

ABSTRACTS – ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΕΙΣ

K. OIKONOMAKOS, *Critical Observations on the Nicander's Alexipharmaca*.

After a collation and classification of the manuscripts as well as a critical examination of their readings, the author was drawn to the conclusion that the text of the *Alexipharmaca* on which its last editor (A. S. F. Gow, 1953) settled ought to be modified at some sixty points. This article examines twenty-four instances where the author suggests amendments to the manuscript tradition, prefers other readings or, contrary to Gow, follows the manuscript tradition or adopts solutions already proposed by other scholars.

A. D. MAVROUDIS, *The Classification of the Works of Galen in his Treatise on his own Works* (Observations on *Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων*).

In the first part of this article, the two ways in which Galen classified his works in his treatise on his own works *Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων* are identified. In chapters 1-2, Galen classifies his works on the basis of four periods of time: his apprenticeship in Pergamum and Smyrna and his first and second sojourns in Rome. In chapters 3-17, the classification is by type and these chapters the author has arranged into four units: a) units 3-5; works are classified by content, ostensibly on the basis of the parts of medicine, those which were in practice accepted by Galen, because in theory he was not bound by any formalised division of medicine into parts; b) chapters 6-10: the treatises which are recorded refer to commentaries on works by doctors or critiques of the views of doctors or schools of medicine; c) chapters 11-16: the treatises with a philosophical content are listed; and d) chapter 17: the philological treatises are enumerated. This division into four units is based mainly on the more particular contents of these chapters; it is reinforced, however, by the author's observation that it was in some such similar manner that Galen writes about the contents of his works in chapters 2-5 of his earlier work *Περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων*.

The second part of the article examines the contents of the problematically-transmitted 3rd chapter (*Περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀνατομικὴν θεωρίαν*) of *Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων*, as well as the order of chapters in this treatise. It is noted that the fourth part of the 3rd chapter cannot belong thematically to that, but rather to a chapter recording the diagnostic treatises and which is missing from the work as published. On the basis, therefore, of the diagnostic content of the last part of the third chapter and the division of medicine accepted by Galen in practice, it is claimed that the 3rd chapter has been transmitted in truncated form rather than with a gap in the middle, as the editor of the text believes, while its last part, as published, constitutes the surviving part of the untitled 4th chapter concerning the diagnostic treatises.

B. A. FYNTIKOGLOU, *At tenuis non gloria: Poetic Glory and the Delicate Muse in the Callimachean Tradition.*

The first part of the article suggests that it is possible to identify a parallel for the emphatic antithesis *in tenui labor; at tenuis non gloria* (Virg., *Georg.* 4.6-7) in Callimachus, *Hymn* 2.10-11: ὅς μιν ἴδῃ, μέγας οὔτος, ὅς οὐκ ἴδε, λιτὸς ἐκείνος. / ὀφόμεθ', ὦ Ἐκάεργε, καὶ ἐσσόμεθ' οὔποτε λιτοί. Although “it is unusual for Callimachus to use μέγας as a term of approbation” (Williams), it ought to be recognised that these verses correspond to the advice of Apollo, ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον θρέψαι (fr. 1.23-4 Pf.): great size is appropriate to religious context, provided it is in accordance with divine magnitude. At the same time, it can be said that the theophany of the Prologue of *Aetia* fulfils the wish expressed in the *Hymn*. Virgil combines two scenes: he addresses Apollo in a formally ritualistic manner, but calls on him as the protector god of poetry, of the new Hellenistic poetry —the whole staging is a reminder of *topoi* in the Callimachean programme. In this way, the poetological function of the theophany in *Aetia* is rendered in the formal diction of Callimachus' *Hymn* 2.10-11. Virgil's aim is to show that *delicate* poetry can be successful and that its authors can achieve glory.

Callimachean poetry and poetics favour terms such as μικρός, ὀλίγος, λεπτός etc. Nevertheless, any poet naturally expects great success from his work. The contradiction between critical terminology and the characterisation of poetic glory within the frame-work of New Poetry is the subject of the second part of the article. Neither Callimachus nor Catullus were interested in defining the magnitude of the glory they expected. Propertius, on the other hand, often refers to the question of his personal repu-

tation, on occasion using terminology that is clearly anti-Callimachean (*El.* 1.7, 3.1, 3.2). He refers to poetic glory in a funeral context and transposes it to the future because of the opposition of the official state towards the love elegy. Thus the contradiction under examination is linked with the conventions of the elegiac genre. Horace refers to the same antithesis when he likens the glory he is expecting from the *Musa tenuis* with the glory given by the pyramids (C. 3.30) and seeks the degree of size which elsewhere (e.g. C. 3.29.10) he rejects. In this way he illustrates the Virgilian declaration *in tenui labor; at tenuis non gloria*.

I. D. POLEMIS, *Georgios Maistor Hagiotessarakontites*.

This article examines two texts by the teacher Georgios Hagiotessarakontites which refer to a fire which occurred in Constantinople during the reign of Manuel I Komnenos (1143-1180). The date of the fire is determined on the basis of a reference in the first text to a certain Ioannis Megas Logistis and Protonotarios, who is identified with Ioannis from Puntze, a well-known courtier of Manuel I.

DIM. A. CHRISTIDIS, *The “Κῶος ποιητής”: a recantation*.

The author revises his view, formerly expressed in his article «The “Κῶος ποιητής” of Niketas Choniates», *Ἑλληνικά* 35 (1984) 70-73, that in the passage of Niketas Choniates’ *Χρονική διήγησις*, p. 491,3-6 van Dieten, there is a reference to Philo, “Ὅτι ἄτρεπτον τὸ θεῖον 35-36 (II p. 64,1-10 Cohn-Wendland), and that the phrase ὁ Κῶός φησι ποιητής constitutes an erroneous reference to the poet Philetas from Cos, perhaps because Choniates knew Philo’s passage from some anthology, in which the text in question was attributed to the poet Philetas (the confusion is understandable because of the similarity of the names).

The “recantation” is due to the later realisation that at this particular point Niketas Choniates draws from the Hippocratic *Ἀφορισμοὶ* 1,3 (IV pp. 458,10-460,3 Littré), but he uses the simple *ἔξις* instead of the Hippocratic *ἐνέξια*, thus misleading some translators of the passage into a mistaken understanding and translation, and the author of this article into a mistaken identification of the reminiscence.

This Hippocratic passage is also mentioned by many other writers (Plutarch, Galen, Basil of Caesaria, Gregory Nazianzinos, Palladios, Olympiodoros, Theophylactos Simocates, Theophilos Protospatharios, Pseudo-Damasios, an Anonymous Byzantine doctor, Eustathios of Thessaloniki, Scholia

on Pindar, Demetrios Triclinios, Gregory Acindynos and Manuel II Palaeologos), whose texts are presented chronologically in this article, so as to make clear the many and various ways in which this particular Hippocratic teaching has been interpreted and used.

CR. LUCIANI, *Οι «διασκευές» στο Κρητικό Θέατρο: G. B. Giraldi Cinzio μεταξύ της Φαίδρας του Μπότσα και της Ερωφίλης του Χορτάτση.*

Η παρούσα μελέτη, προκαταρκτική σε κριτική έκδοση του έργου, για την τραγωδία *Fedra* του νεαρού κρητικού ποιητή Φ. Μπότσα, που εκδόθηκε μόνο το 1578 στη Βενετία, αποβλέπει κυρίως να διαπιστώσει τις σχέσεις, αν τυχόν υπάρχουν, ανάμεσα σ' αυτήν και την *Ερωφίλη* του Γ. Χορτάτση. Από μια διεξοδικότερη συγκριτική ανάλυση των δύο κειμένων, που ήδη αποπειράθηκε μερικά ο Κ. Σάθας το 1879, προκύπτει πως, πραγματικά, η ιταλική τραγωδία *Orbecche* του Giraldi Cinzio, την οποία, ως γνωστό, είχε υπόψη του ο Χορτάτσης, για τη συγγραφή της *Ερωφίλης*, αποτέλεσε μοντέλο και για το έργο του Μπότσα. Ο συγγραφέας καταλήγει στο φυσικό συμπέρασμα πως και οι δύο κρητικοί συγγραφείς αντλούν, λιγότερο ή περισσότερο ελαφρά, από το ίδιο πρότυπο ανεξάρτητα ο ένας από τον άλλο.

G. SAUNIER, *Ο μύθος της Αλεξάνδρειας στα ελληνικά δημοτικά τραγούδια.*

Ανάμεσα στους μυθικούς τόπους και πόλεις που απαντούν στα δημοτικά τραγούδια, η Αλεξάνδρεια (και μαζί της όλη η Αίγυπτος) αποτελεί αντικείμενο πρωτότυπου μύθου.

Απ' όλες τις λειτουργίες των μυθικών χωρών, η Αλεξάνδρεια και τα υποκατάστατά της αποδίδουν ξεχωριστό βάρος στη σχέση τους με το θάνατο. Η Αλεξάνδρεια παίζει, βέβαια, όπως και άλλες πόλεις, τον ρόλο του σημείου του ορίζοντα, και συγκαταλέγεται ανάμεσα στις θρυλικές και επιθυμητές πόλεις που προσφέρονται στο μωρό στα νανουρίσματα, δεν εμφανίζεται όμως ποτέ σαν τόπος απ' όπου φέρνουν πολύτιμα αντικείμενα, ενώ ο μόνος μάστορας που φέρνουν από κει είναι ένας μαρμαράς για να φτιάξει κιβούρι. Η Αλεξάνδρεια λειτουργεί, επίσης, στα εγκώμια ως σύμβολο ομορφιάς και τελειότητας, αλλά το επίθετο *αλεξανδρινός* φαίνεται να χρησιμοποιείται κατά προτίμηση σε σχέση με τον θάνατο και τον κάτω κόσμο. Η Αλεξάνδρεια είναι, επίσης, μια από τις ξένες χώρες όπου αναπτύσσεται η ολέθρια μαγεία της ξενιτιάς, που συγγενεύει κι αυτή με τον θάνατο. Τέλος, τρία αφηγηματικά τραγούδια παρουσιάζουν την Αλεξάνδρεια ως τόπο της επαφής με τον κόσμο της ετερότητας, ίσως καμιά φορά της μυητικής επαφής, συχνότερα όμως της μοιραίας επαφής, ως το κατώφλι του άλλου κόσμου.

Λόγοι δυο ειδών μπορούν να εξηγήσουν αυτό το φαινόμενο. Οι πρώτοι είναι ιστορικής φύσης και αφορούν στον ρόλο που έπαιξε η Αλεξάνδρεια ως θύρα μιας δυσπρόσιτης ηπείρου, κατά τους αιώνες που δημιουργήθηκαν τα δημοτικά τραγούδια. Οι πιο σημαντικοί, όμως, είναι μυθικής φύσης. Αφορούν την προσωπικότητα του ιδρυτή της πόλης, του Μεγαλέξανδρου: στη λαϊκή παράδοση, εκείνος είναι κατ' εξοχήν ο ήρωας που η δράση του είναι εξ ολοκλήρου μια αναζήτηση του Άλλου. Στην Αλεξάνδρεια, τόπο των μυθικών του καταβολών, βρισκόταν και ο τάφος του.

G. FARINOU-MALAMATARI, *Readers of Novels in the Novels of Xenopoulos.*

In a considerable number of novels written by Xenopoulos, male and, particularly, female characters read novels. The aim of the present paper is to show that the list of authors which appears in Xenopoulos' fiction functions as a signifier of the tastes of a certain period, shows that the reading of novels is profession-, class- and gender-determined, brings out the attitudes of official criticism concerning morality and obscenity, high and popular literature and alludes to the various modes of fiction (Romantic, Naturalistic) among which Xenopoulos would like to place his own novels. All the above makes a context within which Xenopoulos' own output should be read and appreciated. Finally, references to and quotations from other novels may engage the reader in an interpretative activity, ensuring that meaning must be constructed rather than passively extracted.

NOTES

TH. SIAPKARAS-PITSILLIDÈS, *Errors in Some Publications on the Love Poems in Cod. Marc. IX,32* — The article is a response to three recent publications by Else Mathiopoulou-Tornaritou and one by Vincenzo Pecoraro on the collection of Cypriot love poems preserved in Cod. Marc. IX,32. The author, drawing on her extensive previous work on these texts, points out and corrects some of the arbitrary conclusions with which the above-mentioned articles abound. In the course of the article, the influence of Petrarch and his circle on Renaissance and 16th cent. poetry is pointed out, short references to the rules of Italian versification of the period are made, and the basic rules which ought to govern the editing of texts are repeated. Lastly, the author points out the dangers involved in introducing hyper-corrections to a perfectly sound text by editors who fail to understand its meaning.