάρβουνο καὶ τὰ χαρακτηριστικὰ τῶν παρισταμένων προσώπων εἶναι περισσότερο ζωηρὰ καὶ καθαρὰ ἀπὸ τὸ πρότυπο. Οἱ πτυχῆς τῶν ἐνδυμασιῶν φαίνονται περισσότερο τονισμένες, ἐνῶ οἱ κινήσεις, οἱ χειρονομίες καὶ οἱ θέσεις τῶν προσώπων καὶ στὶς δύο εἰκόνες εἶναι σχεδὸν ὅμοιες. Ἡ εἰκόνα χωρίζεται σὲ δύο ζῶνες. Στὴν ἄνω ζώνη, με τὴν ἐπιγραφή «Ὁ Πατριάρχης Γρηγόριος Ε΄. Προσφέρω τὴν ζωὴν μου διὰ τὸν βωμὸν τῆς πατρίδος. Ὁ Πατριάρχης Γρ. κρεμάται τὸ 1821», παριστάνεται ὁ ἀπαγχονισμὸς τοῦ πατριάρχη, ὅπως καὶ στὸ πρότυπο. Λεῖπει ἐδῶ ὅμως τὸ ἐγκόλπιο με τὴ μορφή τοῦ πατριάρχη. Τὴ θέση του ἔχει πάρει ἡ ἐπιγραφή: «Ἔργον Θεοφίλου Χατζημιχαήλ, 1928». Ἀπὸ τὰ ἑπτὰ πρόσωπα, τὰ ὁποῖα βρίσκονται καὶ ἐδῶ ἀριστερὰ ἀπὸ τὸν πατριάρχη,

1. Θεόφιλος, ἔκδοση Ἐμπορικῆς Τραπεζῆς, Ἀθῆναι 1966.

2. ἔ.ά., σ. 20.

κατονομάζονται μόνο τὰ πέντε, δηλαδή ὁ καρακοντζής, ὁ Ἐβραῖος, ὁ Καλεντζής, ὁ Σουλτάν Μπιαζής καὶ ὁ κατσίβελος. Ὁ Θεόφιλος ἔχει μεταβάλει λίγο τὶς ὀνομασίες τῶν προσώπων (π.χ. *καρακοντζής* ἀντὶ *καρακουλουκτσής*), ἐνῶ ὁ *μποσταντζής* τοῦ προτύπου ἐδῶ ἔχει τὴν ὀνομασία *Σουλτάν Μπιαζής*. Τὸ ὄνομα αὐτὸ εἶναι φανταστικό, γιατί τὴν ἐποχὴ τοῦ ἀπαγχονισμοῦ τοῦ Γρηγορίου Ε', βασίλευε ὁ Μαχμουτ Β' (1803-1839). Ἀσφαλῶς τὸ ὄνομα *Μπιαζής* τὸ ἔγραψε ἔχοντας ἀκουστὰ τὸ *Βαγιαζίτ*. Πάντως τὰ πρόσωπα, τὰ ὁποῖα βρίσκονται μετὰ τοῦ Καλεντζή καὶ τοῦ Σουλτάν Μπαζή, καθὼς καὶ αὐτὸ κοντὰ στὸν κατσίβελο, δὲν κατονομάζονται, ὅπως καὶ στὴ λαϊκὴ λιθογραφία. Τὸ ἴδιο συμβαίνει καὶ μὲ τοὺς δύο Τούρκους ποὺ βρίσκονται δεξιὰ ἀπὸ τὸν κρεμασμένο πατριάρχη.

Ἡ κάτω ζώνη διαιρεῖται σὲ δύο μέρη καὶ εἰκονίζει δύο σκηνές. Λεῖπει ἐδῶ τὸ τρίτο μέρος, τὸ ὁποῖο ὑπάρχει στὸ πρότυπο καὶ ἀπεικονίζει τὴν παραλαβὴ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ πατριάρχη ἀπὸ τὸν Κεφαλλονίτη πλοίαρχο Σκιάβο. Στὸ ἀριστερὸ μέρος τῆς κάτω ζώνης παριστάνεται, ὅπως καὶ στὴ λιθογραφία, ἡ μετάληψη τῶν φυλακισμένων ἀρχιερέων ἀπὸ τὸν πατριάρχη Γρηγόριο Ε' καὶ τὸν ἀνεψιὸ του Θρασύβουλο. Ἴσως νὰ ὀφείλεται σὲ ὀπτικὸ λάθος τοῦ Θεόφιλου ὁ μικρότερος ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἀρχιερέων, οἱ ὁποῖοι ἐδῶ εἶναι ἔντεκα, ἐν ἀντιθέσει πρὸς τὴ λιθογραφία, ὅπου παρουσιάζονται δώδεκα. Κάτω ἀκριβῶς ἀπὸ τὴ σκηνὴ αὐτὴ ὑπάρχουν δύο ἐπιγραφές, ἡ πρώτη ἀριστερὰ ἀναφέρει: «Ἀνιψηδὸς τοῦ Πατριάρχου Γρ. Θρασύβουλος φύλαξ τοῦ Ρωσικοῦ προξενείου ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει λαβὼν τὴν εὐχὴν τοῦ πατριάρχου διὰ τὴν μάχην τὸ 1821». Ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ αὐτὴ δὲν ὑπάρχει στὸ πρότυπο. Στὸ ἀντίγραφό του ὁ Θεόφιλος παρουσιάζει τὸν Θρασύβουλο ὡς φύλακα τοῦ ρωσικοῦ προξενείου. Ἡ πληροφορία αὐτὴ δὲν ὑπάρχει στὸ μυθιστόρημα τοῦ Στέφανου Ξένου. Νομίζω ὅτι εἶναι προσθήκη τοῦ Θεόφιλου, ὁ ὁποῖος ὅπωςδὴποτε θὰ εἶχε κάποιο λόγο νὰ τὴν ἀναγράψῃ. Εἶναι πολὺ πιθανὸ πὼς ὁ Θεόφιλος εἶχε ὑπόψη του τὴ δικὴ του θητεία ὡς θυροφύλακα στὸ Ἑλληνικὸ προξενεῖο τῆς Σμύρνης καὶ ἦταν παρασυρμένος ἀπὸ τὴν ἀγάπη καὶ τὸν ἐνθουσιασμό του πρὸς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἐπειδὴ γι' αὐτὸν τὸ Ἑλληνικὸ προξενεῖο τῆς Σμύρνης σήμαινε κάτι τὸ ἱερὸ καὶ σπουδαῖο. Ὁ ἴδιος μάλιστα σὲ μιὰ προσωπογραφία του, δίπλα στὸ ὄνομά του, εἶχε γράψῃ: «θυροφύλαξ (καβάσης) Προξενείου Σμύρνης»¹.

Ἡ δευτέρη ἐπιγραφὴ, ἡ ὁποία βρίσκεται δεξιότερα, ἔχει ὡς ἐξῆς: «Φυλακισμένοι ἀρχιερεῖς ἐν Γαλατῶ οἵτινες λαμβάνουσι ἀπὸ τὸν Πατριάρχη τῶν ἀχράντων μυστηρίων τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ θανάτου τους». Ὅπως βλέπουμε, ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ περιγράφει τὸ περιεχόμενον τῆς εἰκόνας ἀναλυτικότερα ἀπὸ τὸ ἀντίστοιχο τῆς λιθογραφίας καὶ μάλιστα ὀρίζει ὅτι ἡ σκηνὴ αὐτὴ διαδραματίστηκε λίγον πρὶν ἀπὸ τὴν ἐκτέλεση τῶν ἀρχιερέων. Τὸ δεξιὸ καὶ τελευταῖο μέρος τῆς κάτω

1. Θεόφιλος, ἔ. ἀ., σ. 14-15.

ζώνης εικονίζει πῶς οἱ Ἑβραῖοι παρουσιάστηκαν ἔμπρὸς στὸν Σουλτάν Μπιαζή καὶ τοῦ ζήτησαν τὸν νεκρὸ πατριάρχη. Οἱ ἐπιγραφές τῆς ζώνης αὐτῆς διαφέρουν ἀπὸ τῆς λαϊκῆς λιθογραφίας, δηλαδὴ τοῦ προτύπου, ἀλλὰ γενικὰ δὲν ἔχουν ἀλλάξει πολὺ.

Ποῦ βρῆκε τὴ λιθογραφία ὁ Θεόφιλος; Στὴ Μυτιλήνη ἢ στὸ ἐλληνικὸ προξενεῖο τῆς Σμύρνης; Μοῦ φαίνεται μᾶλλον στὴ Μυτιλήνη, κρεμασμένη στὸν τοῖχο κανενὸς καφενεῖου ἢ σπιτιοῦ. Καὶ στὴν περίπτωση αὐτὴ δὲν εἴμαστε μακριὰ ἀπὸ τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολη, ὅπου, κατὰ τὴν γνώμη μου, τυπώθηκε ἡ λιθογραφία.

Θεσσαλονίκη

Κ. Α. ΒΑΚΑΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ

ΒΩΜΟΣ - ΒΟΥΝΟΣ

Στὸ *Χρονικὸν περὶ τῶν Τούρκων σουλτάνων* (ἔκδ. Γ. Θ. Ζώρα, Ἀθήνα 1958), ἔργο τοῦ 16ου αἰῶνα, στὴ σ. 49, 2, ὅπου γίνεται λόγος γιὰ τὴ σύγκρουση τῶν δυὸ γιῶν τοῦ Τούρκου σουλτάνου Μπαγιαζίτη, τῶν ἀδελφῶν Μεχεμέτη καὶ Μουσαῖ, καὶ γιὰ τὴν ἤττα τοῦ πρώτου ἀπὸ τὸν δεύτερο, ἀναφέρεται: «Καὶ ὡσὰν εἶδε ὁ Μεχεμέτης πὼς ἐνικήθη, ἔφυγε καὶ ἐγλύτωσε· καὶ ἐδιάβη εἰς τὰ μέρη τῆς Πόλης. Καὶ ἐστάθη καὶ ἐμεταμάζωξε τὰ φουσσᾶτα του, νὰ πάγη νὰ μεταπολεμήσῃ μὲ τὸν Μουσαῖ. Καὶ οἱ Ρωμαῖοι ἀπεροῦσανε τὰ φουσσᾶτα του ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀνατολὴ εἰς τὴν Ρούμελη καὶ ἐβάλλασι πολλὴ δύναμι εἰς τὸ ἀπέραμα τῆς Καλλίπολης καὶ εἰς τὸν βωμὸ ὅπου τὸν λέγουσι Ἱερὸ, εἰς τὸ πέραμα τῆς Καλλίπολης».

Τὸ Ἱερὸ παρουσιάζει διάφορα τοπογραφικὰ προβλήματα, γιὰτι καὶ ὁ Λ. Χαλκοκονδυλῆς (Β' 99, 14-16) ἀναφέρει Ἱερὸν στὴν ἀσιατικὴ ἀκτὴ: «Ἔστι γὰρ τοῦτο τῆς Προποντίδος στενωτάτον ἐπιεικῶς καὶ πύργος ἔνεστιν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ Ἱερὸν καλούμενος». Ὁ Ἰδιος (Α' 169, 16-17) ἀναφέρει: «τόν τε Ἑλλησποντον ἐπετήρουν καὶ τὸ ἐν Προποντίδι Ἱερὸν», ὅπου δὲν φαίνεται γιὰ ποῦ Ἱερὸν πρόκειται. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ *Χρονικὸν περὶ τῶν Τούρκων σουλτάνων* (60, 23) ἀναφέρει ὅτι καὶ ἀργότερα ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ σουλτάνου Μουράτ, ὁ Μουσταφᾶς «ἐμάζωξε φουσσᾶτο Τούρκους καὶ ἀπέρασε καὶ ἐδιάβη εἰς τὴν Ἀνατολὴ καὶ ἐπῆρε τὸ Ἱερὸν μὲ τὴν βοήθειαν τῶν Ρωμαίων», ὅπου εἶναι φανερὸ πὼς πάλι πρόκειται γιὰ τοποθεσίαν τῆς ἀσιατικῆς παραλίας.

Ὁ ἐκδότης τοῦ *Χρονικοῦ*, στὸν Πίνακα Ὀνομάτων, σ. 354, ταυτίζει ἀόριστα τὶς δυὸ τοποθεσίες μὲ τὴ σημείωση: «Ἱερὸν, τοποθεσία παρὰ τὴν Προποντίδα». Παραμένει ὅμως πρόβλημα ἂν πρόκειται γιὰ δυὸ συνώνυμες τοποθεσίες, μιὰ δηλ. στὴν εὐρωπαϊκὴ καὶ μιὰ στὴν ἀσιατικὴ παραλία τῆς Προπον-

τίδας, ἢ μήπως πρόκειται γιὰ μιὰ καὶ μόνη, ποὺ ἡ ἀκριβὴς θέση της συγχέεται ἀπὸ τοὺς χρονογράφους.

Πάντως εἶναι βέβαιο πὼς στὸ χωρίο τοῦ *Χρονικοῦ* ποὺ ἐξετάζουμε ἐδῶ τὸ *Ἱερὸν* βρίσκεται «εἰς τὸ πέραμα τῆς *Καλλιπόλης*», δηλ. στὴν εὐρωπαϊκὴ παραλία τῆς Προποντίδας, ἐπάνω στὴ Θράκη, ἄρα δὲν μπορεῖ νὰ εἶναι ἄλλο ἀπὸ τὸ γνωστὸ *Ἱερὸν ὄρος* (τουρκ. *Tekir dağ*), ποὺ ἐκτείνεται κατὰ μῆκος τῆς θρακικῆς ἀκτῆς, ἀπὸ τὴν Καλλιπόλη ὡς τὴ Ραιδεστό, καὶ ποὺ τὰ χρόνια ἐκεῖνα ἦταν ὑχυρωμένο μὲ δυνατὸ φρούριο. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ τὸ «ὄρος» στὴ λαϊκὴ γλώσσα τοῦ ἀνώνυμου χρονογράφου μας πρέπει νὰ ἦταν τὸ βουνὸ ἢ ὁ βουνὸς (ποὺ σώζεται μὲ τὸν ἀρχαῖο ἀρσενικὸ τύπο του σὲ μερικὰ σημερινὰ ἰδιώματα), νομίζω πὼς ἡ γραφὴ *βωμὸ* ποὺ μᾶς δίνει ὁ μοναδικὸς κώδικας 111 τῆς Βαρβερνῆς Βιβλιοθήκης, δὲν ἔχει τὴ θέση του, οὔτε ὡς λέξη στὴ γλώσσα τοῦ χρονογράφου, οὔτε ὡς ἔννοια στὴν τοποθεσία αὐτῆ, καὶ πὼς πρέπει νὰ διαβαστῆ: *εἰς τὸν βουνὸν ὁποῦ τὸν λέγουσι Ἱερό.*

Θεσσαλονίκη

N. Π. ΑΝΔΡΙΩΤΗΣ