

ABSTRACTS – ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΕΙΣ

I. G. KALOGERAKOS, Δίκης ὄνομα. *The Dimensions of Dike in Heraclitus.*

Dike, a concept originally formed in the βουληφόρος ἀγορά, acquires a cosmic meaning and considerable symbolic significance in early Greek philosophy. Anaximander is the first to use *Dike* in this way. He explained the constant interchange between opposed substances by means of a legalistic metaphor; according to him (fr. 1) the prevalence of one substance at the expense of its contrary is «injustice», and a reaction takes place through the infliction of punishment by the restoration of equality. Δίκη is employed in four fragments of Heraclitus: 80, 94, 28, 23. In fr. 80, strife or war is a metaphor for the dominance of change in the world and is obviously related to the reaction between opposites. War is also called δίκη, the «indicated way», or the normal rule of behaviour; the context is probably not only cosmological but also anthropological. The principle of measure in natural change is also illustrated in fr. 94: the sun is restrained by *Dike*, the personification of normality and therefore regularity, from exceeding its measures. In fr. 28, *Dike* appears as one who «will convict the fabricators of lies and (their) false witnesses»; Pythagoras and his pupils may have been the prime targets here. In fr. 23, *Dike* is again a personification and means «the right, or established, way». This fr. is an example of the unity of opposites and its meaning is that there would be no right without wrong. The result of our discussion is that the sense of *Dike* in Heraclitus is extended from the life of man to the function of the cosmos: in the first place it is the *modus essendi* of cosmos (covering the behaviour of the external world and stressing the rule of regularity and reciprocity in the cosmos); secondly it appears as the Goddess of punishment and revenge; thirdly it has the meaning of «the right way». Although in the surviving sayings of Heraclitus *Dike* does not appear as the abstract notion of «justice», the philosopher is on the right way towards an abstract apprehension of the essence of *Dike*.

I. D. POLEMIS, *The Pleasure of Natural Contemplation: The Influence of Philo Judaeus and Synesius of Cyrene on the Ethikos of Theodore Metochites.*

This study is a discussion of some passages of *Ethikos*, a treatise of Theodore Metochites on the value of education, where strong influences of Philo Judaeus and Synesius of Cyrene can be detected. The author takes advantage of Synesius' views on pleasure, as expounded in *Dio*, in order to express his own views on certain aspects of monastic life in his own time.

C. PAÏDAS, *The Erotic Element in Bergadis' Apokopos.*

Bergadis' *Apokopos* is one of the most significant texts bequeathed to us by the Middle Ages and has been the object of much research by scholars, mainly because of its literary qualities and its anthropocentric nature. The majority of scholars (E. Legrand, St. Alexiou, A. F. van Gemert) have dealt with the text of *Apokopos* as a satirical/didactic, theological and eschatological poem, the purpose of which is to castigate sin. G. Kechagioglou detected the underlying eroticism of the text, centred on the introductory dream, and demonstrated the potential variety of ways of addressing the poem.

The present study aims at demonstrating that the central theme of *Apokopos* is erotic love, and particularly the various guises this love adopts in the life of mankind. Stress is placed on the vanity of this love, which is seen, on the one hand, as a danger to life and an impending disaster (for a man) and, on the other, as a means of introduction to a life of sensuality and riches (for a woman). Initially, the erotic tone of the introductory dream is demonstrated, and thereafter the main body of *Apokopos* is interpreted as an extension of the positions set out in the first part of the poem.

M. ΚΑΡΠΙΟΖΗΛΟΥ, *Το Επιστολάριο του Θεόφιλου Κορυδαλέως.*

Στο άρθρο εξετάζονται από φιλολογική και πραγματολογική άποψη οι πηγές και το περιεχόμενο του *Επιστολαρίου* του Θεοφίλου Κορυδαλέως. Η πρώτη έντυπη έκδοση του *Επιστολαρίου* πραγματοποιήθηκε από τον Νικόδημο Μεταξά στο Λονδίνο το 1625. Πρόκειται για έναν οδηγό επιστολογραφίας, στον οποίο θίγονται θεωρητικά ζητήματα περί επιστολής εν γένει, όπως η διαίρεση των επιστολών σε γένη, είδη και άλλα συναφή. Το θεωρητικό μέρος συνοδεύεται από υποδείγματα επιστολών που μαρτυρούν την κλασική παιδεία και τον αριστοτελικό προσανατολισμό του λογίου συγγραφέα. Οι προσωπικές επιστολές επωνύμων Ελλήνων λογίων του 16ου και 17ου αι., που απαρτίζουν το δεύτερο μέρος του *Επιστολα-*

ρίου, πιστεύουμε ότι δεν επιλέγησαν να δημοσιευτούν από τον Κορυδαλέα, αλλά από τον πρώτο εκδότη του βιβλίου, τον Νικόδημο Μεταξά. Στο άρθρο συζητούνται επίσης οι δύο αφιερωτικές επιστολές της πρώτης έκδοσης, οι παλαιότερες εκδόσεις των επιστολών, καθώς και οι μεταγενέστερες εκδόσεις του *Επιστολαρίου* (Μοσχόπολις 1744, Άλλη της Σαξωνίας 1768, Βενετία 1786).

G. KECHAGIOGLOU, *The First (and most substantial) Summary of N. Mavrokordatos' Philotheou Parerga* (Leisures of Philotheos).

The author edits with some comments an unpublished French manuscript that analyses the contents and ideological positions expressed in N. Mavrokordatos' *Philotheou Parerga* (1715/6-1718, edited posthumously in 1800), a kind of Modern Greek novel written in archaistic language.

The manuscript «Notice» (dated 2.8.1719) belongs to Jean Boivin, a well-known Hellenist; it constitutes an extensive report addressed to Boivin's protector, and supervisor in the Parisian Royal Library, Jean-Paul Bignon. Its significance lies in some very careful and acute observations and evaluations; the author stresses the fact that most of them seem not to have been taken into account by recent scholars.

G. VELOUDIS, «*The Beauties of our Language*».

There is a discrepancy between rigorous study of the *language* of Solomos and the attitude adopted by his Greek readers from his first «Greek» public appearance to this day – an attitude characterised by doubts and reservations or outright rejection as regards his *dialectal-idiomatic* language, even as regards proper knowledge of the Greek language itself on his part.

This negative self-contradictory attitude has its roots in the «historical» effort of the «Athenian centre» to impose a «national» *koine*, at the expense of local dialects and idioms – and is also expressive of it. The main representatives of this negative attitude towards Solomos' language were: the «Phanariotes», I. R. Neroulos (1827), A. Soutsos (1833) and A. R. Rangavis (1855, 1877, 1885, 1887); Sp. Zambelios, who rejected Solomos; the most authentic representative of Athenian «cleansing», G. N. Hatzidakis (1890/93, 1905); and also the diplomatic official of the Metaxas Dictatorship, G. Seferis (1937).

A consequence and corollary of this «rejection» of Solomos' language has been the attempt to expunge or muffle the idiomatic character of his language on the part of his editors, from I. Polylys (1859) down to his latest

anthologist-«editor» St. Alexiou (1994).

This study attempts to demonstrate the idiomatic character of the language of Solomos and to restore and «legitimize» his *genuine* dialectal-idiomatic linguistic types.

E. VOGLI, «*A European Regime*»: *Views on the Government of the New Greek State in the War of Independence (1821-1828)*

What was the appropriate regime for the Greek nation state at the time of its creation? One of the pious myths of modern Greece identifies the revolutionary regime with the first Greek republic, seeing in the liberal principles of the revolutionary constitutions proof of the alleged «democratic» character of the people. Others see in the experiences and pronouncements of insurgent Greece the «monarchical» character of the people. These alleged characteristics of the modern Greeks are among the inventions which modern Greeks can claim to be their own; they have been the frequent recourse of politicians as well as of intellectuals feeling the need to «prove» the roots of republicanism or monarchy in modern Greece, especially in times of political crisis. Contrary to such interpretations, this article aims to examine the political intentions of the insurgents and the formation of the revolutionary government in their historical context. As might be expected, the process of government – building was long and painful; the insecurity of life and property soon after the outbreak of hostilities, the inexperience of people in self-government, the powerful local interests, the conflicts between the various nuclei of established power, as well as the urgent need for the establishment of law and order, all of which were indispensable not only for the successful pursuit of the war, but also for winning the approval of Europe, all these determinants lead in the same direction: the establishment of a prudent regime and the concentration of authority preferably on one «able and virtuous man». In this respect, references to the need for a king or even a dictator are very common in the relevant sources. In spite of the varying references to the basic features of a fitting regime, there was a considerable consensus among those who were involved in forging a national government for the Greek state: it would have to be a representative government, preferably a constitutional monarchy, a regime fashioned on the model of European constitutional monarchies.

NOTES

Π. ΚΑΡΕΛΟΣ, *Το ανέκδοτο προοίμιο των Σχολίων του Βαρλαάμ του Καλαβρού. Σχετικά με το δεύτερο βιβλίο των Στοιχείων του Ευκλείδη*. — Η κριτική έκδοση των Στοιχείων από τους I. Heiberg και E. Σταμάτη (Λειψία 1977) περιέχει όχι μόνον τα 13 βιβλία που αποδίδονται στον Ευκλείδη αλλά και σχόλια μεταγενεστέρων μαθηματικών σε μεμονωμένα κεφάλαια του έργου. Ο τόμος V, 2 της εν λόγω έκδοσης περιλαμβάνει μεταξύ άλλων και ένα εκτενές σχόλιο του Βαρλαάμ του Καλαβρού στο δεύτερο βιβλίο των Στοιχείων. Για άγνωστο λόγο οι εκδότες παρέλειψαν το προοίμιο του σχολίου, παρόλο που αυτό παραδίδεται από τα περισσότερα χειρόγραφα. Στο παρόν άρθρο παρουσιάζεται και σχολιάζεται το ανέκδοτο κείμενο του προοιμίου από τον κωδ. Marc. gr. 332 (coll. 643)· ο κώδικας αυτός ανήκε στον καρδινάλιο Βησσαρίωνα και περιέχει διορθώσεις από το χέρι του ιδίου του Βαρλαάμ, γεγονός που του προσδίδει ξεχωριστό κύρος.

ST. ALEXIOU, *A Solomos Update*. — The author points out two instances of incomplete knowledge of the bibliography relating to Solomos, as they appear in articles by Prof. G. Veloudis: The first relates to the interpretation of the phrase *scappata della tromba* in *Κρητικός* (AE 359 A 7-8). The second concerns the metrical form of the poem «*Η φαρμακωμένη στὸν ἼΑδη*» (AE 383-387, 395). Both of these issues were resolved many years ago by Eleni Tsantsanoglou (*Μιὰ λανθάνουσα ποιητικὴ σύνθεση τοῦ Διονυσίου Σολωμοῦ*, 1982, p. 61 and p. 191ff.).