

## ABSTRACTS - ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΕΙΣ

G. L. KONIARIS, *Πάλι για τον δεύτερο Ολυμπιονίχο του Πινδάρου.*

Το παρόν δημοσίευμα είναι επέκταση άρθρου μου (*Ελληνικά* 39, 1988, 237-269) για τον δεύτερο *Ολυμπιονίχο* του Πινδάρου, και αποσκοπεί στο να θεμελιώσει πιο πειστικά γνώμες που εξέφρασα εκεί και να αντιμετωπίσει απόψεις του καθηγητή M. M. Willcock στο βιβλίο του *Pindar, Victory odes ...* [Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics], Cambridge 1995. Η πολεμική μου εναντίον των απόψεων του Willcock είναι και πολεμική εναντίον της σχολής Bundy στην οποία ανήκει ο Willcock.

Το πρώτο μέρος του άρθρου ανατρέπει κύριες θέσεις του Willcock αναφορικά με τη συνολική ερμηνεία του *Ολυμπιονίχου*, ενώ το δεύτερο περιλαμβάνει θέματα δευτερεύουσας σημασίας, που είναι όμως αρκετά σημαντικά για την ορθή κατανόηση της ωδής.

ANT. TSAKMAKIS, *Comments on Production and Interpretation of Aristophanes' Thesmophoriazusae.*

Questions about the production of Greek Comedy can better be answered if they are envisaged in close relation to the interpretation of a play. For example, the absence of any allusion to Euripides' physical appearance in *Thesmophoriazusae* is an argument against the use of portrait-masks in this comedy (1). On the other hand, the abundance of allusions to the appearance of Agathon is a mark for his unusual presentation. It seems probable, that implicit stage directions indicate divergencies from the conventional (2). Those cases are the exceptions, which assure the rule of economy; this rule can be held against the danger of over-interpretation in many disputed passages of the play (3). The expectations of the spectators are also an important parameter which is crucial for the interpretation of the text. The hostage-scene in *Thesmophoriazusae* can better be explained if we take into consideration the expectations based on the audience's knowledge of a similar scene in the *Acharnians*, rather than as referring to the remote performance of Euripides' *Telephus* (4). Parody

in *Thesmophoriazusae* also presupposes an extended use of the written text of Euripidean tragedy, a fact which inevitably determines the character of the comedy itself (5). Finally, a peculiarity of the *Andromeda*-parody is the abuse of certain characteristic Euripidean techniques or conventions in both dramaturgy and production (6).

B. LENTAKIS, *Pederasty: Ideological Undercurrents in Sykoutris' Approach*.

This paper explores the terms in which Ioannis Sykoutris tackled, some sixty years ago, the issue of ancient Greek pederasty. He professed an approach free of contemporary preconceptions; and yet, his discussion reveals more about himself and his times, than about the ancient Greeks. The «ideal type» of pederasty he proposed betrays much un-Greek influence: 19th century racialism; fin de siècle aestheticism; Victorian sexual attitudes; Werner Jaeger's aristocratic «humanism». And all these strands converge into the Neoclassical vision of a racially pure, sexually healthy, and spiritually lofty Hellenism.

I. D. POLEMIS - I. E. STEFANIS, *Two Republications of Monastery Typika*.

A series of philological observations on the *Typika* of the Monasteries of the Theotokos Evergetis (ed. P. Gautier) and the Kosmosoteira (ed. G. Papazoglou).

I. GRIGORIADIS, *Byzantine Wordplay and the Function of Secular Rhetoric in the Twelfth Century*.

Byzantine rhetoric is certainly a vast subject yet to be explored. This article tackles the issue of punning in twelfth-century Byzantine literature. It is argued that the employment of wordplay is an activity totally dependent on the authors' rhetorical education, sense of humour and literary talent. An attempt is made to examine various examples of wordplay based on proper names and to analyse the professional skill behind such endeavours.

G. VELOUDIS, *D. Solomos' «Στοχασμοί» (Reflections) in Ελεύθεροι Πολιορκισμένοι*.

The -Italian- «Reflections» of Solomos in *Ελεύθεροι Πολιορκισμένοι* were first brought to attention by I. Polilas, who chose 11 extracts from

them and presented them *only in Greek translation* in the text of *Ελεύθεροι Πολιορκισμένοι* in the edition of Solomos' *Ευρισκόμενα* (1859).

In this article, after an interpretive re-examination of Polilas' selection, an attempt is made at a) the publication of the *Italian original* of the 11 extracts presented by Polilas on the basis of Solomos' *Αυτόγραφα Έργα* in the edition by L. Politis (1964); b) the addition of a further 10 *Italian fragments* to the «Reflections» —again on the basis of the edition of the *Αυτόγραφα*; c) the critical reappraisal and modernization of Polilas' translation and the —overall— translation of all 21 extracts of the «Reflections»; d) a commentary on them with the aim of demonstrating and exhibiting their philosophical nature and, consequently, the philosophical, aesthetic and poetic theory of Solomos in his mature period on Corfu (1829-1857).

L. PAPALEONTIOU, *The persona of Phonissa and the Narrator: Some Comments.*

Literary criticism has characterized the narrative persona of Papadimandis' Phonissa through a variety of, sometimes contradictory, attributes: at times the author has been identified with the heroine and at others with the narrator. But there is no need to equate and identify the author either with the narrator or with the characters in the narration.

In this article, it is claimed that the persona of Phonissa is justified in literary terms mainly because the heterodiegetic-extra diegetic narrator does not distance himself from her ironically; he does not comment on her, he merely *shows* her passions. Occasionally, in fact, he allows her «transparent mind» to dominate, her unarticulated discourse and her voice, through a consonant psycho-narration and with free indirect speech.

It is with these considerations in mind that we must read the «open» ending of the novel: the death of Phonissa does not constitute a (condemnatory or theological) comment on the part of the author or the narrator. This is why, therefore, the heroine is left lost «between divine and human justice».

## NOTES

AIM. D. MAVROUDIS, *Critical Observations on Galen's Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων*. — Four interventions for improvement are suggested in the text of Galen's work *Περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων* (ed. I. Mueller, Teubner) (a) p. 84, 4-9 M.: the editor's proposal to obelize the passage *τὴν μὲν τινὰ... μεθοδικῆν*

is rejected; (b) p. 100, 5-9 M.: it is suggested that the passage {τὸ} *περὶ χρείας μορίων* {πρῶτον} ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ δεδήλωται be published as: <κατὰ τὸ περὶ χρείας μορίων πρῶτον [sc. βιβλίον], ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ (δέ) δεδήλωται>; (c) p. 101, 14-18 M.: the obelisk for καὶ (δείξας) is rejected; (d) p. 107, 5-6 M.: the ἄ (μὲν κεφάλαια) has nothing to do with the anaphoric pronouns ὅς, ἧ, ὃ as the editor believes. It is rather the customary numeral α' (= first).

D. J. JAKOB, *Nicephoros Ouranos*, Epistle 41. *A Re-examination*. — Darrouzès' edition of Epistle 41 of Nicephoros Ouranos is flawed. The following corrections are proposed: ἀλγῶ μὲν instead of ἀλγοῦμεν, γράφομαι instead of γράφομεν, παρανόμου instead of παρὰ νόμον. Κοινὸς ἐρώμενος does not mean, as D. A. Christidis believes, «he whom Antioch claims», but «the beloved friend of all of us». Finally, an echo from Gregory Nazianzenos is noted.

A. I. THAVORIS, *Kosinitza-Eikosiphoenissa*. *Old Names for the Monastery of the Panaghia Acheiropoietos in Pangaeon*. — On the occasion of B. Atsalos' work: *Η ονομασία της Ιεράς Μονής της Παναγίας της Αχειροποιήτου του Παγγαίου, της επονομαζομένης της Κοσινίτσας ή Εικοσιφοίνισσης* (Drama 1996), the author provides linguistic evidence for the view expressed by some scholars that the original name of the Monastery *Κοσίνιτσα*, as an additional definition, probably as a place-name, was the Bulgarian word *košnica* (κοσνιца), the primary meaning of which is «basket». This was rendered into Greek as *Κόσνιτσα* or *Κοσνίτσα* (in the local northern idiom: *Κουσνίτσα*).

An explanation is first given of how, from this initial type, other forms later derived, such as: *Κοσινίτσα*, *Κοσίνισσα* etc. with the development of the «ι» sound between the foreign consonantal cluster «σν». Thereafter, the types *Κοσσυφ-ίνιτσα*, *Κοσσυφ-ίνισσα* etc. are explained as having come from the previous names in the following way: the initial syllable *Κοσ-*, (which was not written as a fricative *ḥ*, as in Bulgarian), was taken, probably by Bulgarian-speaking Greek scholars or monks, to be another Bulgarian word *kos* meaning *κοτσύφι* (= blackbird), rather than *koš*, which also means basket (as does *košnica*). They therefore translated the first element by the Ancient Greek literary word *κόσσυφος* - *κοσσύφιον* and rendered the originally Bulgarian name as *Κοσσυφ-ίνιτσα*, *-ίνισσα*, etc.

The name was then emended to a «more Greek» form as *Κοσι-φοίνιτσα*, *Κοσι-φοίνισσα*, as though deriving from the verb *φοίνισσω* = to redden and this meaning was given to the icon, of Our Lady in the Monastery. The final version was in the form *Εικοσι-φοίνισσα*.

N. D. TRIANDAFYLLOPOULOS, *Minor Notes on Papdiamantis*, II. — In this brief study, the use of the words *μουρλουλοῦ*, *προπήρα*, and *ὑπέρφως*, is examined in texts by Papdiamandis.