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In this dissertation, I investigate the textual tradition of the Cretan tragedy *Erofili* by Georgios Chortatsis (16th century). The play, accompanied by a set of four Interludes, has survived in three manuscripts and two editions, all originating from the 17th century. All the witnesses are examined and presented thoroughly, both as autonomous texts and in comparison to each other. The examination of each witness separately sheds light not only on the history of the transmission of *Erofili*, but also to the production of manuscripts and printed books in Crete, the Heptanese and Venice in general. As far as the condition of the text is concerned, three witnesses preserve the most reliable texts: the second edition and the two manuscripts originating from Crete. The investigation of their relationship shows that two groups can be identified: one includes the two Cretan manuscripts and another one the three other witnesses. No important alterations in the plot and the sequence of events are found, so the textual variation concerns mainly the phrasing. There are indications that variation among the witnesses might have resulted from revisions by the playwright himself. The evaluation of the two groups of witnesses shows that it is not possible to consider one of them as superior, and this leads to the question which would be the most appropriate editorial method. Previous editors have followed the eclectic approach, which has many positive aspects, but cannot help the readers to realize all the stages of the transmission of the play. Since various theoretical approaches have appeared during the last decades, it has been understood that no edition can be called “definitive” and that editions following different methods can address different questions and achieve different aims. *Erofili*, and other texts with a rich and complicated textual tradition, can be edited in various ways and each edition can offer new insight in the history of the production, transmission and reception of the work.
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LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The witnesses of *Erofili* are abbreviated as follows:

- **K** First edition by Matthaios Kigalas (Venice 1637)
- **G** Second edition by Ambrosios Gradenigos (Venice 1676)
- **A** Ms Θ62 (16) (Historical Museum of Athens)
- **B** Ms 742 (Birmingham University Library)
- **M** Cod. graec. 590 (Bavarian State Library, Munich)

Ded. Dedication

Prol. Prologue

The Acts are numbered with upper case Roman numerals (Act I, II, III, IV, V)

The Interludes are numbered with lower case Roman numerals (Interlude i, ii, iii, iv)
INTRODUCTION

The tragedy Erofili by Georgios Chortatsis is one of the relatively few dramatic works which have survived from the mature period of Cretan Literature. Little is known about the author or the intellectual milieu in which Erofili, as well as the other plays, were produced, because the available historical testimonies are sparse and sometimes vague.

It has been generally assumed that playwriting in the Cretan dialect was related to the literary academies. A member of the Academy of the Stravaganti, Giovanni dall’Aquila, is attested to have participated in performances organized by the Academy; however, there is no historical reference to any specific link between the known playwrights (Chortatsis, Troilos, Foskolos) and the Cretan academies.

1 For the Cretan Academies and their possible relations to theatrical activities see Panagiotakis 1966; Panagiotakis 1974; Panagiotakis & Vincent 1970; Bancroft-Marcus 1978: 26-66; Bancroft-Marcus 1982-3.
3 Paschalis 2006 argues that the Cretan Academies “snubbed” the literary production in vernacular Greek and therefore could not be related to the flowering of Cretan literature. Evangelatos believes that the information about theatre in Crete is not enough to permit us believe that Greek plays were actually performed (Evangelatos 2002a and 2011). See also the abstract submitted by Paschalis for the 11th Cretological Congress (Paschalis 2011c) and for the conference Neograeca Medii Aevi VII (Paschalis 2012), where he also deals with these issues.
Testimonies about theatrical activities in Crete include a staging of Guarini’s *Pastor Fido* in Chandax, the performances of Antonio da Molin, the staging of *Amorosa Fede* by the Cretan Andonios Pandimos for the celebration of the wedding between Francesco Querini and Kallerga Kallergi and sketches or comedy performances during the Carnival, but it is not clear from historical data when any of the Greek plays which have survived was staged. A specific reference to performances of *Erofili* does exist and is given by Nikolaos Papadopoulos Komninos, who remembered that *Erofili* was staged many times during his childhood (i.e., during the siege of Candia).

The fact that Troilos states that he did not permit his play to be performed («σὲ θέατρα δὲν ἄφηκα νὰ βγαίνει νὰ γυρίζει», Prol. 24) is an indication that other plays were indeed performed. It is not clear if the other testimonies refer to plays in the Greek or the Italian language: Giovanni Papadopoli mentions in his memoirs that Greek comedies were performed every year during the Carnival and this custom changed during the siege, but it cannot be said with certainty what this “change” actually was.

1. Chortatsis and his works

Information about Chortatsis is limited. Marinos Tzane Bounialis, a poet who lived a bit later than Chortatsis, gives us the information that the playwright came from Rethymnon and mentions the titles of three plays written by him:

```
'Ενα παιδί μου παλαιόν, ὅποιο ὅθελα γεννήσει
κ' ἐκείνο μὲ πολλὴν τιμὴν ἤθελε μὲ στολίσει,
Γεώργιον Χορτάκιον ἐκράζαν τ’ ὄνομά του
```
κ’ οἱ στίχοι του φημίζονται καὶ τὰ ποιήματά του,  
κ’ ἔκαμε τὴν Πανώρια του μὲ ἄχαρενια χείλη  
μαζὶ μὲ τὸν Κατζάροπον, τὴν ἄξιαν Ἐρωφίλη[.]

Since we don’t know his father’s name, it is not easy to relate him with  
certainty to any of the many Chortatsises who appear in the sources. There have  
been some efforts to narrow down the possible choices, but still few facts can be  
considered as certain: he must have lived during the second half of the sixteenth  
century and composed his plays between 1580 and 1600.⁸ Although he came from  
Rethymnon, he may perhaps have lived in Herakleion at some point;⁹ he composed  
with certainty three plays, each belonging to a different genre: Erofili, a tragedy;  
Panoria, a pastoral drama and Katsourbos (or Katsarapos), a comedy. The Interludes  
which accompany his works are probably his own compositions as well.¹⁰ Another  
comedy by an unknown author, Stathis, has been attributed to him on stylistic  
grounds.¹¹ His family was one of the old aristocratic Byzantine families of Crete,¹²  
but we don’t know if Chortatsis himself was a nobile Cretese;¹³ his plays demonstrate  

---

⁸ Two of his plays are dedicated to well-known personalities, Markantonios Viaros and Ioannis  
Mourmouris, so it is possible to date his theatrical activities with the help of historical information  
about them. See Manousakas 1963, on the life of Viaros. See Eleftheriou 1980 for a brief overview of  
the available information on Chortatsis.

⁹ His knowledge of the topography of Herakleion which is revealed in Katsourbos suggests that he was  
familiar with the city and he must have lived there (Kaklamanis 1993b: 37-42).


¹¹ Evangelatos 1974: 93 and Martini 1976: 32-4. This attribution has been greeted with scepticism by  
has suggested a method of finding encoded references to writers’ names (called “κρυπτοσφραγίδες”);  
according to his suggestions, Chortatsis has composed not only Stathis but Pistikos Voskos and  
Voskopoula as well (Henrich 2010). However, his method does not seem very convincing and should  
be treated with caution.

¹² See Manousakas 1956 and 1962 for the history of the family.

¹³ Kaklamanis argues that he must have been, judging from references to him as εὐγενὴ ἀφέντη (by  
Foskolos in the Birmingham manuscript) and εὐγενέστατον κύριον (by the editor of the second  
edition, Ambrosios Gradenis). Evangelatos on the contrary believes that his family belonged to the  
cittadini (bourgeois), since there is no mention of a noble family named Chortatsis during the period  
good knowledge of Italian literature and rhetoric and a familiarity with classical languages, so he must have been well educated, perhaps in Italy.\textsuperscript{14}

The dating of his plays is possible only with the help of their Italian models. \textit{Panoria} was composed after 1583, when \textit{La Calisto} by Luigi Grotto, on which it is believed \textit{Panoria} was based, was published.\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Erofili} cannot have been completed before 1587, because Chortatsis was aware of Tasso’s play \textit{Il Re Torrismondo}, published in that year.\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Katsourbos} has been traditionally dated in the years between 1595 and 1601, on the basis of references to Michael the Brave.\textsuperscript{17} The information given in the Dedication of \textit{Panoria}, that her “sister” \textit{Erofili} is going to appear soon, has led scholars to the assumption that either \textit{Panoria} was composed first,\textsuperscript{18} or that Chortatsis was working on both plays in the same period and \textit{Panoria} was completed only a short time before \textit{Erofili}.\textsuperscript{19} Alexiou has suggested that \textit{Erofili} was composed after 1595, because the Prologue of Charos might allude to the plague of 1592-1595.\textsuperscript{20} Kaklamani has made a different suggestion about the chronological sequence of the three plays: \textit{Katsourbos} was written first (and reworked later, with the addition of the references to Michael the Brave),\textsuperscript{21} and both \textit{Erofili} and \textit{Panoria} were completed before the Dedication to Viaros, which refers only to a performance and not the completion of the play.\textsuperscript{22} Bancroft-Marcus believes that the plays were

\textsuperscript{14} See Kriaras 1975, Pidonia 1977, Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 54-6 and Markomichelaki 1996 on his education and cultural background.
\textsuperscript{15} Politis 1966.
\textsuperscript{16} See Manousakas 1959 for more details.
\textsuperscript{17} Politis 1964: ιζ′-κ′.
\textsuperscript{18} Oikonomou 1963: 526 and Kriaras 1975: 11-12.
\textsuperscript{20} Alexiou 1954b: 244.
\textsuperscript{22} Kaklamani 1993b: 46-52.
composed and revised over a long period of time and suggests that Katsourbos was
the earliest, Erofili followed and Panoria was the last one.23

Spyros Evangelatos has made an effort to relate the playwright to a specific
Georgios Chortatsis, son of Ioannis, whose biographical data agree with what little
we know about the poet.24 Arguments have been raised against some of his
suggestions,25 but no one else has suggested a more plausible identification.
Rosemary Bancroft-Marcus has suggested that Chortatsis was perhaps a certain
Pithikogiorgis, mentioned in a couple of letters by Francesco Barozzi, but no specific
biographical information is available about him.26 Until these hypotheses are
confirmed or rejected, it can only be said with certainty that the playwright was
active during the last quarter of the 16th century, he was well-educated and familiar
with Italian literature of the time and he had a close relationship to some important
personalities of Crete.

2. Textual tradition and editorial problems of Chortatsis’s works
None of Chortatsis’s works is preserved in an autograph manuscript or an edition
authorized by him. Erofili is one of the few works of the mature period of Cretan
Literature with a rich and complicated textual tradition, as it is preserved in three
manuscripts and two printed editions, all from the seventeenth century. Two of the
manuscripts come from Crete and are written in the Latin alphabet, and one was

24 He suggested that for the first time in Evangelatos 1970 and has published since then more details
26 Bancroft–Marcus 1978: 268-83; See also Bancroft–Marcus 1992: 33-35 and Bancroft–Marcus 2004:
64-9. See also Pidonia 2007: 107-113 for an overview of the discussion about the identification of the
poet.
copied in the Ionian Islands.\(^{27}\) Neither *Panoria* nor *Katsourbos* was printed. *Panoria* has survived in three manuscripts, all from the Ionian Islands.\(^{28}\) The whole text of *Katsourbos* is preserved in only one manuscript together with *Panoria*, while some parts of the comedy are transmitted by two other witnesses, where they were intercalated as Interludes between the acts of *Panoria* and the *Tragedia tou Agiou Dimitriou*.\(^{29}\)

The lack of autographs or of manuscripts and editions authorized by the playwright poses many problems for the prospective editors of Chortatsis’s works. The works preserved in multiple witnesses might have survived in different stages of composition, if the playwright was working on them during a long period, while the non-Cretan origin of the majority of the witnesses usually affects their linguistic characteristics.

3. The textual tradition of *Erofili*

The first edition appeared in Venice in 1637 and was prepared by the Cypriot priest Matthaios Kigalas.\(^{30}\) The editor transliterated a manuscript written in the Latin alphabet, which, according to his editorial prologue, belonged to the Zakynthian Filippos Chareris and is now lost. Kigalas’s edition is full of transcription errors that make the text incomprehensible and contains many interventions of the editor, which distort the language, versification and style of the text to a considerable degree: the editor replaces dialectal elements with learned or non-dialectal forms and in some cases inserts Cypriot dialectal features. The use of learned and non-

---


\(^{30}\) For more information about his life and activities, see section 1 of Chapter 1.
dialectal elements often destroys the metre. The quality of this edition is unanimously condemned by 19th-century and modern scholars, who have pointed out many instances of the alteration of the original text.  

Almost forty years after the first edition, the Cretan priest Ambrosios Gradenigos prepared a second edition of the play. The publisher’s introductory note states that the previous edition of Erofili makes the text repellent because of the alteration of the original language and style and claims that the present edition has corrected it to its original form, as written by the poet. All the subsequent reprints of the tragedy up to the 19th century were based on this edition.

Of the three manuscripts of Erofili, two are of Cretan origin and use the Latin alphabet, and the other one is of Heptanesian origin, written in the Greek alphabet. The Heptanesian manuscript, codex Monacensis graecus 590, provides us with the full text of the tragedy, but in a rather problematic condition. The scribe has inserted elements of the Heptanesian dialect, which of course was a common practice of the period, but has also made many errors that distort the meaning of many passages.

A text of a better quality, but unfortunately incomplete due to the loss of many folios from the beginning and the end of the tragedy, and from other parts of the text as well, is provided by the manuscript first edited by Emile Legrand in 1875,

---

32 For his life and activities see section 2 of Chapter 1.
33 See Legrand 1881: ci and Xanthoudidis 1928: μ’-μα’ and Daskalopoulos 1967 for the reprints that are known to us. Moullas (Moullas 1964) has suggested that there could have been an edition of the play unknown to us, because a notarial act from Lefkas, dated 1771, mentions a catalogue of books among which there is a “book of Erofili and Panaretos” («παλαιόφαλαδα τῆς ΄Ερωφίλης καὶ τοῦ Πανάρετου, έτζή άνομαζομένη»). According to Moullas, since all the known editions have the same title, “tragedy named Erofili” (τραγωδία άνομαζομένη ΄Ερωφίλη), the catalogue refers to an edition which was named Erofili and Panaretos and is now lost.
which is now in the possession of the Historical and Ethnological Society in Athens (Θ 62 [16]).

The best manuscript source of *Erofili* was the last to be discovered: it is the manuscript of Birmingham University Library (MS 742, previously known as 13/i/17), which was copied by the Cretan poet Markantonios Foskolos, author of the comedy *Fortounatos*. It is one of the most important witnesses of the text, although it has some minor lacunas. This manuscript, along with Foskolos’s autograph of his comedy, is a very important source of information for the methodology of the edition of Cretan texts, as they were copied by a poet, who, as one would assume, would be very sensitive in respecting the linguistic, poetic and stylistic choices of another poet.

4. Modern editions of *Erofili*

As the first Gradenigos edition (1676) was not available to the 19th-century scholars who were interested in *Erofili*, the first academic publications of the text were based on other sources. Legrand, who had a copy of the 1772 reprint of Gradenigos’s edition, preferred to publish only the text of the manuscript he possessed without corrections, believing that the 1676 edition was necessary in order to present a reliable text. Sathas, on the other hand, based himself on the 1772 edition, with an apparatus that contained only variants of the Athens manuscript, although he noted that Kigalas 1637 can sometimes be helpful for the correction of problematic passages. An edition of *Erofili* in 1926, with an appendix that notes the variants of

---

35 A brief description is given by Legrand, who had purchased the manuscript (Legrand 1881: xc-xci). See also Jeffreys 1977: 260-261 and Pecoraro 1978: 215-221 for the history of the manuscript.

36 For a description of the manuscript and arguments that support the attribution to Foskolos, see Vincent 1971.


38 Legrand 1881: cvii.

39 Sathas 1879: Ξε’.
the Legrand manuscript and a prologue by N. Veis, was based on Sathas.\textsuperscript{40} Two years later, Stefanos Xanthoudidis prepared the first critical edition of \textit{Erofili}, based on all the known witnesses of the text, with the exception of Kikalas’s edition, which he considered as completely useless for the restoration of the text.\textsuperscript{41} Xanthoudidis used primarily the 1676 edition of Gradenigos and secondly the Legrand manuscript, but his apparatus also contains variants from Sathas’s edition and from the Munich manuscript, although he considers the latter almost useless, apart from a few cases, and regrets taking it into account.\textsuperscript{42} Xanthoudidis’s edition contains many typographical errors, as the editor died before the text was printed, but also has methodological problems that sometimes result in significant alterations of the character of the text, such as the insistence on hiatus and the avoidance of synizesis and the preference for forms of the West Cretan dialect that often damage the rhyme.\textsuperscript{43} A publication of \textit{Erofili} by A. Solomos in 1969 was based on both Xanthoudidis and Sathas.\textsuperscript{44}

The latest edition of \textit{Erofili} was prepared by Stylianos Alexiou and Martha Aposkiti in 1988 and used all the extant sources of the text, including the newly discovered Birmingham manuscript. The Interludes were printed in a different volume, which appeared in 1992, with the same method and editorial principles. The editors base themselves primarily on the best witnesses of the text, which according to their classification are the two Latin-script manuscripts, but use the other sources eclectically as well, because even the most corrupt versions can offer solutions to problematic passages.\textsuperscript{45} This edition is not critical in the strict sense of

\textsuperscript{40}Veis 1926.
\textsuperscript{41}Xanthoudidis 1928: μά.
\textsuperscript{42}Xanthoudidis 1928: λέ.
\textsuperscript{44}Solomos 1969.
\textsuperscript{45}Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 17.
the word, as it does not contain a critical apparatus, but discusses editorial issues in a separate commentary. For this reason, although it was generally accepted that these editions offer us an adequate text of Erofili and the Interludes, some objections have been raised about the appropriateness of this editorial method in the case of texts with a complicated textual tradition. Alexiou defends their practice claiming that a full apparatus would offer nothing more to the understanding of problematic passages or to the reading of the tragedy as a literary text, though he points out that for such texts a detailed study or even a diplomatic edition of all the witnesses is important, necessary and indeed more helpful than a detailed apparatus criticus.

An edition of all the plays of Chortatsis by Rosemary Bancroft-Marcus, accompanied by an English translation, has just appeared. The edition presents a clear-text, based eclectically on all the witnesses. The apparatus and the editorial methodology will be presented in the second volume which is yet to appear.

5. Scholarly history
Research about Erofili, and Cretan literature in general, was till recently mainly absorbed with editorial, dating and biographical issues, and less with matters of style and literary interpretation. Corrections and suggestions for problematic

---

47 Puchner 1990: 624.
49 Bancroft-Marcus 2013.
passages of *Erofili* have been published by Xanthoudidis (before his edition), Deinakis, Kriaras, Politis, Alexiou and Papatriandafyllou-Theodoridi.

Work on the Italian models of *Erofili* had been done rather haphazardly by Sathas, but it was Bursian who identified the tragedy *Orbecche* by Giambattista Giraldi as Chortatsis’s main model. Other sources of inspiration have also been investigated. The models of the Choric Odes were identified more recently. Another issue which has concerned scholars is the Renaissance or Baroque character of *Erofili* (and other works as well). The relation to European Petrarchism and Italian dramatic theory, as well as other motifs of Italian literature of the time, has also been examined. The plays of Cretan drama have also been analyzed from various theatrological perspectives (scenic space, stage directions, music and other performance issues). Stylistic matters, mainly in the field of metre and rhyme, but also in language and rhetoric as well, have been investigated and also studies with thematic approaches have appeared. Finally, intertextual issues, mainly but not

---

51 Xanthoudidis 1927.
52 Deinakis 1923.
53 Kriaras 1935.
54 Politis 1952 and 1958.
56 Papatriandafyllou-Theodoridi 1972.
58 Manousakas 1959; Spadaro 1975; Alexiou & Apositi 243-6; Spathis 2001; Cappellaro 2005.
64 Apositi 1986-7, Rodosthenous 2006 and Savoye 2011.
exclusively between *Erofili* and *Erotokritos*, as well as the wider reception of *Erofili* and the popular adaptations of the play have concerned scholars.\(^6\)

6. Aims and methodology of the dissertation

Although many scholars have dealt with the textual problems of *Erofili*, the presentation of the exact relations among the witnesses and the various stages of the transmission of the play is still a desideratum. The aim of the present dissertation is to provide a detailed comparative analysis of the manuscript and printed witnesses of *Erofili* in order to trace the history of the transmission of the play, to specify the relations among the witnesses and their position in the textual history of *Erofili* and to describe the individual characteristics of each witness and/or the version it represents. Furthermore, I plan to show how the results of this analysis could assist a future new edition of the play: what kind of information the researcher can obtain about the editorial problems of Chortatsis’s plays and the works of Cretan Literature in general and which would be the most appropriate method for editing *Erofili* (or what various kinds of editorial approaches could offer for the needs of different audiences).

The study of the transmission history of *Erofili* and the Interludes will be done from various perspectives. The focus will not be placed solely on the best witnesses and their usefulness for future editions, for two reasons. First of all, because an objective and unbiased examination of all the textual material is needed. Secondly, because the study of the witnesses of a literary work does not contribute only to our knowledge of the author’s original text: the dissemination of a work through

---

various media is an important part of its history, so each witness deserves to be studied on its own merits. Moreover, modern editorial theory has shown that certainties of the past about editorial methodology should be abandoned: the production and transmission of literary works is a quite complex phenomenon and terms like “archetype”, “authorial intentions”, “corruptions” etc. should be used cautiously; the original forms of a literary work might have been much more unstable than we imagine, because of revisions, generic peculiarities or the involvement of other agencies in their production or dissemination, and this should be taken into account, especially in the case of dramatic works. Scholars who work in the field of editorial theory and practice have realized that there are no single and definitive answers to editorial problems. These issues have also been addressed in recent years by scholars in the field of Early Modern Greek.

The First Chapter of the dissertation presents each witness individually. The history, physical and textual condition and other characteristics of each witness are discussed. The emphasis is not placed on the importance of each witness for an edition of Εροφελ. Each witness is treated as an autonomous text and is examined on its own merits, with the aim of presenting the individual characteristics of its style. As the play has survived through both manuscript and print media which originate from various geographical and dialectal regions, it is important to examine how the origin of each witness affects the way the work is presented. This is of great interest for the text of the two more unreliable witnesses, the first edition and the

---

67 See the proceedings of a special conference devoted to editorial problems of Early Modern Greek (Eideneier, Moennig and Toufexis 2001) and the round table discussion on the same issue (Agapitos & Pieris 2002), both organized under the aegis of the Neograeca Medii Aevi Conference. See also Kechagioglou 1993 and 1998, Lendari 2001 and Bakker 2002. As far as the study of early printed editions is concerned, Panagiotakis’s study of the first edition of Αποκόπος should be mentioned (1991), because the methodology of textual bibliography is introduced in the field of early modern Greek printed books. See also Kaklamanis 1997, 1998 and 2001 for further analysis on the study of early modern Greek editions.
Heptanesian manuscript. Instead of just dismissing their importance for the restoration of the play, the alterations introduced by the copyist/editor will be examined, in order to show how they treated a literary work written in a different dialect and how their alterations affect the poetics of *Erofili*.

The Second Chapter deals with the relations among the witnesses. Firstly, the kinds of textual variation will be presented, and then the witnesses will be classified into families with the help of various criteria (errors and gaps, order of lines, paratextual material and other variants). After the identification of the branches of the transmission history of the play, the families will be evaluated in Chapter Three.

The Fourth Chapter of the dissertation discusses the implications the results of the previous analysis have for future editions, after presenting in detail how previous editors have dealt with the textual problems of *Erofili*. The aim of this part will not be to present clear-cut solutions, but to show how the complicated textual problems of *Erofili* can be addressed from various perspectives with different, but equally legitimate, results.

*Erofili* is one of the most important works of Cretan Literature, which has inspired other poets and was widely disseminated and adapted in popular tradition. Moreover, the play is still frequently performed and parts of it are taught in schools and universities. So the impact of *Erofili* has been great since the time it was composed, so modern reliable editions are needed. Furthermore, as the play has survived in witnesses from various origins, the examination of its transmission can offer useful information for the study and edition of other works of the same period. Finally, *Erofili* should be examined in its European context: since the emergence of Early Modern Greek drama followed closely the development of drama in other European cultures (e.g. Italy, England, Spain), the study of the play should not be isolated from the European tradition. As far as editorial problems are concerned,
the particular editorial problems of Greek drama could be discussed in comparison with their contemporary European dramatic works.\(^{68}\) Additionaly, since the publication of Greek books follows the evolution of printing in Italy, a field which has concerned scholars in the past decades,\(^{69}\) the study of the tradition of *Erofili* could both benefit from this development and offer material for comparison.

\(^{68}\) A volume dedicated to the editorial problems of Renaissance drama has appeared (Lancashire 1976) and it offers interesting material for comparison.

1. The edition of Kigalas

The first edition of *Erofili* was printed at the printing house of the Giuliani family in 1637. At that time the Giuliani were the only printers of Greek books in Venice.\textsuperscript{70} Matthias Kigalas collaborated with the Giuliani in the editing of religious and chronographical books, so *Erofili* is the only literary (in the strict sense of the word) text prepared by him.\textsuperscript{71} Four exemplars of the edition have survived and are now preserved at the British Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, Biblioteca Universitaria di Padova and the Bodleian Library in Oxford. The edition was reprinted by Giuliani in 1648 and 1682.

1.1. Historical background and importance of the edition

*Erofili* was the first modern Greek play to be printed. Although none of the other plays of Chortatsis appeared in print, the first edition of *Erofili* perhaps inspired the

\textsuperscript{70} See Kontosopoulos 1954: 304-5 and Papadaki 2007 on the activities of the Giuliani family.
printing of other Cretan and Heptanesian plays in the next decades: in 1646 the edition of Montseleze's *Evgena* appeared, a year later *King Rodolinos* by I.-A. Troilos, *Erofili* was reprinted in 1648 and ten years after that *Pastor fidos* was published, all by the publishing house of Giuliani, whose contribution to the enrichment of the corpus of Modern Greek texts at the time was very important.\(^{72}\) Kigalas's name does not seem to be connected to any of these editions. Although none of these works, with the exception of *Erofili*, became so popular as to be reprinted, the initiative of the Giuliani family to undertake the edition of dramatic works is of particular importance, not only for the history of Modern Greek Theatre, but the history of Cretan literature in general: with this edition *Erofili* became available to a wide reading public many decades before two other important Cretan works, which later became extremely popular, appeared in print: *The Sacrifice of Abraham* and *Erotokritos* were not printed before the end of the 17\(^{th}\) and the early 18\(^{th}\) century respectively.\(^{73}\)

The manuscript from which Kigalas edited *Erofili* was given to him by the Zakynthian Filippos Chareris, a member of the important noble family of Chareris/Carrer. The manuscript was written in the Latin alphabet, according to the information given by Kigalas, so it most probably originated from Crete. Puchner has made the suggestion that Kigalas might have been inspired to publish *Erofili* by Domenikos Mavrikios, a Jesuit priest who was involved in theatrical activities in Chios and had lived in Cyprus at Kigalas's home.\(^{74}\) This could be an interesting hypothesis, but there is no concrete historical evidence to support it. On the contrary, the “Address to the readers” of the edition, which was composed by

---

\(^{72}\) Iliou 1973: 90.

\(^{73}\) *The Sacrifice of Abraham* was printed in 1696, but no exemplars have survived; the existence of the edition is known because a Turkish translation in Karamanlidika was based on it (Papadopoulos 1984, n. 564). The first extant edition of the text appeared in 1713 (Legrand 1918: 107-8 and Papadopoulos 1984, n. 5641) and *Erotokritos* was printed at the same year (Legrand 1918: 112-6 and Papadopoulos 1984, n. 3180).

\(^{74}\) Puchner 1997a.
Kigalas himself, puts emphasis on the donation of the manuscript by Chareris: actually, the biggest part of the address is devoted to praising him, while the reference to the playwright is restricted to a short sentence. So the reasons for which Kigalas (or Giuliani) became involved in the printing of *Erofili*, apart from the request of the owner of the manuscript, remain unknown.

Another aspect of the historical importance of this edition is the fact that the nature and the extent of Kigalas's interventions makes it easy to trace the dissemination of the edition. The religious play *Δράμα περὶ τοῦ γεννηθέντος τυφλοῦ* by Gavriil Prosopsas, an orthodox priest from Chios, which is influenced by *Erofili*, has been based on the text of the first edition, as many similar phrases can show. This is an interesting case of the reception of this edition, because at the same time when Gradenigios was pointing out the deficiencies of the first edition, another playwright was using this text as a model for his own work.

1.2. Contents and typographical characteristics

1.2.1. Structure

Title page: ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ | Ο’ΝΟΜΑΖΟΜΕ’ΝΗ | ΕΡΩΦΙΛΗ, | ΠΟΙ’ΗΜΑ ΤΟΫ ΛΟΓΙΩΤΑ’ΤΟΥ | Ε’ν σπουδαίοις κυρού Γεωργίου Χορτάτζη Κρήτης :- | Καὶ συνεργεία τοῦ εὐγενεστάτου ἐν ἄρχουσι, κυροῦ Φιλίππου | Χαρέρη Ζακύνθιου :- | Con licentia de’ Superiori, & Priuilegio | Ε’ΝΕΤΙ’ΗΣΙΝ, Παρὰ Α’ντωνίῳ τῷ Ι’ουλιανῷ :- | Ἐτει ἀπὸ τῆς Θεογονίας :- αχλζ’:

Contents:
Address to the readers (Τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις)
Dedication to Mourmouris

---

75 See Lampaki 2011 for details.
Argument

Dramatis personae

Prologue (This section is untitled)

Acts I-V with Interludes intercalated between the acts (the Interludes are called “Στροφή τοῦ δράματος”)

1.2.2. Typesetting and orthography

The second line of each couplet is indented, as was done usually in manuscripts and editions of Early Modern Greek texts in rhymed political verse, and the first letter of each line is capitalized. Decorated initials appear at the beginning of each section. No other decorations are used. The orthography is generally correct, with the usual idiosyncrasies of the period (ξόμπλη, χαραῖς etc). The traditional accentuation and breathing system is used consistently. The punctuation is standardized, following the practice of the period: full stop at the end of the couplet, comma or semicolon at the first line of the couplet, comma at the caesura. For example:

Μὰ πλέον εἶναι δυσκολότερον, μ’ ἀγάπη ὅταν φυτρώσῃ,
Σὲ κοπελλίτικην καρδιὰν, καὶ δυνατά ρίζωσῃ.
Μὲ μάκριτα πολλοῦ καιροῦ, νὰ ν’ἀσπασθῇ νὰ πέσῃ,
Δίχως μεγάλην δύναμιν. Μ’ἐκείνος ποῦ μπορέσῃ.
Κτέτοιναν σκλαβιάν νὰ λυτρωθῆ, τὸν κράζουσιν μεγάλον,
Στὸν κόσμον καλορίζηκον, παρὰ κανέναν ἄλλον. (Ι 185-192)

Παρακαλῶτον καὶ ἐγὼ Βάγιαμου σὰν καὶ σέναν,
Διατὶ δὲν ξεύρω τίχουσιν, καὶ μέσα τὰ καϊμένα.
Τὰ άσωτικὰ μου σφάζουνται, καὶ ὁ πόθος μ’ ἀρχινίζῃ,
Σάμετρον φόβον, καὶ πολὺν, τρομάραν νὰ γυρίζῃ. (II 87-90)

See also pp. 257-8 for illustrations.
1.2.3. Paratextual characteristics

The structure of the edition follows the conventions of editions of dramatic texts at the time: the address to the readers and the list of the *dramatis personae* and the argument of the play precede the main text. The address to the readers was a usual practice in editions of the period. It is written by Kigalas himself and presents the background to the edition (that the Latin script manuscript of the play was offered to him by Chareris) and the usefulness of the book for the readers. The argument of the play presents a short summary and a very brief comment on the moral teaching of the plot, in which a religious tone is given: ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ τοῦ ἀδερφοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως εὐχαριστᾶται εἰς τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τὴν δικαιωτάτην ὁποῦ ἔγινεν ἐκ θεοῦ.

The two Venetian editions are the only witnesses of the play which include a summary of the plot (although it should be noted that the Athens manuscript is missing many folios from the beginning of the play and the Munich manuscript is missing the Dedication, so the summary could have been lost). Of all the other plays of Chortatsis, a summary is preserved only in a Heptanesian manuscript of *Panoria* (ms A) and can be attributed to a Heptanesian redactor, judging from its linguistic features. So perhaps a summary did not accompany the Cretan manuscripts of plays (neither *King Rodolinos*, which was printed ten years after *Erofili*, includes a summary of the play). On the other hand, it belonged to the conventions of printed editions of dramatic texts, which had been standardized in the previous century.⁷⁷ So most probably Kigalas was familiar with these conventions and added a summary to the material that was included in the manuscript from which he published *Erofili*.

---

⁷⁷ The development of these conventions in European theatre is presented in Stone Peters 2000: 17-27. The same conventions are followed in other Modern Greek dramatic texts of the period, as *Rodolinos, Evgena* and *Pastor Fidos*. 
1.3. The condition of the text

The edition is missing several couplets from various parts of the play: Prol. 27-8, 35-6, 51; I 9-10, 237-8, 437-8; II 101-8, 149-50, 509-11; IV 281-2, 567-600; V 225-6, 253-6, 283-4, 289-90, 303-4, 425-8, 495-6, 589-90. Most of these small gaps occur in other sources of the play as well, especially in the Munich manuscript, and they are couplets whose absence does not seriously affect the understanding, or parts of passages where significant differences between groups of sources exist (Act V).\(^78\)

The gaps that are found only in K are Prol. 27-8, 35-6, 51; I 437-8; II 101-8, 149-50. Of all these, only the absence of Prol. 35-6 and I 437-8 disrupts the sense:

\[
\text{Διαυτὸ ὅσοι φαντάζουνται, μὲ τέχνην ἡ μὲ γνῶσιν,}
\]
\[
\text{Νὰ κάμουσιν τὸ χέρημου νὰ μὴν ἵππορὴ νὰ σώσῃ.}
\]
\[
\text{Λωλλοίναι ὅσοι ἀθάνατοι λογιάζουν νὰ ὑπομείνουν,}
\]
\[
\text{Καὶ μελετοῦν κέρδη πολλά, κ’ἀρίθμητα. πλουτεῖνου. (Prol. 33-8)}
\]

\[
\text{Δὲν ξίζουν ἡ μετάγνωσας, καὶ οἱ καϊμοὶ δὲν φθάνουν,}
\]
\[
\text{Τὸ πρᾶγμα ὅποι νὰ γίνηκεν μέσο σας νὰ ὁλιγάνουν.}
\]
\[
\text{Θὲν νὰ λογιάσης μοναχὰ, πῶς οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡμέρα,}
\]
\[
\text{Ε’σὲν καὶ έκείνην ἀκομὴ, εἰς τοῦτο τὸ πρᾶγμα φέραν. (I 435-40)}
\]

The couplet 35-6 of the prologue is part of a larger passage where the order of verses is problematic (33-40 are placed after 50, and 51 is missing, so this corruption is probably due to Kigalas’s exemplar). Lines 27-8 of the Prologue mention Carthage, so their absence could be a deliberate omission by Kigalas, who either did not understand the historical reference, or considered it as difficult for his audience to understand. The bigger gap in Act II, 101-8, is a passage with almost self-contained meaning, so the omission could be a deliberate abridgement by a copyist or even a redactor for the needs of a performance:

\[
\text{(Ερωφ.) Σώννουν τὰ πάθη π’ οὐδ’ οὐχουσίν, τὴν δόλιαν τὴν καρδιάνμου,}
\]

\(^78\) For more details see section 3 of Chapter 2.
Τρυγυρισμένην. κιαύταρκον, Βάγια τά κλάματά μου.
Σάν ἢν πολύς καὶ ἀμέτριτος φόβος νἀ μὲ σκοτώση,
Δίχως κ' ἡ καταδίκησου δύναμιν να τοῦ δώση.
(Νένα) Ποί' ἄλλη ἀφορμή ναι τὸ λοιπὸν, σὲ κάμινη τώρα νάσαι, 109
Τόσον κλητή και ταπεινή, καὶ τόσον νά φοβᾶσαι;

Also, extra couplets are added after I 70, III 194, IV 670. These additions just repeat something that has already been mentioned, or give a more narrative style:

Εὐθασεν ὁ Πανάρετος, καὶ σφικταγκάλλιασέντον.
Καὶ λέγειτο Πανάρετε, καλημερίσματά σου (after I 70)

Καθὼς χαρὰ μηδὲ καμιά, δὲν εὐρίσκεται ν' ὅμιαζῃ,
Μὲ τῆς ἄγαπης τήν χαράν, προῦκα δὲν εἶναι πάλιν
Σάν ὅταν δύο χωρίζουνται ποὺ χοῦν φιλιάν μεγάλην,
Τοῦτο καλὰ τὸ ξεύρομεν, κ' ὅλοι τὸ μαρτυροῦσιν. (after I 257).

Τόσον ποῦ ὁ κόσμος γίνεται ὅλοθεν μαυρισμένος,
Καὶ ὅλος ἀέρας τ' οὐρανοῦ, μένει σκοτεινιασένος (after III 194)

Kigalas’s text contains a substantial amount of errors and corrupted passages. Many of these textual problems seem to originate from earlier stages of the transmission of the play, as they are found in other witnesses as well (I 171, I 274, I 591, II 214, II 283 etc.). In addition to a few misprints, many errors seem to be a result of misunderstandings and misreadings during the transliteration of the Latin alphabet. The cluster –gn– is frequently transliterated as γν (μόν' γνια, σταγνιό, προξεγνιά, χιόγνια). Combinations of letters which would look similar in the Latin alphabet, like ghi (χι) and gli (λι) or chie (κε) and dhe (δε) are frequently misunderstood:

• εἰς μάλην instead of εἰς μάχην (I 27, maghi -magli)

79 It should be noted, however, that this is not necessarily a misunderstanding of the conventions of the Latin script, as the same practice appears systematically in other Venetian editions, as King Rodolinos and The Cretan War by Bounialis. Perhaps it was an effort to represent in writing the synizesis (cf. Alexiou & Aposkiti 1995: 46, about Bounialis).
καὶ καρτερεῖ instead of δὲ καρτερεῖ (II 379, dhe-chie)

Other passages are misinterpreted because of the misinterpretation of the word division and the misunderstanding of the phonetic orthography of the Latin script:

- διατίμας ἐκράτεν ἡτήρησις (Deiîiô polîa) τόννούμας, instead of deiiîo polâ (dhiîlio pola, I 219)
- φαίνουντον νάναί έναν instead of μοû φαίνετόνε Nένα (mu fenetone Nena, II 147)
- Κύριέμου άσγένη σήμερον instead of κι έρημο (chierimo, III 370)
- ἐμαχήσατο instead of αἷμα χύσασι (emaghisasi, IV 485)
- σὰν μὲ τρεῖς λόγχαις instead of σ’ ἄμετρης λόχης (s’ ametris loghis, IV 752)
- νὰ γαληνώσης / τὴν μάνητα instead of νὰ χαλινώσεις (ghaglinosis, IV 461-2)
- νὰ σὲ κυκλώσουν instead of κουκλώσου (cuclosu, V 7)

The editor also seems to be easily confused by long sentences and hyperbata:

- εἰς τέτοι ἀνθηβολὴν βαριὰν, νὰ στέκουν πεθυμοῦσι (I 128, instead of βουβά)
- τέτοιας λογῆς καὶ ταῖς καρδιαῖς, τά λόγια ἃπο ποθοῦσιν, / μετάξια ταῖς κορασιαῖς οἱ ἀγαπητικοὶ κινοῦσιν / σπόν πόθοντος ταῖς σύρνουσιν, πλέα παρ’ ἄλλον καὶ ένα, / ζητά τὸ θάῤῥος μου, πάντα στὴν δούλευσίμου, / νὰ βάλω καὶ τὴν κόρην μου τὸ δεῦμα τ’ ἀντίμεφινμου (III 208 μοû τάσσει)
- καὶ σιδερὴν τὴν ὁμιλιὰν νὰ βαγάννα τὸ καîμένον / τόσα νὰ εἰπὼ κοράσιμου δὲν ἦτον μπορεμένου. (V 25, instead of τὸν καήμό μου).
and are found throughout the whole text, so this work has been done very systematically. Learned consonant clusters, like αυ and ευ instead of ψ (ἀνάπαυσιν, δούλευσιν), σθ instead of στ (ἐχαλασθῆκαν, ἀποχωρισθούμεν), φθ or πτ instead of φτ (φθάνει, μπορῶ να), μβ instead of μπ (γαμβροὺς, θαμβώνε ται, ἐμβαίνω), νδ instead of ντ (πανδρεμένη), σχ instead of σκ (ἔπασχε, σχοινία), and the clusters γχ, μψ, γμ, νθ are preserved (ἄσπλαγχνος, λόγχη, ἀνθος, ἄνθρωπος, λάμψη, πράγμα). Archaizing endings in nouns are preserved: αἱ τιμαί, τὴν γνῶσιν, τὸν βασιλέαν, οἱ βασιλεῖς and the dialectal forms of the article and the pronoun, τοῇ and τοῖ are replaced with the common forms τῆς, τοὺς, ταῖς. Kigalas also keeps the final –ν in the genitive plural and the third plural person of verb forms, which is omitted in the Cretan dialect. All the future forms with θὰ are replaced by θὲν νὰ (more frequently), θὴλη or νὰ, and μπορὰ is always replaced with μπορῶ νὰ.80

Kigalas systematically avoids certain dialectal or demotic words and always changes the relevant passages according to his preferences:

- χώνω, ζυγώνω and βλέπησι is always replaced with κρύβω, διώχνω and φύλαξη.
- κατατάσσω, σιργουλίζω and διάξες are replaced with various synonyms: γαληνήση (κατατάξη, Ι 11), κατευνάζω (κατατάσσω, Prol. 20); τάξαις (διάξες, I 59, I 142, IV 557). paralleling (κατατάξη, ΙI 118), διάξες (κατατάσσω, ΙI 398).
- κἂν is used instead of (σ)κιὰς and πάραυτα, παρευθύς, ξαφνικά, σύντομα instead of γιαμιὰ and ζημιό.
- κατέχω and γρικῶ are sometimes replaced by synonyms (μαθαίνω, γνωρίζω, ἀκούω, ἠξεύρω), but not systematically.

80 The use of θὰ was a relatively recent development at the time and, since this form was used more frequently in comedies than in other genres, as research has shown, perhaps Kigalas considered the form too demotic. For the evolution of the formation of future in this period, see Holton 1993 and Markopoulos 2007.
Other Cretan words that are replaced by synonyms that would be easier for the readers to understand are:

- ἀντήρητα (Ι 117), replaced by ἀσύνετα
- κοπελίστικον (Ι 150), replaced by ἀνήλεικον
- δότομη (Ι 538) by εἰς ἡλικιάν
- γλακᾶ, (ΤΤΙ 84) by τρέχει
- κοπελιάρη (IV 126) by νέον
- ταέλεγο (IV 336), by σπούργητα
- πατούχες (V 113) by πατοῦσαις
- ἀναμουρδώσω (IV 630) by μαγαρίσω

Other changes at the level of vocabulary show a preference for more learned forms:

- στερήσω (I 278), instead of πάρω
- υπέρλαμπραις (II 326) instead of φωτερές
- καινήν (ΙΙ 433), instead of καινούργια
- τὴν κυρίαν, instead of κόρη or κυρά
- πατρός (ΙΙΙ 259) instead of κυροῦ
- ἀνταπόδωσιν (IV 146) instead of πλέρωμαν
- τῆς ἄθλιας ἐμοῦ (IV 244) instead of κακορίζικης
- φρόνησις (IV 170, 259 etc) instead of φρόνεψη
- ζωὴν (IV 388) instead of ζήση

Another example of an archaism is the term “στροφή τοῦ δράματος” instead of Interlude. This is the only appearance of the term in Cretan Literature\(^{81}\) and it was probably influenced by the lyric parts of Ancient Greek Drama.\(^{82}\)

---

\(^{81}\) See also Puchner 2001 on stage terminology in Modern Greek Drama.

\(^{82}\) The use of this term, as well as other characteristic lines which Kigalas has revised extensively, is one of the indications that Prosopsas used this edition as a model for his play. The term στροφή is also used by Katsaitis in Thyestis, as a term for the Interludes (although no interludes have been
On the other hand, as has already been observed, Kigalas sometimes moves in the opposite direction and uses Cypriot dialectal features: τζάμπρα (I 307) instead of κάμερα, μοναῦτα (I 359) instead of ζιμιόν, αὐταρκοῦν (II 98) instead of σώνουσι, κουσενιασμένες (II 302) instead of εὐχαριστημένες, ἀκ instead of ἐκ or ἀπ(ό), κουρελλένος instead of κοραλένιος. The endings –ες and – εν are used in the past continuous (ἐθώρες, ἐκράτεν, ἐμπόρεν, ἐθάρεν, instead of ἐθώρειε, ἐκράτειε etc) and the ending –ένος replaces –ένιος (ἀσημένα, ζαφυρένα, κουρελλένα). Geminate consonants as in τελείωννει, πλιόττερα, πολλήν, are also an indication of Cypriot influence, although it should be noted that geminates sometimes appear in Cretan texts in the Latin alphabet, such as the Dedication to Mourmouris in the Birmingham manuscript (which was not copied by Foskolos) and L’Occio by Giovanni Papadopoli.

The nature of the linguistic interventions of Kigalas shows that he had good knowledge of the Cretan dialect, because usually the original meaning of the phrases he alters remains the same. So the editor understood Cretan words, but replaced them because his edition was intended for a public which would either not understand or not appreciate a dialectal text. The insertion of Cypriot vocabulary, on the other hand, seems to be accidental and occasional and most probably Kigalas used Cypriot words without realizing that they are dialectal.

preserved in the manuscript of the play). The comparison of the passages of Thyestis influenced by Erofili does not give any other indication that Katsaitis was aware of the edition of Kigalas.

84 See section 4.1.1 of this Chapter for details.
85 See Vincent 2007: 371-4 for examples of Greek words in the Latin alphabet.
1.5. Versification

Sometimes Kigalas’s changes are combined with an effort to respect the versification, but this is not always the case, as the metre and the rhyme are frequently distorted. In lines 11-14 of the Prologue, the use of the article τοὺς instead of τοι does not damage the versification, as the syntax and the phrasing are changed to a more learned level, so that the metre is not affected:

Ἐγώ μ’ ὁποῦ τοὺς βασιλεῖς, καὶ τοὺς δυνάστας οὐλους, πλουσίους τε καὶ πένητας, ἀφθέντας, καὶ τοὺς δούλους, ὁμοῦ νέους καὶ γέροντας μικρούς τε, καὶ μεγάλους.

A similar thing happens in 23-24, where he changes the phrasing in order to avoid the use of μπορεζάμενες and he adapts it so as to respect the metre and the rhyme:

ποῦ τῶν ἑλλήνων βασιλεῖς; ποῦ τῶν Ῥωμαίων τόση, | δύναμις, πλοῦτος, καὶ πολλαῖς χώραις, καὶ τόση γνῶση. But most frequently the addition of final –ν, the use of the full forms of articles or pronouns and the substitution of words make lines hypermetric:

- πράγμαν πολλὰ παράξενον ἀπὸ τὴν ὄραν ἐκείνην (Ι 167)
- Μ’ ἦτον ὁ κόπος μ’ εὔκαιρος, ὅτι ἀναψεν στὴν καρδιάν μου (Ι 181)
- ὃταν ἀπεται τὴν φλόγατης εἰς μίαν μερὰν κ’ εἰς ἄλλην (II 188)
- ὁχου ἀλήμονον, καὶ τί γροικῶ, τάχα καινούργια πάλιν (III 59)

The rhyme is often affected, either by an addition of a –ν to only one of the words, or by the replacement of a word with another:

- τοῦτον τὸν λόγον λέγωτον, διότι κρατοῦσιν ἄλλοι, | Βλέποντας τὸν Πανάρετον εἰς τόσην τιμὴν μεγάλην (Ι 57-8)
- Καὶ ἀπὸ τὴν ἄλλην βλέποντας, τὴν χρείαν τοῦ Βασιλιάμου | θάνατον εἶχα πλέον γλυκὺν, νὰ δώσω τοῦ ἐμαυτοῦμου (Ι 247-8)
- Ταῖς μάχαις ταῖς ἄδικαις, στὸν νοῦντο τῷ πῶς δὲν βάλλης, | μᾶ τόσου ταραχίζεσαι. Καὶ τόσην πίκραν πιάννης (IV 495-6)
Moreover, hiatus is not avoided, as in the other witnesses, so the euphony of the play is distorted:

- Μὲ ὅλον τοῦτο πεθυμῶ, διὰ πλέον θεράπευσίν μου (Prol. 7)
- Τὸν ἑαυτόντου εἰς τιμαῖς, καὶ δόξας ἀνεβάζει (I 52)
- Δὲν ἥξευρω ἡ κακόμοιρα σήμερον ἄν γλυτώσω (IV 4)

1.6. Style

The complicated structure of Chortatsis’s syntax and style is frequently simplified. A characteristic example of an extended adaptation of a complicated passage is the beginning of the Prologue: Kigalas either confuses the relative pronoun ἁποὺ with the preposition ἀπὸ, or he considers the sentence too complicated and turns it into two sentences, at the same time changing the whole passage so that it makes sense, resulting in a text that, despite some difficulties, has the same meaning as the original, but loses the dense and complex syntax that is a special characteristic of Chortatsis’s style:

```
Η῾ ἄγρια καὶ ἀλύπητη, καὶ σκοτεινὴ θεωρία μου,
Καὶ τὸ δρεπάν’ ὅποι βαστῶ. καὶ τοῦτα τὰ γυμνάμου
Κόκκαλα. Κ’ ἡ πολλαίς βρονταῖς. καὶ ἀστραπαῖς ὀμάδη,
Α’πὸ τὴν γῆν μ’ ἀνοίξασιν. κ’ εὔγηκ’ ἀπὸ τὸν ἅδην.
Ποίος ἦμαι δίχως νὰ τ’ εἰπὼ. ὅλοι σας ἐμπορεῖτε.
```

Generally long sentences are broken in smaller ones and subordinate syntax is avoided:

```
Μ’ ἄφον ἀναθραφήκαμεν. καὶ ἡλθαμεν σ’ ἡλικίαν
Δὲν ἡμιπροόμεν πλέον ὁμοῦ. διὰ τῆς τιμῆς τὴν βία.
Νὰ στέκομεν. Μ’ ὁ Βασιλέας μὲ πίκρανμὰς μεγάλην,
Χωρίζη. Ὄμως ἐσμίγαμεν. εἰς τὸ παλάτην πάλιν. (I 161-4)
```
Καὶ τρέμουν καὶ φοβοῦνταισε, καὶ δὲν ἀποκοτοῦσιν,
Μέσα κταίς ἐπαρχιαῖς
Ν’ άλθουν νὰ μᾶς πειράζουσιν, μᾶλιστ’ αὐτοὶ ἀναμένουν,
Πόλεμους ἀπολόγουμας, ώσάν τοὺς περασμένους.
Στὴν Πέρσιαν τρέμουν δυνατά νὰ μὴν τὸ πάθουν πάλιν,
Καὶ πάντατους σὲ σκότησιν στέκουν πολλὰ μεγάλην. (I 393-8)

1.7. Other interventions

Historical references and other proper names appear in corrupt versions in Kigalas’s edition. Memphis and Egypt are confused in the Prologue, where Charos presents the setting of the play (Prol. 111-116):

Λέγω στὴν χώρανσας διατί, δὲν ἦσθαι ὡσὰν θαῤῥεῖτε,
Στὴν μέμφιν, μόν’ στὴν Αἴγυπτον τὸν τὰς γῆν πατεῖτε.
Αἴκουτε μέμφοι οἰ ξάκουστοι, πολλὰ ὀνοματισμένοι,
Διὰ τὰς καλὰς πηράμιδες σὲ ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην.
Ποῦ ἐδῶ τὸν τώρα ν’ εὑρίσκεσθε, σὰς ἔκαμεν ἡ χαρίς,
Τοῦ ζεὺς, ξόμπλην καθ’ ἕνας σας. Δἰἀνὰ μπορῆ νὰ ’πάρη

Similar problems exist in the same passages in the Heptanesian manuscript of Erofili. Also, the absence of the couplet about Carthage (Prol. 27-8) and the reference to the Colossos of Rhodes or the Colosseum (κάστρη τόσα is written instead of Κολόσσα) could also be a deliberate omission by Kigalas who might have considered them as difficult for a wider audience to understand. Although the information about performances of the Cretan plays is limited, the text themselves show that they were addressed to an audience with a level of education that allowed the understanding of such references86, and it is interesting to observe that these could (apparently) not be so readily understood by audiences in different educational and cultural environments. On the other hand, the tower of Babel is called Nimrod’s

tower (Prol. 53), after the Biblical figure of Nimrod, who is related to the building of the tower of Babel.\textsuperscript{87} Kigalas, as a priest, was probably influenced by his readings and his knowledge of Biblical matters.

Finally, another aspect of the aesthetics of Kigalas’s edition that would deserve closer study is the nature of the changes he makes to the text. Apart from his choice of more learned vocabulary, his phrasing sometimes seems to be influenced by religious texts. For example, the exclamation ὦ πλῆσα κακορίζικοι is transformed to οὐαὶ εἰς τοὺς ταλαίπωρους and μεγάλοι ν’ ἀπομένετε μὲ τῶν ἄλλω τὸν κόπο as adapted by Kigalas resembles preaching in the church: τὴν ἄρπαγὴν ὅποι κάμνετε, εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τὸν κόπο. A comparison with other texts which deal with the subject of \textit{memento mori} and the Underworld, reveals some similarities in the phrasing. In \textit{Penthos Thanatou}, l. 147, ἰδέτε τοὺς ταλαίπωρους; 287-294, 356, there are references to avarice and the desire to acquire goods regardless of the needs of the poor. The same motif of the exploitation of the poor, or the advice to perform acts of charity, appears in two alphabet poems with the same subject: Ἄνθρωπε, πάσχεις καὶ θαρρεῖς, l. 18, ἢ δυναστεύσης ὀρφανοὺς καὶ πένητες καὶ χήρες, l. 105, καὶ ἐνθυμήσου τοὺς πτωχοὺς καὶ ποίσε ἐλεημοσύνην; Ἄνθρωπε, τί 'ναι τὰ κοπιᾶς, l. 5, γενοῦ οἰκτίρμων στὰ πτωχὰ, 23-4, μὰ πάλιν παραγγέλλει μας διὰ τὴν φιλαργυρίαν, τὸν φθόνον καὶ τὴν ἄρπαγὴν καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν\textsuperscript{88}. Also, the description of the Underworld, στὰνήλιον κ’ εἰς τὸ σκοτεινὸν τῆς μάβρης γῆς τὸ χῶμα (Prol. 68, instead of ψυχὲς γδυμένες δὲν ξεύρω ποῦ, στὴ γῆ λιγάκι χῶμα), resembles the description in \textit{Apokopos}: κ’ ἐμπῆκα εἰς μνήμα σκοτεινὸν, εἰς γῆν καὶ ἀνήλιον χῶμα (66), νὰ γέρθημαν οἱ ταπεινοὶ ἀπὸ τ’ ἀνήλιον στρῶμα (243). Of course these are common topics and similarities in subject matter or in phrasing do not necessarily mean that there is a direct influence, but it is not improbable that Kigalas

\textsuperscript{87} The Oxford Guide to People and Places of the Bible, s.v. “Nimrod”.

\textsuperscript{88} Kakoulidi 1964: 97-103.
remembered verses or phrases from texts with related subjects (especially from published texts like *Penthos Thanatou* or *Apokopos*) that he considered appropriate for the work he was editing. Another aspect that could be considered is the frequent change of the word μοίρα (“Fate”), as well as καλομοιριά and occasionally κακομοιριά with τύχη (“Fortune”) and κακοτυχιά / καλοτυχιά: καλομοιριά is systematically changed to κακοτυχιά, with only two exceptions at the end of the play, μοίρα is sometimes changed and κακομοιριά only once. Perhaps μοίρα sounded fatalistic or seemed to be connected to the personified Moirai of popular tradition, and thus was considered inappropriate for theological reasons. In addition, alterations to the text for moral reasons could be considered as possible: sometimes the word πόθος is replaced by others, such as κόπος (I 272, 394), ἀγάπη (I 382), ἔρωτος (I 13), although this is not done systematically. Also verse I 257 (γλυκεὶα τοῦ πόθου ἀντίμεψη... ) is missing and the whole passage is adapted:

Καθὼς χαρὰ μηδὲ καμιὰ, δὲν εὑρίσκεται ν’ ὀδύμαιζῃ,  
Μὲ τῆς ἀγάπης τὴν χαρὰν, προῖκα δὲν εἶναι πάλιν  
Σὰν ὅταν δύο χωρίζουσιν ποῦ χοῦν φιλιάν μεγάλην,  
Τοῦτο καλὰ τὸ ξεύρομεν, κ’ ὅλοι τὸ μαρτυρῶσιν

In Erofili’s nightmare (II 147-50), the reference to the embraced doves (ἐσμίγασι κανακιστὰ καὶ σπλαχνικὰ ἐφιλοῦσα) is missing:

Δύο περιστέρια πλουμιστὰ μοῦ φαίνουντον νάναι ἑναν,  
Καίναντ’ ἄλλου τὰ πάθητους σοῦ φαίνετε λαλοῦσαν.

Of course, there is not much evidence to prove the hypothesis that Kigalas intended to censor the play with certainty, because the examples are very few. Moreover, the

---

89 Alexiou and Aposkiti (1992: 18) refer also to interventions in the text for reasons of religious propriety, citing as an example the use of πνεύματα and σπίρτα instead of δαίμονες in the stage directions of the Interludes (after ii 30 and iii 125). However, σπίρτα is used in the Munich manuscript as well (in ii 30), so most probably it was written like that in Kigalas’s exemplar. Perhaps πνεύματα is an attempt to use a more learned word instead of one with Italian origin.
secret marriage between Erofili and Panaretos is so important for the plot that Kigalas would have had to revise the whole play if he wanted to avoid mentioning it.

1.8. Later reprints

The 1648 reprint faithfully reproduces the first edition with no alterations.90 The 1682 reprint omits the introductory note of the editor (‘Τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις’) and adds a title at the Prologue (‘Ἀρχὴ τῆς τραγωδίας’), which was untitled in the previous editions.91 Apart from that, no other alterations are introduced. The impact of these reprints was not significant, as all the later editions of the play in the next two centuries were based on the Gradenigos edition.

1.9. Conclusions

The edition of Kigalas is a very interesting witness for the history of the transmission and reception of the play. Apart from its historical importance, as the first printed edition of a modern Greek dramatic text, this witness deserves a close study which will illuminate many aspects of the production and circulation of Venetian chapbooks. The close examination of the edition shows that the prevailing opinion about the poor quality of the text it has preserved is not unjustified. However, as Sathas had first remarked, even this edition can sometimes be useful for the restoration of problematic passages; although Xanthoudidis considered this

90 Title page: ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ | Ο’ΝΟΜΑΖΟΜ’ΕΝΗ | ΕΡΩΦΙΛΗ, | ΠΟΙ’ΗΜΑ ΤΟΥ- ΛΟΓΙΩΤΑ ΤΟΥ | Ἐν σπουδαίοις Κυροῦ Γεωργίου Χορτάτζη Κρητὸς :- | Καὶ συνεργεία τοῦ εὐγενεστάτου ἐν ἄρχουσι, Κυροῦ Φι- | λίππου Χαρέρη Ζακύνθιου :- | Con licentia de’ Superiori, & Priuilegio :- | Ἑ’ΝΕΤΙ’ΗΣΙΝ, αˏχμή | Παρὰ Ἰωάννη Ἀντωνίῳ τῷ Ἰουλιανῷ :- .

91 Title page: ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ | Ο’ΝΟΜΑΖΟΜΕ’ΝΗ | ΕΡΩΦΙ’ΛΗ, | ΠΟΙ’ΗΜΑ ΤΟΥ- ΛΟΓΙΩΤΑΤΟΥ | Ἐν σπουδαίοις Κυροῦ Γεωργίου Χορτάτζη Κρητὸς. | Καὶ συνεργεία τοῦ εὐγενεστάτου ἐν ἄρχουσι, Κυροῦ Φιλίππου Χαρέρη Ζακύνθιου. | Con licentia de’ Superiori. | Ἑ’ΝΕΤΙ’ΗΣΙΝ, αˏχπβ’ | Παρὰ Ἀνδρέα τῷ Ἰουλιανῷ.
text as absolutely useless and did not take it into account in his edition, scholars have subsequently shown that Kigalas's edition should not be overlooked. In the latest edition of *Erofili* and the Interludes by Alexiou and Aposkiti, Kigalas's edition has aided for the clarification of a few passages. For that reason the detailed study of Kigalas's text in comparison to the other witnesses is necessary.
Table 1

Kigalas’s linguistic interventions

1. Phonology

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ā</td>
<td>āν (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγαπημένος</td>
<td>ἀγαπημένος (13), ἡγαπημένος (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγαφτικός</td>
<td>ἀγαφτικός (3/7), ἀγαφτικός (4/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγδίκιωτος, ἀνεγδίκιωτος</td>
<td>ἀκδίκητος (3), ἀνέκδικητος (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδυνατός</td>
<td>δυνατός (15/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλαγμένος</td>
<td>ἀλλαγμένος 1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναπαημένος</td>
<td>ἀναπαμένος 6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναστεναμοί</td>
<td>ἀναστεναγμοί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνήμπορος, ἀνεήμπορος</td>
<td>ἀνήμπορος 4/5 +1 paraphrased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπομονή</td>
<td>ὑπομονή 3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρίφνητος</td>
<td>ἀρίφνητος 4/9, ἀρίφνητος 3/9 + 2 changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀφεντης, ἀφέντρα</td>
<td>ἀφεντής 2/46, ἀφέντρα 2/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βαρεμένος</td>
<td>βαρεμένος (1/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλοπούλα</td>
<td>βασιλοπούλα (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουβαίνομαι</td>
<td>βουβάλλα (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουηθῶ, βουηθός</td>
<td>βουήθησε (1/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουνιά</td>
<td>βουνά (3/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συχνά</td>
<td>συχνά (16/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φοινιάζω</td>
<td>φοινίζω (1/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γδικιώνω, γδικιωμός, γδίκιωση, γδίκια</td>
<td>ἐκδικαιώνω (1), ἐκδικοῦμαι (4), ἐξεκδικοῦμενον (1), ἐξεκδικοῦμενον (1), δίκη (4), ἐδικαιοσύνη (2), ἐκδικοῦμαι (4), ἐκδικοῦμαι (4), ἐκδικοῦμαι (4), δίκη (2), δίκαιο (4), ἐξεκδικοῦμενον (1), ἐξεκδικοῦμενον (1), δίκη (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεῖς</td>
<td>εῖς (10/20), ἔνας (7/20), 3 paraphrased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- εύω</td>
<td>-εύω 46/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θωριά</td>
<td>θωρία (12/20), θεωρία (3), θεωρία (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καιώμα</td>
<td>καίω (4/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κανείς</td>
<td>κανείς (68 / 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλάμα</td>
<td>κλάμα (21/22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλάγω</td>
<td>κλάγω (17/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλερονομιά, κλερονομῶ, κλερονόμος</td>
<td>κλερονοματική, κλερονομική, κλερονομικός (4/8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κερά</td>
<td>κερά (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλερωμή, πλερώνω</td>
<td>πλερώνω (4/16), πληρώνω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κουρφός</td>
<td>κουρφός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κραιά</td>
<td>κραία (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λαγός</td>
<td>λαγός (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λιγαίνω</td>
<td>λιγαίνω, ὅλιγαίνω (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ναύκλερος</td>
<td>ναύκλερος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νιός</td>
<td>νέος (18/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νιότη</td>
<td>νεότη (7/8), νιότη (1/8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλιά</td>
<td>πλέον (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλιότερος</td>
<td>πλεότερος (6/30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ντήρηση</td>
<td>τήρησις (7/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραπονεθώ, παραπονεμένος</td>
<td>παραπονηθώ, παραπονημένος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πηαίνει</td>
<td>πιένη (2), ύπαγέννη, παγένει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πηαίνου</td>
<td>φύγομεν, πάγομεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πηαίνω, πηαίνεις</td>
<td>πάνουν, πάσιν, πιένουν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πήγαινε</td>
<td>παγαίνω, παγαίνεις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πήγαινε</td>
<td>πάγαινε (4/5), κόπιασε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρικα, πρικαίνω</td>
<td>πρίκα / πρικα, πρικαίνω (15/150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σοθεμένος</td>
<td>συνθεμένος (1), other (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψεύτικος</td>
<td>ψευτός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψεύτικος (4/4)</td>
<td>ψευτός (1/3), ψευδής, ψευστός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψέμα</td>
<td>ψευματένιος, ψεματένος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Morphology

| ἁγαπημένος | ἡγαπημένος (8/21) |
| ἀδη | ἀδου (2) |
| βασιλιός | βασιλεύς (6), βασιλέας (3), βασιλέας / βασιληάς (5), βασιλεάς (1) |
| βασιλιόν | βασιλεάν (9), βασιληάν (8), βασιλεάν (1) |
| βασιλιοῦ | βασιλέως (19), βασιλεώς (1), βασιλίως / βασιληάως (4), βασιλείου (2), βασιλεά (2), βασιλεά (1), βασιλιού (1) |
| βασιλιοί, βασιλιούς, βασιλιώ | βασιλείς, βασιλεών (all) |
| βασιλιά | βασιλεά (1), 2 paraphrased |
| βασιλιά | βασιληά (6), βασιλεά (1), βασιλεύ (1) |
| ἠμπορὰ / μπορά | μπορώ (1/14), μπορώ νά |
| θά | θέν νά (13), νά (7), θέ + subj. (4), θέ + inf. (2), θέλω νά (2), θέλω + inf. (2), θέλω + subj. (1) |

3. Vocabulary

<p>| ἀναμουρδώνω | μαγαρίζω 2/2 |
| ἀπολιγαίνω | χάνομαι 1/1 |
| ἀντήρητα | ἀσύνετα 1/1 |
| ἀπερθήνος | ἀληθινός (1/1) |
| ἀπείς | ἀφόν (8), ἀφο (3), ἀφῆς (1), πειδή (2), (ἐ)πεί (2) + 5 paraphrased |
| ἀπείτις | ἀφ’ ὅτης (1/1) |
| ἀπολιγαίνω | χάνομαι (1/1) |
| ἀφορμάγρα | λολλάδα (1/1) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀφορμισμένος</td>
<td>βρουλισμένος (1/1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νένα</td>
<td>βάγια 9/21, νένα 7/21 (6 verses missing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βαρεμένος</td>
<td>βαρυμένος (1/4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βάρος</td>
<td>θλίψις (1/5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βλέπηση, βλεπημένος</td>
<td>3/6 φύλαξη, φυλαμένος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόστομος</td>
<td>εἰς ἥλιον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έχθρητα</td>
<td>μαλλιά (2/3), μάχη (1/3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζήση</td>
<td>ζωή (3/4), ψυχή (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φορά</td>
<td>βολά (8/35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μπορετό</td>
<td>βολετόν (4), τὸ πρεπόν (1), δυνατόν (1), μπορεμένον (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σιργουλιά, σιργουλίζω, σιργουλιστά</td>
<td>γαλλούφισμα (1), γαλλουφιά (2), παρηγορία, σμβουλή, τέχνη, συνεργία, καταπείθω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξα</td>
<td>έξουσιά (3/3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γιάντα</td>
<td>διατί (20), γιατί (2), γιάντα (2), διὰ ήντα (1), διὰ αὐτα (1), διότι (1), 3 paraphrased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ήντα</td>
<td>τί (18), ήντα (4) ποίαν, πώς, διατί</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γιατί</td>
<td>διατί (133), γιατί (11), διότι (10), ὅτι (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διάξω, διάξη</td>
<td>πράττω, κάμω, τάξη (3), other (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εδά</td>
<td>έδα (4/11), έδώ (1), τώρα (3), 2 paraphrased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐδεπά</td>
<td>(ἐ)δεπά (2/6), ἐδώ (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζυγώνω</td>
<td>διώχνω (3/7), βγάζω, ἀφήνω, 2 paraphrased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατέχω</td>
<td>κατέχω (25/37), ξεύρω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μάνητα</td>
<td>μάνητα (16), κάκητα (3), κάκιαν (2), other (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κάμερα</td>
<td>κάμερα (4), κάμερι (1), κάμαρα (1), κάμαρη (1) τζάμπρα (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατατάσσω</td>
<td>κατατάσσω (1/3), γαληνίζω, κατευνάζω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καματερή</td>
<td>καθημερινή</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(σ)κιὰς</td>
<td>κάν (all)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοπελλίτικος</td>
<td>άνειλήκος, κοπελλίτικος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοπελιάρης</td>
<td>νέος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κουζουλαίνω</td>
<td>λωλαίνω (1/1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κούτελο</td>
<td>μέτωπο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μονοτάρου</td>
<td>κατά κράτος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυροῦ</td>
<td>κυροῦ (1), πατρός (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κνογελῶ</td>
<td>χαμηληρής</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κουζουλαίνω</td>
<td>λωλαίνω (1/1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κούτελο</td>
<td>μέτωπο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μονοτάρου</td>
<td>κατά κράτος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυροῦ</td>
<td>κυροῦ (1), πατρός (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κνογελῶ</td>
<td>χαμηληρής</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λούπης</td>
<td>λούπος (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαξί</td>
<td>μαξί (8), όμοι (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαγνιά</td>
<td>μπόγλια (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μπορετός</td>
<td>μπορετός (13/20), βολετός (4/20), πρεπόν, δυνατόν, μπορεμένον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μπορεμένος</td>
<td>φουμισμένος (1/10), τιμημένος (1/10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μπόρεση</td>
<td>δυναστεία, δύναμις (4/14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νένα</td>
<td>βάγια (8), νένα (7), other (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ξάζω</td>
<td>ξιάζω (2/5), ἀξίζω (2), ἐξουσιάζω (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁμάδι</td>
<td>ὁμάδι (27/35, rhyme-words), ἀντάμα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πατούχα</td>
<td>πατούσα (1/1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλιά</td>
<td>πλέον (all)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πήγαινε</td>
<td>πάγαινε (4/5), κόπιασε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πηαίνομε</td>
<td>φύγομεν, πάγομεν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παίδωμή</td>
<td>παιδεμός (11), παιδευμός (1), παίδευσις (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οποδώνω</td>
<td>(α)ποσώνω, σκοτώνω, δαγκάνω</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίβετσι / τίβατας</td>
<td>τίβοτες (1/14), τίποτες (8), τίποτε (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τόμου καί</td>
<td>παρευθύς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τσέλεγος</td>
<td>σπούργητας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φρόνεψη</td>
<td>φρόνησι / φρόνεσι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χώνω, χωστά</td>
<td>χώνω (12/26), κρύβω (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψευτός</td>
<td>ψευτός (1/3), ψευδής, ψευστός</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The edition of Gradenigos

The second edition of *Erofili* appeared in Venice almost 40 years after the first, in 1676, at the printing house of Nikolaos Glykis, under the supervision of the Cretan scholar Ambrosios Gradenigos.\(^92\) Only one exemplar has survived and it now belongs to the Library of St Mark’s, having being donated to it by the Italian scholar Emilio Teza. Although the existence of the edition was known to Papadopoulos-Vrettos and Legrand,\(^93\) neither the bibliographers nor the first editors of the play, Sathas and Legrand, had been able to consult a copy.\(^94\) Sathas based his edition on a 1772 reprint, assuming that it was following accurately the 1676 edition,\(^95\) and the first scholar who actually took it into account was Xanthoudidis in his 1928 edition of the play.

This edition was reprinted several times until the beginning of the 19\(^{th}\) century: in 1746 by Bortoli\(^96\) and in 1772,\(^97\) 1804 and 1820 by Theodosiou.\(^98\)

2.1. Background and historical importance

Gradenigos, custodian of the Library of St Mark’s and an acclaimed scholar, collaborated with the printing houses of Glykis and Giuliani as a corrector, but was also appointed in 1671 as censor and corrector of all the Greek books published in Venice, after having submitted a report to the *Riformatori dello Studio di Padova* about

\(^{92}\) For the printing house of the Glykis family see Veloudis 1987; for the life and activities of Gradenigos see Manousakas 1955; Karathanasis 1970; Iliou 1985; Veloudis 1987: 59-60, 80-1.


\(^{94}\) Legrand 1881: xcviii; Sathas 1879: ξδ.\(^5\).

\(^{95}\) Sathas 1879: ξδ.\(^5\).


\(^{97}\) Legrand 1918-1928, vol. II: 163.

the low quality of Greek printed books. He corrected a variety of liturgical and religious books between 1671 and 1680 for Giuliani and Glykis, the only printers of Greek books in Venice at that time; *Erofili* is one of the few books with non-religious subject matter corrected by him (the others are Laskaris’s *Grammar* and the chronographical works of Dorotheos of Monemvasia and Nektarios of Jerusalem).

*Erofili* was published within the first six years of the operation of the printing house and with the exception of *Istoria tis Sosannis*, published in 1672, was the only work in verse published by Glykis until almost the end of the century, when *The Tale of Apollonios* appeared in 1696. Although some works of the mature period of Cretan Literature were printed in the previous decades (Voskopoula 1627 by Pinelli, 1st edition of *Erofili* 1637 and *Rodolinos* 1647 by Giuliani), the edition of *Erofili* does not seem to be part of an attempt by Glykis to enrich the corpus of modern Greek printed books with literary texts: the printer’s preface explains that the motivation for this edition was the bad quality of its first edition.

Glykis advertises this edition as not just a reprint, but as a carefully corrected text: διορθωθεῖσα δὲ εἰς τὴν φυσικήντης γλώσσαν μὲ κόπον καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν τοῦ Σοφωτάτου καὶ Πανοσιωτάτου Αμβροσίου τοῦ Γραδενίγου. It was a usual practice of the printers of the period to advertise their editions as revised and carefully corrected texts. However, it has been shown in praxis that this was usually an advertising gambit and the later editions are mere reprints of the first one, without even correcting mistakes. This case is an exception, because the edition is indeed

---

100 Italian printers used to advertise their editions with the same method, as they usually included letters to the readers where they stated that their edition was restoring the text to its original state, which had been corrupt in the previous editions, although their statement was not always true (Richardson 1994: 3).
101 This general principle has been formulated by Politis (1958: 305-6) and has been generally accepted since then (Kechagioglou 1998: 159-60; Kaklamanis 2001: 154). The examination of vernacular texts which have been reprinted many times confirms the truth of this general
a completely different text, without the serious textual and stylistic problems of the first one.

The importance of this edition lies not only in the fact that it is a text of very good quality, but also in the editorial principles on which it was based. The address of the printer to the readers, which is attributed to Gradenigos himself by modern scholars,\footnote{Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 19.} states that the previous edition of *Erofili* made the text repellent because of the alteration of the original language and style; for that reason in this new edition the text is restored to its original language and style, as it was composed by the poet, because one can appreciate and enjoy a literary text only when one reads it in the original language:

Ἡ παροῦσα τραγωδία, ὅσον εἶναι μελίρρυτος καὶ γλυκοδιήγητος εἰς τὴν φυσικήν της γλώσσαν τὴν Κρητικήν, τόσον εἶναι ἀνοστομίλητη καὶ συχαδερή εἰς ἐτέραν καὶ ἄλλοδαπὴν ὁμιλίαν. [...] Ἡ παροῦσα τραγωδία, ὅσον εἶναι μελίρρυτος καὶ γλυκοδιήγητος εἰς τὴν φυσικήν της γλώσσαν τὴν Κρητικήν, τόσον εἶναι μαζί με τὴν παραγωγήν τῶν στίχων καὶ ἀναγωγήν τῆς γλώσσας. Ἔνας δὲν μεταφέρει τὴν βιομορφὴν τῶν στίχων εἰς τὴν παροῦσα γλώσσαν, ἀλλ' ἐντός τῆς Κρητικῆς γλώσσας καὶ ἀνυπόκειται ἀνοστομίλητη καὶ συχαδερή εἰς τὴν φυσικήν της γλώσσαν τὴν Κρητικήν. Ἀδελφοὶ δὲν ἔχουσιν τὴν παραγωγὴν τῆς γλώσσας με τὴν παραγωγὴν τῶν στίχων τῆς γλώσσας τῆς παροῦσας τραγωδίας, ἀλλ' ἐχουσιν τὴν παραγωγὴν τῆς γλώσσας με τὴν παραγωγὴν τῶν στίχων τῆς παροῦσας τραγωδίας.

So, the editor’s approach, as described here, is not aiming just at the presentation of a readable text, but is critical in the philological sense of the word, as it follows the idea of publishing a text with respect to the author’s original style. For this reason...

\footnote{Kaklamanis 2001: 138-59 for other cases and some exceptions as well.}
Gradenigos has been characterized as the first critical editor in Modern Greek literature.\textsuperscript{103} This editorial approach, which stresses the importance of respect for the original language and style, is quite important for this period and shows that the printers of Greek texts in Venice had started to develop the appropriate attitude for editing texts in the Cretan dialect, as we can also attest from the editions of \textit{The Sacrifice of Abraham} and \textit{Erotokritos} which followed in later years (1696 and 1713 respectively) and had been prepared by Cretans with diligence and respect for the language and style.\textsuperscript{104}

No information about the sources of this edition is given, so we do not know if Gradenigos used only one manuscript or collated several. But it is beyond any doubt that he did not simply correct the text on the basis of Kigalas’s edition, without having access to another witness. Politis had first expressed this opinion, without elaborating on the subject.\textsuperscript{105} The detailed comparison of the two editions\textsuperscript{106} shows that this claim is indeed correct: the problem of the first edition is not only the extent of Kigalas’s linguistic interventions, but also the omission of lines (e.g. II 101-108) or the confusion of their order (Prol. 30-51) as well as a number of heavily corrupted passages; all these problems do not appear in the second edition, so Gradenigos must have used a different manuscript as the basis of his edition. This could not have been either the Birmingham or the Athens manuscript, because they belong to a different branch of the tradition, as will be shown later, and certainly not the Munich manuscript, which not only belongs to a different branch but also preserves a low quality text.

A further question which arises is if there are indications that Gradenigos compared his source to Kigalas’s edition. The most likely answer is no, if we judge

\textsuperscript{103} Manousakas 1955: 128.
\textsuperscript{104} Alexiou 1980: ιστ´-ιζ´.
\textsuperscript{105} Politis 1958: 314-5; see also Kaklamanis 2001: 158.
\textsuperscript{106} See Chapter 2 for details.
by the fact that his edition is missing couplets found in Kigalas and other witnesses
(I 133ab, found in K and B, I 70a, III 194ab, IV 670ab, found in K only and probably
not authentic,\textsuperscript{107} and i 24ab, iii 26ab, iii 98ab, iv 90ab from the Interludes, which are
found in all the other witnesses). Also Kigalas’s edition could have served as a source
for restoring some of the few problematic passages in Gradenigos’s edition. Alexiou
has already pointed out some cases where K offers solutions, as for example I 51
κοινά, instead of κεῖνα, and II 454, δόσια, instead of δροσιά.\textsuperscript{108} A few more examples
could be found, where Gradenigos could have avoided some mistakes in his own
edition, had he compared his source to Kigalas.

- Γ κιέναν ὑποῦ ῥπορέη / τέτια σκλαβιὰ νὰ λυτρῳθη / κτέοιαν σκλαβιὰν νὰ λυτρῳθη (I 190-1).
- Γ κ’ ἦλεγε ἢ τόσῃ παίδωμῃ πὼς θέλει μ’ ἀποθάνην ] Κ κ’ ἔλεγα ὁ τόσος παίδευμός, πὼς θέλη μ’ ἀποθάνη. However, ἦλεγε could be just a typographical error (I 204).
- Γ καθὼς πάνταμον σκλάβοςσου καὶ δότηλοσ μπιστικόςσου, / οὐδένα πράμμα ἐκάμα δίχως τὸν ὑρισμόσου ] Κ Καθώς παντ’ ἠμοῦν σκλάβος σου, καὶ φίλος πιστικόςσου / κ’ οὐδέναν πράγμα ἐκάμα δίχως τὸν ὑρισμόνσου (I 311).
- Γ Τὸ πὼς ποτὲ μὲ δύναμι νὰ πάρουν ἐμποροῦσα / Κ ὃτι ποτὲ μὲ δύναμιν διὰ πάρουν δὲν μποροῦσαν (IV 518).

From these examples it is apparent that Gradenigos did not collate the edition of
Kigalas with his own exemplar.

2.2. Contents and typographical characteristics

2.2.1. Structure

Title page: ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ | Ο’ΝΟΜΑΖΟΜΕ’ΝΗ | Ε’ΡΩΦΙ’ΛΗ | ΠΟΙ’ΗΜΑ ΤΟΥ-
ΛΟΓΙΩΤΑΣ ΤΟΥ, | Καὶ Εὐγενεστάτου, Κυρίου, Γεωργίου | Χορτάτζη τοῦ Κρητικοῦ. |

\textsuperscript{107} See the section 1.3 of this chapter for more details.

Μετατυπωθεῖσα μὲν μὲ ἔξοδον Κῗ Νικολάου Γλυκέως, | τοῦ ἐξ Ἰωαννίνων,
διορθωθεῖσα δὲ εἰς τὴν ψυχικήντης γλώσσαν μὲ κόπον καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν | τοῦ
Σοφωτάτου καὶ Πανοσιωτάτου Α’μβροσίου | τοῦ Γραδενίγου, Α’ββᾶ καὶ
Βιβλιοφύλακος | τῆς Γαληνοτάτης τῶν Ε’νετίων | Α’ριστοκρατίας, τοῦ Κρητικοῦ |
Ε’ΝΕΤΙΗΣΙΝ, ἀχος’ | Παρὰ Νικολάω τω Γλυκεῖ, τω ἐξ Ἰωαννίνων. | Con Licenza de’
Superiori, e Priuilegio.

Contents:

Address to the reader (Εἰς τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας)

Dedication to Mourmouris (Πρὸς τὸν εὐγενέστατον καὶ Ἐξοχώτατον Κύριον
’Ιωάννην τὸν Μούρμουρην)

Argument (Ὑπόθεσις τῆς Τραγωδίας, καλουμένης Ἐρωφίλης)

Dramatis personae (Πρόσωπα τοῦ Δράματος, ἤγουν τῆς τραγωδίας)

Prologue (πρόλογος, τὸν ὁποῖον κάνει ὁ Χάρος)

Acts I-V with Interludes i-iv intercalated between the Acts

2.2.2. Typesetting and orthography

The second verse of each couplet (as well as the third in the Choric Odes) is
indented, as was usually done in manuscripts and editions of rhymed texts of the
period in political verse, and the first letter of each verse is capitalized. Decorated
initials appear only in the Preface, the Dedication, the Argument and the Prologue.
Stage directions are printed in different fonts and are centred in the middle of the
line. Decorative floral motifs are used sometimes between different acts or scenes,
but in other parts of the text as well.

The orthography is generally correct and consistent, with the exception of the
irregularities and idiosyncrasies of the period: ἀρχήσω / ἀρχηνήσω but πατίσω/
ξυπνίσω, συμώνω, τυχένω, συκώνω, ἀφίνω, σβύνω, πρύκα (not always), τέρι, ζημιὸ,
ἐμαφτός, ἀφτίνος (not always). The traditional accentuation and breathing system is used, without significant mistakes. There is also a tendency to present in written form some of the characteristics of the Cretan pronunciation. The y-glide (οἱ γιάξοι, οἱ γιάθρωποι) is used systematically (more than 90%) to avoid hiatus. The y resulting from synizesis (χέργια, λογαργιάζει, θεργιὸ) is frequently written (almost 60%). Synizesis within a word or between consecutive words is also indicated with the use of –ι- (πιος, ὅπιος, πιένω, κράτιε, κ᾽ ἰανελύπητη, λολώτεριοδιώρθανατοι, τόσαγαπημένοι, χριάναι). According to Alexiou and Aposkiti this is an indication of lack of familiarity with the phenomenon of synizesis; however, it could be the exact opposite, an attempt to guide the readers on the metrical features of the text. It should be noted, though, that generally synizesis is avoided with the use of elision and aphaeresis (Καρπόφορ᾽ Ἀδερφάκιμου, φίλεμ᾽ ἀκριβὲ), following the standard practice of the printed texts of this period. Final –ν is not used before consonants, with the exception of κ, π and τ (not γκ, μπ and ντ) in the following cases: article+noun, enclitic pronoun following noun or verb, object pronoun preceding verb, at the end of the particles and conjunctions οὰν, μὴν, δὲν, ὅταν and in some adjectives and determiners like ἕνας, ἄλλος, περίσσος, πλῆσος, τόσος, τέτοιος etc. The use of –ν before κ, π and τ is systematic (around 90%) and the opposite case (ν used before a consonant other than these) is extremely rare (not more than 15 instances in the whole text). Most frequently instead of final –ν before κ and π, the voicing of the initial consonant is preferred (στὸγΚόσμο, τὸσο γκόπο, τὸμπύρο, τόσιἀγαπημένοι, χριάναι).

110 Cf. the observation about similar differences between the manuscript and the editions of The Sacrifice of Abraham (Bakker & van Gemert 1996: 142-3). See also Deliyannaki 2005: 177 and Bancroft-Marcus 2006: 339-40.
111 These are in general the cases when other texts of the period exhibit the use of final –ν, e.g. the writing system of Foskolos in his autograph of Fortounatos and the copy of Erofili, the notarial acts of Varouchas, the other Latin-script manuscript of Erofili (Vincent 1980: οὰ -οε’, Bancroft-Marcus 1987: 64-5).
Contrary to the practice of the Latin-script manuscripts, initial κ is voiced (στὸ γκόσμο); the initial of proper names is also voiced (τὸμΠανάρετο), while the Latin-script manuscripts of Erofili always write to Panareto and never to Banareto.\(^{112}\) The phenomenon of voicing is not found in other printed editions of Cretan texts of the same period, but is not restricted to texts in the Latin alphabet, as it appears occasionally in the notarial acts of Varouchas.\(^{113}\) The voicing in Erofili, which predominates in the first two acts, becomes more rare in the Third Act and disappears completely in the fourth and fifth acts. The reason for that would be either that the editor did not care to indicate the phenomenon in the copy-text he prepared for print, or the neglect of the compositor (or compositors).

The punctuation is not standardized irrespective of the meaning, as in other printed texts of the period (comma at the end of the first line and full stop at the end of the second line of each couplet); on the contrary, it seems to aim to follow the needs of the sense. Couplet closure with full stop or semi-colon is not followed strictly, if the sentence continues to the following lines and a comma is placed at the caesura or the end of the verse only if the sense allows for it. This helps the reader to follow the sense, even in long sentences with complicated structure and a clash between the metrical form and the meaning:

\[
\text{Tὴν ἄσπρη σάρκα χώματα καὶ βρῶμο καταστένω,}
\]
\[
\text{Tὴν ὄψι λιώνω καὶ χαλῶ, καὶ πᾶσα μυρισμένο}
\]
\[
\text{Στῆθος, σκωλήκω κατοικιά κάνω ρημιό καὶ βρῶσι,}
\]
\[
\text{Κ’ ἢ χέρα μου καθημερνὸ γυρεύγει νά τελιώσῃ}
\]
\[
\text{Σπήτα, γενιές καὶ βασιλιές, καὶ κόσμους σὰν τυχένει}
\]
\[
\text{Ὑ δικιοσύνη τοῦ Θεοῦ νὰ μείνῃ πλερωμένη (Prol. 87-92)}
\]

\[
\text{K’ ἐπάσχισα δοὺ ’μπόρεσα τὴ λόχητζη τὴν τόση}
\]
\[
\text{Τζ’ ἀρχαῖς νὰ σβύσω πλιώτερα πρὶ μὲ καταπλακώσῃ,}
\]
\[
\text{Μί’ ἀτὸν ὁ κόπος μ’ εὔκερος, γιατὶ ἂψε τὴ γκαρδιὰ μου}
\]

\(^{112}\) Vincent 1980: οα΄-οδ΄.

\(^{113}\) Bakker 1989-90: 278.
Γιαμιὰ γιαμία δὲ ξεύρω πῶς, κίδλα τὰ λογικάμου
Μοῦ πῆρε, κίάλλη ἀνάπαψι νὰ πάρω δὲν ἐμπόρου
Παρὰ τὴν ὥρα μοναχάς ποῦ τὴ γκερά μου ἐθώρου. (I 179-84)

Καὶ τοῦτος ὁ Πανάρετος μόνο γιὰ τὴν τιμή σου
Τὸ θάνατο δὲ χρήζωντας, οὐδὲ γιὰ τὴ ζωή σου
Μηδὲ ποσῶς δὲν ἔχωντας βλέπησι στὴ δικήν του,
Εὐγήκεν ὁλομόναχος, καὶ μὲ τὴ δύναμιν του
Τς’ ἐχθροὺς, ἀπὸ βαστούσανε φωτιά νὰ μὰς κεντίσου,
Καὶ μὲ τῇ Βασιλείασου νὰ πάρου τῇ ζωήσου,
Ε’διωξε, κ’ ἐδραμὲ σ’ αὐτοὺς τὸσα πολλ’ ἀνδριωμένος,
’Αποῦ βαρβοῦσα κ’ ἦτονε στῇ γῆ κατεβασμένος,
Γ’ τὸν ἄρμώτων ὁ Θεός, γιάλλος κιανείς βουηθόςας,
Κ’ εἰς τόσο κίνδυνον πολὺν εὑρέθη λυτρωμόςας. (IV 573-82)

On the other hand, very long sentences are sometimes split in two parts with full stop or semi-colon:

Καθὼς στολίζου μ’ δμορφο, καὶ λαμπυρὸ χρουσάφι,
Σὰν ἀποξετελιώσουσι τζ’ Εἰκόνες οἱ ζωγράφοι,
Καὶ τότε ’σ τόπο φανερὸ τζ’ ζῶση καὶ κρεμοῦσι,
Κίδλοι ποῦ τζ’ θωροῦσινε θαμάζου κ’ ἐπαινοῦσι
Τέτοιας λογῆς πᾶσα καιρὸ κ’ ἐκεῖνοι ποῦ τελιώσου
Τοῦ νοῦ τως κόπο τίβοτας, πρὶ ὄξω τὸν ἐδώσου,
Μεγάλ’ ἀθρωπὸς καὶἀξου τὸν ἐχαρίζου,
Καὶ τόσα μὲ τὴ χάριν του πλήσα τὸν ἐστολίζου. (Ded. 1-8)

Ἡ ἄγρια, κ’ ἰανελύπητη, κ’ ἡ σκοτεινὴ θωριά μου,
Καὶ τὸ δραπάν’ ὑπὲρ βαστώ, καὶ τοῦτα τὰ γυμνά μου
Κόκκαλα κ’ ἡ πολλαῖς βρονταῖς, κ’ ἡ ἀστραπαῖς ὑμάδι,
Apart from the first letter of each line and initials of proper names, many other words are capitalized. The King, the Counsellor and Erofili’s Nurse are capitalized (Βασιλιός, Σύμβουλος, Νένα), as well as titles and other forms of address, formal or affectionate (Αφέντης, Ἀφέντρα, Κερά, Νεράιδα, Κόρη) and personal relations (Ταίρι, Κύρης, Ἀδέρφι, Θυγατέρα, Παιδί, Γυναῖκα, Μάνα), abstract concepts (personified or not) as Νόμοι, Δικιοσύνη, Τύχη, Ριζικό, Ἕρωτας, Θεός, Οὐρανός, Κόσμος, Κόλαση, Ἡλίος and finally words referring to places or events (Πώλις, Κάμερα, Παλάτι, Χώρα).

2.2.3 Paratextual features

As we saw in the case of Kigalas, the structure of this edition follows the conventions of editions of manuscripts of dramatic texts as well. A list of the

---

115 Other examples:
Μάπεὶς γιὰ καλοσύνησου καὶ χάριν ἐδικήσου,
Καλὰ κ’ ἡ τύχησιν ποτὲ μὲ τή Βασιλικήσου
Τύχη δὲν ἔμιασε, ἀδερφὸ καὶ φίλον ἐκαμέσει,
Καὶ μπιστεμένον ὡς ἐδά λογιάζω γνωρισέμε.
Μὲ θάῤῥος μὴν τὸ βαρεθῇς ἀνὲν κἰἀποκοτίσω,
Τὴν ἀφορμὴ ποῦ σὲ κρατεῖ σὲ βάρος ν’ ἀρωτήσω,
Γιὰ νὰ συγκλίνω σὰν καλὸς φίλος σου νὰ συκώσω,
ὁσο μπορῶ ‘κτὰ πάθησου νὰ σὲ παραλαφρώσω. (Ι 83-90)

116 See also pp. 259-60 for illustrations.
dramatis personae and the argument of the play precede the main text (although summaries of the plays do not appear in the extant manuscripts of Cretan literature, nor in the edition of Rodolinos) and the changes of acts and scenes are signalled with a heading and the name of the characters which appear in each scene.

Gradenigos’s summary of the play follows that of Kigalas and close similarities in phrasing can be found: κρυφίως ἀπὸ τὸν Πατέρα τῆς, νὰ ἐνεργήσῃ τὰ τοῦ γάμου (G) - ἐνήργησεν τὰ τοῦ γάμου μετ’ αὐτήν κρυφίως (Κ); γυρίζωντας ὁ Βασιλεὺς νὰ ἰδῇ τὸ ἀποβησόμενον (G) - ἐρχόμενος δὲ ὁ Βασιλεὺς νὰ ἰδῇ τὸ ἀποβησόμενον (Κ); τὸν ἐθανάτωσαν καταπατώντας (G) - καὶ καταπατώντες τὸν ἐφόνευσαν (Κ); ἔτζη ἔμεινεν ἔρημον τὸ Βασίλειόντου ἐν τῷ ἄμα ἀνελπίστως (G) - καὶ ἔμεινεν ἡ Βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἔρημος ἐν μιᾷ ῥοπῇ τοῦ καιροῦ (Κ).

Both summaries repeat a detail about the murder of the King which is not attested in the stage directions: that the women murder the King by trampling on him. The references to wounds in the dialogue of the murder scene (ἀπονα μὲ πληγόνουσι, V 644) appear to contradict this. For that reason, this detail has been regarded as an inaccuracy and it is believed that the King is stabbed to death.117 Since both summaries have this inaccuracy, it is probable that Gradenigos used Kigalas’s summary as a model for his own.

2.3. The condition of the text

The overall quality of the edition can be described as high. However, it is not completely devoid of problems, both from mechanical causes and as a result of textual corruption. Some typographical errors can be found, e.g.

- λύχη instead of λόχη (I179)
- ζοτημένη instead of ζητημένη (I 534)

The most serious textual problems have already been discussed by scholars.\textsuperscript{118} Some errors indicate that the text was transliterated from a Latin script manuscript. Confusion between ζ and σ appears sometimes:

- ἀμποδίσασι instead of ἀμποδίζασι (Ded. 32)
- ξορίσω and καλοκαρδίσω (Ι 419-20)
- χαρίσῃ and γυρίσῃ (III 135)
- μανίσῃ and γνωρίσῃ (IV 257)
- ἀμποδίσῃ and γνωρίσῃ (IV 285)

Other problems seem to originate from the phonetic orthography of the Latin alphabet: ὅσον ἴσια instead of ὅσον ἦσα (confusion of the depalatalized ἴσα with ἦσα(ν), Int. i 118), ἁπούρθασ' εἶναι instead of ἁπούρθασιν (IV 483). Some errors which can be explained only as transliteration errors are found in other witnesses as well, but since they could have occurred independently in G they are also mentioned here: the confusion between α and o (θαρρῶ and θωρῶ II 1, II 135) could have occurred more easily if the exemplar was written in the Latin alphabet. Also the confusion between φ and σ (φύσις χάρη instead of ζήσης χάρη in I 490, also found in B) can be explained only because of the similarity between s and f in the Latin alphabet. A frequent confusion is also caused by the similarity between ghi and

\textsuperscript{118} Xanthoudidis 1921; Kriaras 1935; Politis 1952 and 1958; Alexiou 1954a, 1954b, 1959; Papatriandafyllou-Theodoridi 1972.
Examples of false word division appear, especially in cases of final and initial -ς or -ν:

- ἀπεῖς τῇ γῇ instead of στῇ γῇ (Pr. 49)
- ἀπεῖς τὸ τιμημένο, instead of στὸ τιμημένο (I 146)
- θωρεῖς στὰ ὑψη instead of θωρεῖ στὰ ὑψη (I 569; the following verses, with all the verbs in 3rd person singular, indicate that this is an error)
- πῶς τόπο μάνας (II 180), instead of στὸ τόπο, λέγει πῶς εἶδε, instead of λέγει πῶς σ’ εἶδε (III 98)
- μέσα ’σ καράβιν ἕνα instead of μέσα ’σ καράβι, νένα (Ι 133)
- μέσα σ’ βατσέλιν ἕνα instead of μέσα σ’ βατσέλι, νένα (V 556).

Other mistakes can also be explained as misunderstandings of the word division (probably because of a Latin-script exemplar):

- διαχωρίζουνται instead of δυὸ χωρίζουνται (I 258)
- τ’ ἄρχόμενα instead of τὰ ἐρχόμενα (I 520)
- μιὰν ὁ δ’ Ὁρανὸς instead of μιὰν ὁδό Ὁρανὸς (Ι 608)
- ἡμεριαγαπημένοι instead of μέρη ἀγαπημένα (i 74)
- δὲν πάγει περιδιάβασι instead of δὲν πάει γιὰ περιδιάβασι (iii 118)

Haplographies and other omissions of words are found as well:

- γιατί σὲ κάπιο φταίσιμον ἔπεσα ἀπατόμου instead of ἁπ’ ἀπατός μου (Ι 97)
- τοῦτ’ ἢς γενῆ σ’ ἐμέν’ ὁμπρος, φόβο κιανέαν ἔχω instead of φόβο κιανέαν ἄν ἔχω (III 169)
- σ’ τοῦτο ἀναθρεμένο instead of σ’ τοῦτο ἀναθρεμένο (III 262).

Only a few verses are hypermetric and they can easily be restored, e.g.
• μεσοβγαλμένοι ἀναστεναμοί, δάκρια πικροχυμένα, instead of μεσοβγαλμένοι στεναμοί (ii 125)
• μὰ μπόδιστον (sic) ἀπὸ λόγου τζη νά ʹχομε δὲ μπορούμε, instead of μὰ μπόδιστρο ἀπὸ λόγου τζη (ii136)
• κ’έκει ἀπὸ τρέχουν οἱ ποταμοί μὲ δίχως νά κτυποῦσι, instead of τρέχου οἱ ποταμοί (IV 111)
• γὰ νὰ σκοτώσι’ ως θέλετε δὴ πρὶν νὰ περάσῃ ἡμέρα, instead of ως θέτε δὴ (Prol. 101)
• καὶ θές τζ’ εἰπῆς ἀπὸ λόγου μου, πως τὸ θυμὸν ἀφτίνο, instead of θές τζ’ εἰπῆ (IV 95).

Finally, sometimes words are confused with others which look very similar:
• δηλοσκόρπηση, instead of δειλοσκόπηση (Ded. 43)
• δροσία instead of δόσια (II454)
• σκορποῦσι instead of σκοποῦσι (I 521)
• τόση instead of φτώση (II 489)
• τάσσομε instead of σάσομε (IV 316)
• ἔλπιζα instead of ἔπλησα (I 243)

The manuscript from which Gradenigos published Erofili belonged to a different branch of the tradition in comparison with the other witnesses, because it preserves the fullest version of the play. Only a few gaps are to be found in the text, and their absence does not affect the reader’s understanding; only four couplets

119 This is not necessarily a mistake; δειλοσκόπηση and δειλοσκοπῶ is very rare in texts of the period and the form δειλοσκόρπηση is attested in two other texts: Pistikos Voskos (δηλοσκόρπιση, III 8, 20) and Katsaitis’s Thyestis (III 76, IV 151, 155) and according to Xanthoudidis (1928: 156) it was still attested in Crete in his time (however the word does not appear in Pangalos or modern Cretan glossaries).

120 Δροσία in the Cretan dialect means “nothing” and this is probably the reason for the misunderstanding (see Xanthoudidis 1915: 543, Kriaras, s.v., where only the example from Gradenigos is given, and Pangalos, vol. 2, s.v.).
which are found in the Birmingham manuscript (and some in other sources as well) are missing: I 134ab (in B and K); III 50ab, (in A and B), rejected by Alexiou-Aposkiti; V 322ab and V 336ab, only in B. Of all these, only I 134ab is actually necessary and has been accepted by Alexiou and Aposkiti. III 50ab has been rejected for stylistic reasons and the other two are from the part of the Fifth Act which is adapted in a different way in B, so belong to a different version of this part of the play.

But, most importantly, Gradenigos’s edition is the only one that includes a large passage in the Fourth Act (IV 567-600) that is not found in any of the other sources. It is part of the Counsellor’s speech where he tries to persuade the King not to punish Panaretos severely and its absence from the other texts does not affect the understanding of the plot, as it does not disrupt the sense: the missing part is the elaboration of an argument in favour of Panaretos, which has already been mentioned. The edition also provides the fullest version of the discussion between Erofili and Nena on their way to meet the King (V 283-328). K and M omit some couplets but follow the structure of Gradenigos’s version, while B omits a big part of the discussion between the women and the comments of the King, but without causing problems of coherence to the text. That probably means that Gradenigos’s exemplar originated from an earlier and fuller version of Erofili, from which longer passages were later abridged, and the other witnesses come from the abridged versions.

---

122 See Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 229 for III50ab.
123 This passage is discussed in detail in section 3 of Chapter 2.
125 For a more detailed discussion, see section 3 of Chapter 2.
On the other hand, the edition presents a different image as far as the Interludes are concerned: three couplets are missing which are found in all the other witnesses. Two of them are supported by Gerusalemme Liberata, the source of the Interludes, so there is no doubt about their authenticity.\textsuperscript{126}

\section*{2.4. Language}

The use of the Cretan dialect in the edition is consistent. Some indicative characteristics of the Cretan dialect of the period which occur systematically are:\textsuperscript{127}

- loss of the nasal of the clusters – μψ-, -νθ-: ἀθρώπους, ἀθό, λάψι, πέψε.
- change of κα- to κια- in the pronoun κιανένας, κιαμιά
- use of the ending –ευγω: γυρεύγει, ἀντιμεύγει and of –σω instead of –ζω: κατατάσσω, ἀλλάσσει, τάσσει
- change of unstressed –ηρ- to –ερ- : πλερωμένη, κλερονομιά
- loss of the final –v of genitive plural of nouns and the third person plural of verbs, apart from when a vowel follows; then –v is preserved in order to avoid hiatus: ποῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνω οἱ βασιλιᾶς; ποῦ τῶ Ῥωμιῶν οἱ τόσες (Prol. 23); ὅλα χαλάσαν ἀπὸ 'μὲ, κιδλ´ ἀπὸ 'με χαθῆκα (Prol. 31).
- use of the Cretan forms of articles and pronouns (τοῆ, τοι instead of τῆς, τοὺς / ταῖς); again with the exception of where there is a following word starting with a vowel: σπιὰ μάκρη τῆς Α´νατολῆς, σπιὰν ἐξοριὰ τζῆ Δύσης (IV 139)

The phonology of the edition follows the modern development; however, sporadically some archaizing characteristics do occur (πάσχουσι, δροσισθῶ, σχισθῆ,

\textsuperscript{126} See Papatriandafyllou-Theodoridi 1972 for more details.

εὐθὺς) and one can also find hypercorrections (εὖχερα, στεκομέσθαναι, ὀμπροσθάς, εἱμεσθαν) or hybrid forms which combine learned and demotic characteristics (θαράπευσι, σκωλήκω, συβασθῆ). Rarely the convention of placing the accent on the first vowel in the sequence ια appears (λογίαζα, παντρία, κορμία, i.e. without synizesis).

Gradenigos, who came from Western Crete, uses characteristics of the West Cretan dialect like the augment ἐ- where East Cretan has η-, and the palatalization of σ, ξ and ζ (δροσία, ἄξιος, ζιῶ). However, the depalatalized forms are used at the end of the line, if it is needed for the rhyme (διάξες - ἄξες, I 59-60; χαρίσω – περίσσο, I 335-6). Only 12.5% of the rhymes affected are imperfect. The depalatalized forms appear sporadically in other parts of the play, when they are not needed for the rhyme (or when both rhyme words are depalatalized), but this phenomenon does not extend to more than 14%. However, as linguistic research has shown, the depalatalized forms are a characteristic not only of Eastern Crete, but also of a large part of the region of Rethymnon, in central Crete, from where Chortatsis originated; this dialectal characteristic already existed in Chortatsis’s period, as it is attested by the notarial acts of Varouchas, who was a contemporary of the poet and came from Rethymnon too, and both types are found in his texts. So Gradenigos’s use of the West Cretan forms is probably his own intervention, based on his own regional dialect. Another characteristic of the west Cretan dialect which does not appear in the two manuscripts is the loss of the final –s before the pronoun μας, a phenomenon that can affect the rhyme if it concerns rhyme words. Gradenigos always writes καρδιέ μας, κύρημας, τύχημας etc, whether it is a rhyme word or not,

128 The other most important difference between the two regional variations, the pronoun τως or τωνε, cannot be used as a criterion because both forms appear for metrical reasons.

129 See Kontosopoulos 1959: 320-1, for the geographical limits of this phenomenon and Bakker 1988-89: 284, for Varouchas.
while the two manuscripts write cardhiesmas, chirimias, tighismas etc, even at the end of verse.  

2.5. Versification

Just as the Cretan dialect is respected and represented in a quite accurate and consistent way in this edition, the same can be said for the versification. The main exception is the already known defect of the Venetian editions where consecutive vowels are avoided by means of elision or aphaeresis, removing the euphonic effect of synizesis which appears in the Cretan manuscripts. On the other hand, Gradenigos is very careful about the preservation of final –ν when it would block hiatus: it appears in more than 85% of the cases where it can be used. Of the hiatuses that can be found, apart from those which can be avoided with the restoration of final –ν, a few others fall into the categories of “accepted hiatus”, i.e. at the caesura after the 8th syllable or when one (or both) of the vowels are stressed:

- ὦ λογισμοὶ πῶς σφάλετε, ὦ γνώμη τυφλωμένη (P. 121)
- γιατί τὰ ξύλα, τὸ νερὸ, ἀσβέστης καὶ τὸ χῶμα (Ι 129)
- θέλω ἵππη ὁσο ὠμορῶ γλήγορα μετὰ ἱείνη (ΙΙ 291).

The remaining cases are passages which present minor textual problems, e.g. the omission of a word, or passages for which an alternative reading without hiatus can be found in the other witnesses:

- "Ὤ Α"δη καὶ τζή κόλασις instead of ὦ τζ Ἄδη (ΙΙ 431)

---

130 Vincent 2005: 84 gives the only example where Foskolos, in his copy of Erofili, writes egthrumas instead of egthrusmas (I 269). But it is only one exception contrary to 13 cases where the s is preserved, among which are rhyme words.


The other device for avoiding hiatus, the y-glide, is used in almost every case of an initial vowel after the article ἥ or οἱ.

2.6. Later reprints

2.6.1. The 1746 edition

Erofili was reprinted in 1746 at the printing house of Bortoli. This edition is a faithful reprint of the 1676 edition and includes all the material of the Gradenigos edition. The title page does not provide the information that the play was restored to its original language by Gradenigos, although the printer’s note from the second edition («Εἰς τοὺς ἀναγιγνώσκοντας») is included in the edition. The edition follows faithfully the one by Gradenigos in all respects. Only the characteristics of the pronunciation, as the y-glide, the voicing of κ and π and the orthographic indication of synizesis with –ι- are not respected as systematically as in the previous edition. Only very obvious typographical errors have been corrected (e.g. Πράξις Β σκηνή α instead of πρᾶξις Δ´ σκηνή Δ´, Ρινάλδο instead of Ρινάδο). Thus, there is no doubt that this edition was prepared on the basis of its predecessor only.

133 Title page: ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ | ΟΝΟΜΑΖΟΜΕΝΗ | ΕΡΩΦΙΛΗ | ΠΟΙΗΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΛΟΓΙΩΤΟΥ | καὶ εὐγενεστάτου, Κυρίου, | ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΥ ΧΟΡΤΑΤΖΗ | ΤΟΥ ΚΡΗΤΙΚΟΥ | ΕΝΕΤΗΣΙΝ | α΄ψμς 1746 | παρὰ ΑΝΤΩΝΙΟΤΟΥ ΒΟΡΤΟΛΙ | CON LICENZA DE’ SUPERIORI.
2.6.2. The 1772 edition

The play was reprinted for the third time at 1772 by the printing house of Theodosiou. The title page mentions that the text was restored to its original language, although without referring to Gradenigos.\footnote{Title page: ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ, Ο’ΝΟΜΑΖΟΜΕ’ΝΗ | Ε’ΡΩΦΙ’ΛΗ. | ΠΟΙ’ΗΜΑ | Τοῦ Λογιωτάτου, καὶ | Εὐγενεστάτου Κυρίου ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΥ ΧΟΡΤΑΤΖΗ, καὶ | Νεωστὶ μὲν τυπωθεῖσα, διορθωθεῖσα δὲ εἰς | τὴν φυσικὴν τῆς γλῶσσαν τὴν Κρητικὴν, μὲ κόπον καὶ πολλὴν ἐπιμέλειαν. | ΕΝΕΤΙ’ΗΣΙΝ, 1772. | Παρὰ Δημητρίῳ Θεοδοσίου τῷ ἐξ Ἰωαννίνων | Con Licenza d’ Superiori.} The printer’s note is included in the edition, as well as all the other paratextual material. Since the title page includes more information in comparison to the 1746 edition, it is most probable that the edition of 1676 was used as a basis.

The orthography of Gradenigos’s edition is not followed faithfully: voicing of κ and π is reduced, as well as the convention of representing synizesis with –ι-. The use of final -v is not done according to Gradenigos’s practice and punctuation is more stylized (comma at the caesura, comma at the end of the first line of the couplet and full stop at the end of the second line). In all other aspects the edition of Gradenigos is followed faithfully and its errors are repeated.

2.6.3 The 1804 and 1820 editions

The last two non-scholarly editions of Erofili were again printed by Theodosiou. They follow faithfully the edition of 1772 and repeat the same mistakes. The title page of the 1804 edition is printed after the 1772 edition but the 1820 one has different structure, although the same information is included.\footnote{Title page of 1804: ΤΡΑΓΩΔΙΑ | ΟΝΟΜΑΖΟΜΕΝΗ | ΕΡΩΦΙΛΗ | ΠΟΙΗΜΑ | ΤΟΥ ΛΟΓΙΩΤΑΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΕΥΓΕΝΕΣΤΑΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ | ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΥ ΧΟΡΤΑΤΖΗ | ΤΟΥ ΚΡΗΤΟΣ | ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΦΥΣΙΚΗΝ ΤΗΣ ΓΛΩΣΣΑΝ ΤΗΝ ΚΡΗΤΙΚΗΝ. | ΕΚΔΟΣΙΣ ΠΡΩΤΗ. | ΕΝ ΒΕΝΕΤΙᾼ | ΠΑΡΑ ΠΑΝΩ ΘΕΟΔΟΣΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΡΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΙΝΩΝ. | Teodosio Editore e Stampatore | 1820.} The 1820 edition is
characterized as “first edition” (ἐκδοσις πρώτη). All the editions of the Theodosiou printing house after 1807 were numbered and the numbering started from 1, even if the book had been printed in the past, as in the case of Erofili. Two important changes are introduced in both editions: the stage directions are not included in the main texts, but in footnotes, and the Interludes are omitted. The omission of the Interludes could be an indication that the reading public was interested only in the tragedy; Erofili had also circulated in oral tradition in many parts of mainland Greece and the Ionian Islands, so it was already known to a relatively wide public. The Interludes on the other hand, were more closely connected to the cultural milieu of Venetian Crete (and perhaps the Heptanese), where they could be performed and their aesthetic qualities (spectacle, action, dances and music, visual effects) could be better appreciated in a performance than as a written text.

2.7. Conclusions

The quality of this edition has been praised by scholars, especially before the discovery of the Birmingham manuscript, when this edition was the only trustworthy witness of the play. Indeed, the edition presents a relatively small number of textual problems and also gives solutions to passages which are preserved with problems in the other witnesses. The discovery of the Birmingham manuscript has revealed a witness which follows a different tradition and the detailed comparison of all the witnesses shows that there are several stages of transmission of the play and perhaps revisions by the poet himself. The fact that this edition has preserved passages which are abridged in other versions is perhaps

---

136 Iliou 2006: 574-5.
an indication that Gradenigos’s exemplar represented one of the earliest stages of
the textual tradition of Erōfili.137

On the other hand, Venetian editions of early modern Greek literature have
always been suspect, not without reason, for alterations of the original dialect and
style, though not always as conscious and systematic as in the case of Kigalas.138 For
that reason, the manuscripts originating from Crete have been considered as more
reliable sources, as far as matters of language and versification are concerned.139 In
the case of Gradenigos, this is true in some respects, such as the treatment of
synizesis vs. elision/aphaeresis. But in other respects, such as the avoidance of
hiatus, the use of final –ν and the y-glide, this edition confirms the information we
have from the Cretan manuscripts.

137 See section 2 of Chapter 3 for more details.
3. The Athens manuscript

The manuscript which now belongs to the Historical and Ethnological Society in Athens (Θ 62 [16]) was donated there by Emile Legrand, who first published it autonomously in 1875 and later in the Bibliothèque Grecque Vulgaire.\textsuperscript{140} He had purchased it in Paris from the residue of the Library of the Marquis of Ferté-Sénectère and before that it belonged to the collection of Giulio Saibante, where it was bound with one of the manuscripts of The Story of Velisarios and the Byzantine Iliad (now cod. Paris. Suppl. gr 1043 and 926 respectively).\textsuperscript{141} The manuscript was in its present incomplete state probably at the time the Saibante collection was catalogued: it appears as a tragedy without title (\textit{Tragaedia [sic] Graeco Vulgari Literis Latinis}) in the catalogue of the manuscripts of the Saibante collection published in 1732 by Scipione Maffei.\textsuperscript{142}

3.1. Presentation of the manuscript

In its present state the manuscript preserves 2173 lines of Erofili and 456 lines of the Interludes (66\% and 76\% of the whole text respectively). The pages have two numberings, the original one, when the manuscript was complete (it now starts from f. 15) and one added after the manuscript ended up in its current condition. The pages which have been lost contained the beginning of the play, including the Dedication, the Prologue and I 1-378 (ff. 1-14), the end of the play after IV 758 and

\textsuperscript{140} A brief description is given by Legrand (1881: xc-xci) and Lambros (1909: 341).
\textsuperscript{141} See Jeffreys 1977: 260-261 and Pecoraro 1978: 215-221 for the Greek manuscripts of the Saibante collection and the history of this manuscript. Panagiotakis has supposed that this could be a manuscript of Erofili that belonged to the library of Francesco Zeno (Panagiotakis 1968: 103; for the catalogue of the manuscripts of Zeno’s collection see Pileidis 1999), however there is no historical evidence to support or refute this hypothesis.
\textsuperscript{142} Pecoraro 1978: 215-6.
vv. I 520-566 (f. 18), i 165-II 42 (end of the Interlude i and beginning of Act II, ff. 25-26), II 185-232 (f. 30), IV 353-446 (ff. 63-64).

If the number of lines on each page is calculated, this means that the 28 pages (14 leaves) which are now lost from the beginning were enough to include the Dedication, the Prologue, the beginning of the First Act and probably a title page and a page with the *dramatis personae*: each page has 24 lines, apart from those with a change of scene, which have 22, and the first page of each act, which has 20. So the dedication would need 3-4 pages, the prologue six and I 1-378 sixteen pages and the remaining 2-3 pages could have contained the title, the *dramatis personae* and other introductory material.

The manuscript is very neatly and clearly written in Latin script, reminding one of clear copies prepared for print. Running titles on the top of each page indicate the number of the scene and catchwords are written on the verso of each folio. Scene headings, stage directions, speech prefixes and running titles at the top of each page are written in calligraphic handwriting. Ornamental motifs are found at the end of the Acts and the Interludes. The first letter of the first line of each couplet is capitalized and the second line of each couplet is indented.

Traces from various owners of the manuscript have been left on some pages. Numbers, probably mathematical calculations, are found on the top of f. 17r (current numbering 3’) and 62r (currently 42’). At the bottom of f. 20v (currently 5’) which was blank because it is the end of the First Act, three names are written in the Greek alphabet: Καλέργι, γιακουμαφ αγαλιανο, ρεμονδο ύγαλιανο (the latter is repeated two more times as ρεμοντω αγαλιανο). The slight variations in the forms of some letters

---

143 Bancroft-Marcus (1978: 73-4) has supposed that it was actually intended for submission to a publisher.
144 See also pp. 261-2 for illustrations.
indicate that this is probably a pen trial. A list of numbered clothing items in Italian appears at the bottom of f. 55 (currently 35).

3.2. The condition of the text

In its present state the text of the manuscript has no lacunas, apart from vv. IV 281-2 and IV 567-600, which are found only in the edition of Gradenigos, as we mentioned previously. The calculation of the number of lines in each page shows that the parts missing contained no lacunas.

Apart from the errors found in other witnesses, there are not many mistakes and most of them can be easily corrected. Only the First Choric Ode is preserved in a very problematic condition, with many copying errors (se mercus instead of ci micrus, chi udhe oranos instead of chie mian odho uranos, sighnia instead of glichia). The rest of the text is in a very good condition. A few lines are hypometric because of the omission of words or syllables:

- *giati an orissusi agli tin enaftimu* instead of *giati agnissos chi orissusi* (II 59)
- *na canome sinnio topus polus na risi* instead of *sinnio sinnio* (IV 304)
- *plusso chie boremeno chie Vassiglio megalo* instead of *boresamen* (IV 341)

Sometimes a wrong word is used, usually because of a visual similarity with the correct word or because of the influence of previous passages:

- *ametro fouo mu metra* instead of *mu giena* (I 423, probably influenced by ametro)
- *ghiglia* (χίλια) instead of *glichia* (γλυκιά, I 592)
- *uiegnico* (βγενικῶ) instead of *gineco* (γυναικῶ, I 615)
- *stin gi* instead of *tighi* (τύχη, II 468)
- *prodhotes*, instead of *podhotes* (III 52)
- *ston ofanno* (III 132), instead of *ston ofthalmo*
- *stathusi* instead of *sastussi* (III 187)
- *parastrafussi* instead of *bora strafussi* (IV 162)
3.3 The writing system

Legrand has given a brief description of the writing system of the manuscript.\textsuperscript{145} Its basic principles are similar to the system used by Foskolos and the copyists of The Sacrifice of Abraham,\textsuperscript{146} but there are some differences in minor details.\textsuperscript{147} The differences do not concern the way Greek letters are represented by Latin letters, which is the same in all such writing systems: $c$ stands for $κ$ before $a$, $o$, $u$ and $τς$ before $i$ (chi is used for $κι$); $u$ ($V$ when capital) represents either $ου$ or $β$; $dh$ is used for $δ$ and $gh$ for $χ$; $λι$ and $νι$ are written as $gli$, $gni$.\textsuperscript{148}

The copyist of the Athens manuscript is very accurate in the distinction between $s$ used for $ζ$ and $ss$ used for $σ$ between vowels, while Foskolos is not very consistent in his practice.\textsuperscript{149} The syllable $γε$ is represented by $gie$ ($giemati$, $me$ $pedheugie$). Synizesis after $r$ and $m$ are frequently represented in the writing system ($calomirgia$, $parigorgia$, $mnia$, $simnio$). When the synizisis results in $gni$ the $i$ is frequently omitted ($mogno$, $pauiogna$ etc); however, this does not happen in the case of the monosyllables $gni$($os$) and $gni$. The word $έχθρος$, which according to the transliteration pattern should be written as $egθhros$, is sometimes (5 times out of 22) written $εθhros$. As it is supposed that the cluster $ct$ could actually represent the sound $χτ$,\textsuperscript{150} this choice could be an indication that indeed in this context $c$ could represent $χ$. On the other hand, $έχθρος$ appears 4 times written $egθhros$, which could be either a mistake or a deliberate avoidance of the repetition of $h$, which means

\textsuperscript{145} Legrand 1881: xcii-xciii
\textsuperscript{146} Described in Vincent 1973: 88-102 and Bakker & van Gemert 1996: 346-8 respectively.
\textsuperscript{147} cf. Vincent 1973: 103.
\textsuperscript{148} See Table 2 for the detailed description and comparison. See also Karantzola 2005 for a comparison with other texts (mainly printed) and Vincent 2007: 39-40 for the writing system of Papadopoli.
\textsuperscript{149} Vincent 1973: 104.
\textsuperscript{150} Vincent 1973: 104 mentions this possibility but is reluctant to accept or dismiss it: he writes it as $kr$ but admits that it could actually represent $χτ$. Bakker & van Gemert 1996: 30 disagree with the interpretation and believe that $ct$ stands for $κτ$. 
that for aesthetic or practical reasons the scribe sometimes wrote the word less accurately according to the rules but still in a way which would look close to the cluster *ghth*. Similarly, probably for aesthetic reasons, *συχνιὰ* is written *sighnia* and not *sighgnia*.

The handling of the cluster of nasal + κ / π / τ presents the most differences from Foskolos.\textsuperscript{151} Initial π is not normally voiced (i.e. written as *b*), with only 5 exceptions in the whole text. Initial τ is voiced systematically in the case of the enclitic pronoun following a historically justified final –ν (*τον* *ορισμοῦ, *τι* *γλικότιδος, *τι* *μυρίδυ*), frequently in the case of articles or pronouns following δὲν, μὴν, ἂν, σὰν (*dhe* *do, a* *do, mi* *do, *sa* *do*) and rarely in the case of a noun starting with τ (*τι* *δίμι, *το* *δόπο, *στέτιο* *δρόπο*). Initial κ is never voiced, exactly as in the other Latin-script manuscripts. Vincent’s observation that Foskolos avoided altering significantly the visual image of a word rather than reproducing the way it was pronounced, but “indicate[d] voicing more frequently in words carrying little semantic load”\textsuperscript{152} applies for the scribe of this manuscript as well, because he very rarely indicates the voicing of the initial consonant of nouns but uses this method systematically in the case of pronouns. Contrary to the practice of Foskolos, the final –ν of the preceding word is occasionally preserved (*στόν* *κόσμο, *τόν* *κράτο, *τόν* *ποθό*), and in some cases the nasal is preserved in the middle of a word (*πανδά*, *λιόνταρι*). The final –ν is preserved mainly in the case of the verb forms *in* (*εἶν’*), a practice which agrees with Foskolos’s tendency,\textsuperscript{153} and also in the phrase *τιν* *σιμέρο(ν)*, which has been considered as a fossilized archaism in Cretan texts.\textsuperscript{154} Perhaps the scribe indeed considered it as an archaism and for that reason followed the traditional spelling.

\textsuperscript{151} His practice is described in detail in Vincent 1973: 95-100.
\textsuperscript{152} Vincent 1973: 97; Vincent 1980: αα-οβ΄.
\textsuperscript{154} Pidonia 1977: 145-6.
Punctuation is used minimally, not according to a consistent practice or set or rules, but mainly according to the needs of the meaning. Questions marks are always used, but commas and full stops are rare. Commas are used in long sentences and as a guide for the reader in case of enjambments, indicating which units should be read as one phrase:

Thegli i agapi na thoro pià cori plumismegni
pià uiegnichi Vassiglissa, pià afedran axomegni
Mu egharisse, chie orisime ci prichies na xoriso (I 417-9)

Sonu ta pathi apu eghussi ti dhoglia ti cardhiamu
trigirismegni, sonussi nena ta claimatamu (II 97-8)

Chi’ agria ti gniicta me xipnu ghiglies thories, chie tuti
ti uaremegnimu cardhia schisu, chie sfasumuti (II 117-8)\textsuperscript{355}

The word division is closer to the modern conventions than Foskolos’s, who would frequently write na lafrotho, na gnimegnis, na rissi\textsuperscript{356} while the Athens manuscript writes n’ alafrotho, n’ agnimegnis, na orissi. Generally the copyist prefers to keep initial vowels intact and deletes the final vowel of the previous word: t’ amatia, s’ etuti, chi’ echino, m’ eurica, while Foskolos writes ta matia, se tutti, chie chino, me urica. In many other cases both vowels are preserved: apu egigni, oxo emiglia, tu edhicumu, mathi oggligora, na olpsi, pu eghussi, to ena, thegli i cardhia, agaglia agaglia (while in the

\textsuperscript{355} Some more examples:
Tutti chie emena Vassiglio m’ ecame, tutti mono
m’ exasse, chie sti chiefagli stema ghrisso sicono (III 347-8)

Sto psilos tu troghí pató ci tghís, chie ta wathi
ulepo ci cacorisichias, chi’ egho perissa pathi (III 221-2)

Giatin patridhamas masí chie già tin edhichimu
pisti, gineca os uriscoe, s’chidino to cormimu (iii 3-4)

... dhen imune sci eghthrussu
prodhitussu, dhen edhoca ci topus ci edhicusu
tu eghthurussu... (IV 665-7)

same passage Foskolos would use elision or crasis or would not repeat the same vowel twice: *apu gigni, oxo miglia, tu dhicu mu, mathi gligora, nalpisi, poghussi, t’ ona, thegli cardhia, agaglia gaglia*). The result is more frequent synizeses than Foskolos has,\(^{157}\) impacting on the metrical character of the text as well.\(^{158}\)

### 3.4. Language

As has already been observed, the Athens manuscript presents characteristics of the East Cretan dialect.\(^{159}\) The most prominent feature is the augment ἤ- ( *iprepe, iperna, irghisses, irpaxe, idhidhe, icopse* etc.) which is used more frequently than in Foskolos’s copy of *Erofili* and the autograph of *Fortounatos*: Foskolos tends to avoid the augment ἤ- after pronouns μὲ and σὲ and the negative particle δὲν or if the verb is followed by clitic pronouns.\(^{160}\) On the contrary, in the Athens manuscript the augment ἤ- is used in these cases with the exception of verb following μὲ / σὲ and τοῖ: *dhen iprepe, dhen icame, idhocatu, isfaxesmu, but s’ ecame, m’ estile, ci ecames*. Foskolos writes *dhen eprepe, edhocatu, esfaxes mu, se came, me stile, ci cames*.\(^{161}\)

The depalatalization of intervocalic *s* and *x* ( *axos, plussos* etc), a dialectal characteristic of Eastern and Central Crete, prevails throughout the text. An interesting exception is the only instance when this rule does not apply, in the word ἀξιότατος (iii 38). Unfortunately the other three appearances of the word in *Erofili* and the *Interludes* belong to the pages which are now lost, so we don’t know if this is


\(^{158}\) See the following section.

\(^{159}\) Xanthoudidis 1928: λγ΄-λδ΄.


\(^{161}\) Vincent 1973: 94, 110 edited them as *σ’ ἐκαμε, μ’ ἔστειλε* etc but considered it possible that it was actually the augment which was elided. Indeed in Vincent 1998: 352 he mentions that it would be more accurate to write μὲ ’καμε etc. Bakker and van Gemert also keep the augment in their edition of *The Sacrifice of Abraham* but in the introduction explain that the elision of the augment would be more reasonable (1996: 147).
done by chance or if it serves a specific purpose: Foskolos does the same in the manuscript of *Erofili* (Dedication and V 391) and in *Fortounatos* in contexts where a more formal style is used, so this form is not a deviation from the East Cretan dialect but probably an effort to produce a more learned style because of the formal context.\(^{162}\) It could be a similar case in the Athens manuscript, since the instance where it appears (*axiotatemu Vassiglie*) would require a more formal style.

Other characteristics of the East Cretan dialect which appear are the change of ἀνα- to ἀνε- in compounds (*anegagliassi, anecatomeno, anemurdhonussi, anecatosse*) and the change of initial vowels of verbs to ἐ- in past tenses (*enomatussa, enethrafschie, efischie, enixassi, epofassissen, ellaxon*). There are also examples of the use of the eastern form of the plural possessive and indirect object pronoun τως instead of τωνε, where the metre would permit the use of either and where in other witnesses the use of the western type is attested: *i figli ci figliestos aparnude* (III 392), *ma sto boris chie dhinesse uoithia tosse dhosse* (IV 70), *ch’i dhiotos esmimegni* (IV 483) etc.\(^{163}\)

One characteristic of the West Cretan dialect which is preserved in this manuscript for rhyme reasons is the loss of the final –s before the pronoun μας. When the words affected are not rhyme words, the east Cretan dialect is followed, so we read *ci agapisms* (I 386), *ci ghorasmas* (II 130), *ci chierasmas* (IV 750) but *ci examas* (IV 315, rhyming with *theglimamas*), *dhicumas* and *eghthrumas* (IV 739 and 741, rhyming with *Vassigliumas*). There is only one exception (III 378 *ci Vassigliasmas μας* rhyming with *dhicamas*) and in IV 739 *dhicumas* seems to be restored over the originally written *dhicusmas*.

---

\(^{162}\) Vincent 1973: 109-10; See also Vincent 1998 for other instances where linguistic variation in Foskolos’s manuscripts indicates a higher language register.

\(^{163}\) Other examples: III 425, IV 448, ii 99 (stage direction), iii 65 (stage direction).
3.5. Versification

Hiatus is systematically avoided with the help of the preservation of final –ν. The exceptions are very rare and most of them can be avoided with the addition of final –ν. It is worth noting that most of these instances appear at the caesura. Hiatus at the caesura is considered as acceptable even with texts where hiatus is generally avoided, so perhaps scribes did not feel the need to be very careful with the preservation of final –ν at the end of the first hemistic h, because the hiatus there would not be considered problematic. All the other cases of unavoidable hiatus (excluding the rare ones which are found in all the witnesses so most likely are authentic), which mainly appear at the caesura (6 out of 10), are in variants unique in the Athens manuscript. Most of them can easily be avoided with simple linguistic variations or the restoration of omitted words:

- μεταγνωμὸ κι ἀμέτρητην ἀγάπη instead of chie ametrin agapi (I 414)
- στὰ γενομένα πράματα μηδὲ κιαινεὶς τυχαίει instead of sta genomena pramata udhe chieagnis (II 91)
- διμένα ὡς τῶρα ποῦ ἐμοι instead of oime os tora (ii 105)
- ως ἥκουσα τέτοιας λογής μαντάτο instead of os icussa etias logis (IV 512)
- κι δχί καθώς γαμπρός σου instead of chi oghi ossa gabrossu (IV 526)
- νοῦς κακοθελητῆ πολλὰ κ’ ἐμὲ καὶ τοῦ παιδιοῦ μου instead of cacothegliti pola eme chie tu pedhiu mu (IV 694)

A characteristic which is generally attributed to the poets of Cretan literature, is the use of synizesis as a euphonic and rhythmical effect. Of course this is one of the phenomena that are particularly affected by the textual transmission and the habits of copyists or editors, as it can be avoided with elision and aphaeresis. As we have mentioned before, Cretan manuscripts show a

---

preference for synizesis and are considered as more reliable in this respect, while in
the Venetian editions consecutive vowels are avoided by means of elision and
aphaeresis.\textsuperscript{166} As far as optional initial vowels are concerned, the Athens manuscript
preserves them more frequently than the copy by Foskolos, resulting in a higher
number of synizeses (\textit{muegharisse}, \textit{giada oggligora}, \textit{isse essena}). This can create a
rhythmical effect in cases of two consecutive stressed vowels\textsuperscript{167} or when the stressed
initial vowel was supposed to be lost and the previous word would take the stress
(\textit{caca icama}, \textit{ela eure me}) and for that reason in such cases usually the initial vowel is
dropped (\textit{muthele}, \textit{nartho}, \textit{muctise}, \textit{pulega}).

\subsection*{3.6. Conclusions}

This manuscript is a very important witness, because of both the excellent
condition of the text and the valuable information it gives about linguistic and
stylistic matters. The only drawback is the use of the East Cretan dialect, which
poses methodological problems since Chortatsis would be expected to use the West
Cretan dialect of his birthplace, taking advantage of the characteristics of the
Eastern dialect only when they were needed for metrical reasons.

The relation of the manuscript to the other witnesses and its place in the
textual tradition of \textit{Erofili} will be discussed in detail in the relevant chapter. The
variants it offers are very close to those of the Birmingham manuscript, copied by
Foskolos, and sometimes present interesting deviations from the other witnesses.
Unfortunately the loss of a large part of the text deprives us of the testimony of a
very important witness which would clarify some issues about the textual tradition.

\footnote{166 See also section 2.2.2. of this Chapter.}
\footnote{167 This is the most rarely used type of synizesis as the presence of two stressed vowels in one
metrical syllable can sound harsh (Deliyannaki 1995: 52).}
The manuscript of *Erofili* which belongs to Birmingham University Library (MS 742, formerly catalogued as MSS 13/i/17) was the last witness to be discovered. It is written in the Latin alphabet and was copied by the Cretan poet Markos Antonios Foskolos (ca. 1597-1662), author of the comedy *Fortounatos*.\(^{168}\) This manuscript is considered to be, along with the edition by Ambrosios Gradenigos and the Athens manuscript, the best witness of *Erofili*, not only because of the condition of the text, which is generally good, with few lacunas and errors, but also because it was copied by a Cretan poet, who would be very conscious about respecting the style and versification.\(^{169}\)

Foskolos's handwriting in the manuscripts of *Erofili* and *Fortounatos* is very similar. This is not an indication about the dating of the manuscript, because other texts written by him show that his handwriting did not change over the years.\(^{170}\) Also, as Vincent observes, the appearance of the first edition of *Erofili* in 1637 does not mean that after that time Foskolos would not need to copy the manuscript because he could buy an edition: Foskolos, a poet himself, would certainly prefer a text that respects Chortatsis's language, style and versification.\(^{171}\)

### 4.1. Presentation of the manuscript

The structure of the manuscript has some peculiarities and poses interesting questions. The Dedication to Ioannis Mourmouris was added later by another

---


\(^{170}\) Vincent 2005: 76.

\(^{171}\) Vincent 2005: 79.
scribe. The Interludes are not inserted between the acts, as in all the other witnesses of *Erofili*, but are placed at the end of the play, although at the end of each act there is the note that an Interlude will follow. The presence of a watermark that is not found in any other part of the play suggests that the Interludes were copied at a later stage. An important omission of the manuscript is the absence of the First Choric Ode; but there is a note that it should start there and a page is left blank at the point where the text should have been written. Also, the end of the Fourth Choric Ode is written in two columns on the same page. That means that Foskolos copied it later and did not have enough space to fit it in. Other lacunas are to be found in various parts of the play, but they seem to be a result of the transmission of the text and will be discussed later. Many corrections are found in various parts of the text: some of them are in Foskolos’s hand and have been made either during the copying or at a later stage, while others are by different hands.

4.1.1. The copyist of the Dedication

The Dedication occupies ff. ii° to iii, with its last six lines overflowing to the bottom of iv°, which originally was the title-page and was left blank, apart from 5 lines at the top, which present the name of the play and its author, in Foskolos’s handwriting. According to Vincent’s description, ff. iii and iv were inserted later. So, at some point after the copying of the play, starting from the Prologue, Foskolos added the title and the *dramatis personae* (ff. iv° and iv’) and at a later stage someone else copied the Dedication in the blank space of ff. ii° and iii, and used the bottom part of iv° to write the remaining six lines that did not fit in the previous pages.

---

172 See p. 263 for a sample illustration of the Dedication.
174 See also p. 266 for an illustration.
175 Vincent 1970: 262.
Vincent suggests that either Foskolos’s exemplar did not include the Dedication at all, or Foskolos was not interested in copying it and the later addition could mean that Foskolos asked someone to copy it for him.\textsuperscript{176} It is also possible that Foskolos’s exemplar lacked the Dedication; it could originate from an early draft of the play which did not include the Dedication because it was not ready for the official presentation, or the first pages of the manuscript could have been destroyed, as they would be more easily exposed to physical damage, and for that reason the dedication was not preserved. Moreover, the absence of the First Choric Ode and the later addition of the Fourth could mean that the exemplar from which Foskolos originally copied the work was lacking some parts of the play and the Dedication could have been one of them. So the Dedication could have been copied from a different manuscript than the rest of the play. Evidence for this could also be the fact that the person who copied the Dedication has written over ff. 53-55\textsuperscript{r}, at the end of the Fourth Act, and has introduced a variant reading.\textsuperscript{177} The identity of this person is unknown. Two names appear on the last page of the manuscript, \textit{Statthis murmuris tu thothori and anastasis leftergiotis tu nicolo}, but the handwriting does not resemble that of the Dedication, so it cannot be said for sure if these names refer to a copyist or an owner of the manuscript.

The writing system of the Dedication is quite different from Foskolos’s and from other Latin-script manuscripts of Cretan literature as well:\textsuperscript{178}

- Intervocalic consonants are frequently geminated (\textit{ghrissaffi, toottes, toppo, megallo, olli})
- final \textit{-v} is preserved before k, p and t and is abbreviated as ~

\textsuperscript{176} Vincent 2005: 77.
\textsuperscript{177} See p. 265 for an illustration.
\textsuperscript{178} See also Table 2 (pp. 84-6) for more details.
- zi is used frequently in the place of ci (z representing το is rarely used by Foskolos and never before –i-)
- g is not used before li or ni, except for cases of synizesis, where gn or gl is written: *pagna, sighgna, apoxetheglossussi* (πανιά, συχνιά, ἀποξετελεύσουσι), but *chianis, arifnito, ligo, plithos, megalai* (κιανείς, ἀρίφνητο, πλήθος, μεγάλη).

Since we know that the manuscript ended up in the Ionian Islands at some point, we might speculate that the person responsible for the copying of the Dedication was not a Cretan and for that reason did not use the convention of *gli* and *gni* to show the palatalization of *li* and *ni* in the Cretan dialect.

### 4.1.2. The Choric Odes

According to Vincent the absence of the First Choric Ode and the way the fourth is written in two columns in order to fit to the existing space could be an indication that the second and third odes were added later as well, probably because Foskolos’s exemplar did not include the odes and not because he was not at first interested in copying them.\(^{179}\) If that was the case, it would be interesting to consider if the reason for a possible omission of the odes would be a performance for which they were not planned to be recited. On the other hand, the odes present quite serious textual problems in all the other witnesses, so a reason for their absence, either from Foskolos’s exemplar, or from the first stage of the copying of the Birmingham manuscript, could be the fact that the text survived in a bad condition and was not copied because it was considered incomprehensible.

\(^{179}\) Vincent 2005: 78.
4.1.3. The Interludes

As mentioned above, the Interludes were added at a later stage, judging from the watermarks that are not found in any other part of the text. The Interludes in Foskolos’s autograph of Fortounatos are copied at the end of the play as well. In all the other witnesses of Erofili, the Interludes are written between the acts, as it is assumed that they would be performed, functioning as entertaining breaks between the acts of the main play.¹⁸⁰ At the end of each act in the Birmingham manuscript there is a note that an Interlude should follow, and at the end of each Interlude there is the note *figniri τo intermedio chie ginete i praxis tis tragodhias*; that means that Foskolos was aware of the practice to have Interludes between the acts of a play. On the contrary, in the autograph of Fortounatos there is no indication that the Interludes were composed with the purpose to be performed between the acts: the end of each act is signaled with the note *telos tu attu* and the end of each interlude is marked by the note *figniri τo intermedio*; it is not mentioned that an interlude follows an act and vice versa. This could mean either that Foskolos as a writer and as a copyist did not want the interludes to interrupt the play, or that at the time he was composing Fortounatos interludes were not performed between the acts of plays. This is not improbable, since at that time Crete was under siege and life conditions had changed; this could have an impact on cultural life as well and could have affected the way plays were performed.

The fact that Foskolos chose to place the Interludes at the end of the play, as he did with his own work, could reflect his preference to have the play uninterrupted in the form of a book, suggesting that it would be read as a unit, although he knew that it would be performed differently. This preference has

particular importance because it is made by a playwright, and not just a copyist, who seems to have a certain idea about how a play should be read.\textsuperscript{181} It could also be an indication, not only of Foskolos’s personal preference, but of a change of the literary taste at Foskolos’s time (we don’t know when the manuscript of \textit{Erofili} was copied, but it was certainly three or four decades after the composition of the play): perhaps at his time plays could be performed without Interludes, or readers preferred to read them independently.

Vincent also suggests that Foskolos could have copied them at a later stage because his exemplar did not include them, so he added them later from another source, which was probably the source for some corrections he made to parts of the play.\textsuperscript{182} This is not improbable, judging from the textual tradition of other plays of the Cretan Theatre: one of the manuscripts of \textit{Panoria} has no Interludes,\textsuperscript{183} while another one has excerpts from \textit{Katsourbos} inserted between the acts and a set of Interludes originally followed the play; at a later stage the text of \textit{Katsourbos} was added after \textit{Panoria}, and at the end of each act the copyist notes the title and the roles of the relevant Interlude,\textsuperscript{184} so this set of Interludes was associated with the comedy. That could support the possibility that a play could be considered as independent from the Interludes, so the same pieces could be used for different plays, or a play could be accompanied by various sets of Interludes, and that manuscripts without the Interludes could exist, perhaps for the purposes of a specific performance or for the needs of a specific reader.\textsuperscript{185} However, the comparison of the witnesses shows that the Interludes and the main play in B

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{181} Alexiou & Aposkiti (1988) 2007: ί.
\item \textsuperscript{182} Vincent 2005: 76-78.
\item \textsuperscript{183} For the Interludes of \textit{Panoria} see Bancroft-Marcus 1980: 17.
\item \textsuperscript{184} Politis 1964: 06’.
\item \textsuperscript{185} It should also be noted that in Italy as well a set of Interludes was not necessarily related to one play only. See Bancroft-Marcus 1977 for examples and more details.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
belong to the same branch of the tradition as far as the divergences with the other witnesses are considered.\footnote{See section 6 of Chapter Two for the comparison among the witnesses.} So it is not very probable that the Interludes were copied from a different source than the tragedy. Moreover, since Erofili is accompanied by the same set of interludes in all the other witnesses, this means that they were concerned as a unit, so most probably there were no manuscripts without the interludes.

Which of these is the case regarding the Birmingham manuscript of Erofili is not easy to determine: the lack of concrete information about the performance of these plays does not allow us to ascertain if the plays were always performed with the Interludes or, alternatively, if readers might have been interested in having a copy of the play as a whole, without the interruption of the Interludes.

4.1.4. Corrections

In the manuscript there appear corrections from at least three different hands. Some of them are certainly by Foskolos, some by the copyist of the Dedication and few words are rewritten (although there is no need to correct an error in these cases).

The person who copied the Dedication has overwritten ff. 53-55\textsuperscript{r} (the end of the Fourth act and the Fourth Choric Ode). These pages are clearly written by Foskolos and there seems to be no specific reason for which the second copyist overwrites some letters. There are no errors to correct and he inserts only one variant reading, l. 646, where \textit{afto olos chie crieno} was originally written, and he replaces it with \textit{ollos pola crieno}. This variant is not found in any of the other witnesses. The only other alterations he makes in the text is the introduction of his writing system: he adds some abbreviations of final –ν (\textit{ti~ triscataramegni, to~}
corassicho, ighie~ pessi), he replaces sometimes ci with zi (z’ eghthusmas, z’ erotias) and he deletes g from words starting with gni (gnica, gnichimenos, gnimegni have a n written over gn).

Foskolos made some corrections of mistakes during the time of copying: the word, or the part of the word, that is wrong is deleted, and the correct version is written next to it. For example, in l. II 405, instead of proxegnitadhes Foskolos started to write proxegnidhe but realized the mistake immediately, deleted the wrong –dhe- and wrote -tadhes after it. In l. II 449, mane chie o fouos tu chirù ti cami na theglissi, Foskolos wrote na after chirù but deleted it immediately and continued with ti cami. Other corrections are written in the line space: I 506, the wrong orexi is replaced by boressi, in III 202 anagagiasmus is replacing the wrong anastenamus, in V 444 to ghieri mu is corrected by to teri mu and in II 449 cardhiasu by thoriasu. In other cases Foskolos does not correct a mistake, but introduces a new variant. In V 42, stunu tu Pirgu tu psilu was written at first, was latter corrected to stu pirgu tu psilotatu. Both of these versions differ from the other witnesses, which present a variety of different phrasings of the same meaning (στοῦ πύργου τοῦ ψηλοῦ ἐτουνοῦ in Gradenigos, στοῦ πύργου κείνου τοῦ ψηλοῦ in Kigalas). In II 390, a whole hemistich is introduced: dhighos timi mian hora instead of giامia chigni tin hora. In V 198, obrostone is replaced by aglilostos and in V 436 aglipito is written instead of agriotato. All of these corrections are of some interest, because the original versions are not found in any of the other witnesses. There are also two corrections with a darker ink, which very much resemble Foskolos’s handwriting, so it is safe to attribute them to him (I 79, edhichimassa is corrected by dhen etheglissa and IV 639 polema is corrected by pethima). Foskolos probably read the play again, spotted two errors and corrected them with a different ink. Finally there are three corrections with an ink very similar to the light brown one Foskolos had used throughout the play, but the
handwriting does not seem identical to Foskolos’s. However, they seem to be written in a similar way to the more calligraphic version of Foskolos’s handwriting, used in the headings of new scenes, so probably they were also made by him. They are, again, corrections of weaker readings: I 69, *isa tu na to xasi*, instead of *chie na midhe to xasi* (this is the version that survives in the other witnesses, but with a different first hemistich than the one in the Birmingham manuscript, which does not make sense with the original version), III 130, *tu nù* instead of *sto nù* and IV 503, *to pos ta ghieria* instead of *chie ta maghieria*. All these corrections could be an indication that Foskolos at some point found a second manuscript of *Erofili* and used it to correct some mistakes or to introduce new variants.

Finally, a third set of corrections appears in the Prologue and the beginning of the first Act. They are written with a dark ink, but the handwriting does not resemble either the handwriting of the Dedication, which is in dark ink as well, or the handwriting of the note at the end of the manuscript, so they must be attributed to another person who possessed the manuscript at some point. This person rewrote some words in ff. 1r and 1v and 5v (*fronimus, megaliteros, antho, panda ine, ton ellino*) although they were clearly written and there are no mistakes, and introduced a new variant in l. I 54 (*ise caco ghierotero* instead of *apo caco s’ghierotero*).187

4.2. The condition of the text

Apart from the First Choric Ode, two big passages are omitted, IV 567-600 and V 295-318, which will be discussed later. Some couplets are missing (I 9-10, I 237-8, III 337-8, IV 281-2, IV 437-442, V 495-6, V 589-90) and these gaps seem to originate from earlier stages of the transmission of the play.

187 See p. 263 for an illustration.
Lines 567-600 are missing from all the other witnesses apart from Gradenigos's edition, while the omissions in V 285-318 belong to a passage which appears in three distinct versions, the fullest in G, a shorter in K and M and the shortest in B, as we mentioned previously. The absence of the Fifth Act in the Athens manuscript, which is the closest to B, does not allow us to reach any conclusions about the reasons for the abridged version of B, i.e. if it was a characteristic of this specific branch of the tradition (A and B) or if it was just the exemplar of B that represented a shortened version.

The absence of some other couplets (I 9-10, I 237-8, II 179-80, III 337-8, IV 281-2, IV 437-42, V 495-6, V 589-90) does not affect the understanding, although a few of them can be considered useful for the coherence of the passages affected. Most of them can be attributed to a common ancestor of B, M and K, as they are missing from all three texts: I 9-10, I 237-8, IV 281-2, V 495-6, V 589-90; IV 281-2 (the relevant parts of A, with the exception of the passage that should contain IV 281-2, have not survived). II 179-80, III 337-8 and IV 437-42 are missing from the Birmingham manuscript only.

There are also four couplets that are not found in Gradenigos’s edition, (after I 134, III 50, V 322 and V 336) although two of them are supported by other witnesses. The couplet after V 322 is added in the large passage that has been adapted, so it probably belongs to the stage of the adaptation. The couplet after III 50, which is also preserved in the Athens manuscript, is rejected by Alexiou and Aposkiti as a weak version that cannot originate from the poet, because of the improbable image of the snow in the sea: 388

\[
\text{chi astrapes chie i urodhes chie to perisso ghiogni / canu chie dhe bora crati o naftis to timogni} \\
\text{(κ’ οἱ ἀστραπὲς καὶ οἱ βροντὲς καὶ τὸ περίσσο χιόνι / κάνου καὶ δὲ μπορὰ κρατεῖ ὁ ναύτης τὸ τιμόνι).}
\]

The couplet after V 336 seems an

improbable addition as well: Para me tu Panaretu mono to thanatodu / thanato chie tharapapsi olono ton oghuthrodu (παρὰ μὲ τοῦ Πανάρετου μόνο τὸ θάνατόν του / θάνατο καὶ θαράπαψη ὀλονῷ τῶν ὀχουθρῶν του). The possessive pronouns seem like an easy addition to fill the verse, and there is no reference elsewhere in the King’s speeches to Panaretos’s enemies. Only the couplet after I 134, also found in Kigalas’s version, has been accepted by Alexiou and Aposkiti: chi arghise mi me tirananas cameme na grichisso / tuto to sfalma to glipo pion ene to perisso (κι ἀρχισε, μὴ μὲ τυραννάς, κάμε μὲ νὰ γροικήσω / τοῦτο τὸ σφάλμα τὸ λοιπὸ ποιὸν ἔναι τὸ περίσσο).

Although the manuscript is generally very carefully copied, small mistakes appear sporadically. They can be simple copying mistakes which are easily explained as a result of the misunderstanding of the syntax, or the confusion between two words which look similar, or can belong to more corrupt passages, which have survived in a satisfying condition in the other witnesses either:

- *anipsidhi*] νιψίδι (Ded. 35)
- *min ctisi*] μοῦ κτίζει (Ded. 75)
- *tus mesites*] τοὺς μὲ ζητοῦ (Prol. 81)
- *tosa morfo*] εἶδα τ’ ὁμορφο (I 299)
- *sciri*] κλιτή (II110)
- *dhe thelo*] μὰ θέλω (II424)
- *udhe 1gis tosa bori na cagni*] οὐδὲ γεῖς ρίζα μπορεῖ νὰ κάνει (III 199)
- *chie cratusi*] δὲν κρατοῦσι (III412)
- *na to pisteugi*] μ’ ἂν τὸ πιστεύει (IV615)
- *sa dhe borussin athropo*] οὰ δὲν πονοῦσιν ἄθρωπο (V11)
- *as ine I tighis theglima*] ἀς εἶναι τ’ ὀχὶ θέλημα (V353)
- *na min paraponethis*] νὰ μοῦ παραπονεθεῖς (V465)
4.3. *The writing system*

Foskolos’s writing system in *Fortounatos* has been thoroughly described by Vincent. In the manuscript of *Erofili*, the same system is followed in the part copied by Foskolos. There is no punctuation and accents are used only on the final syllable of a word, especially if there is a possibility of confusion: chinà is κοινὰ, while china is κεῖνα. Word division also follows the same principles: for example, clitics are written adjacent to the previous word (*throriamu*). All of the other characteristics of his system appear in this manuscript as well: the use of *g* before *ni* and *li*, the frequent voicing of initial *p* and *t* after words which historically would end with –n (*ton, tin, dhen, san* etc.), the preservation of final –n only before a word starting with vowel, with the purpose to avoid hiatus.\(^{189}\)

4.4. *Language*

As has already been observed, the Birmingham manuscript of *Erofili* presents characteristics of the East Cretan dialect, as would be expected because of Foskolos’s origin. The depalatalization of intervocalic *s* and *x* (*axos, plussos* etc) prevails throughout the text, although it is now generally accepted that this feature could equally reflect Chortatsis’s personal choice, because it appears in the area of Rethymnon as well and it already existed in Chortatsis’s period. It is attested in the notarial acts of Varouchas, who was a contemporary of the poet and also came from Rethymnon.\(^{190}\) The augment ἤ- is used quite frequently and when it is not used, most of these cases can be explained by Foskolos’s tendency to use the augment ἔ- after the pronouns μὲ and σὲ and the negative particle δὲν, or if the verb is followed

\(^{189}\) See also Table 2 for more details.

\(^{190}\) See Kontosopoulos 1959: 320-1, for the geographical limits of this phaenomenon and Bakker 1988-89: 284, for Varouchas.
by one or more clitic pronouns\textsuperscript{191}. Also, ἄνα- is sometimes changed to ἄνε- in composites (anecatogni, anecatosi, anesitimegni). The initial vowels of verbs are frequently changed to ἑ- in past tenses (efucrastica, egnixasi, enestenasa, epomina). The eastern and western forms of the third person plural of the possessive pronouns seem to have coexisted in texts of Cretan literature for metrical reasons. In this manuscript of \textit{Erofili} only two cases appear when the eastern form (τως) is used instead of the western one (τωνε), where the metre would permit the use of both: oxo apu ci epraghiestos sa prota pglio na ugussi (II 394) and tin oran opu ualthichies na tose sibathisis (IV 548). One characteristic of the west Cretan dialect which is preserved in the edition of Gradenigos but does not appear in the Birmingham manuscript is the loss of the final –s before the pronoun μας, a phenomenon that can affect the rhyme if it concerns rhyme words:\textsuperscript{192} chiogli nethimithicame chie ferame sto numas / tin oran opu sigoxes ecti ghori ci eghthrusmas (I 357-8); prama pu pglio na ftiasome dhegnitone ci exasmas / ma tuto na to sassome stechi sto theglimamas (IV 315-6).\textsuperscript{193}

The Birmingham manuscript also presents characteristics of the Cretan dialect not found in the edition of Gradenigos. The aorist is sometimes formed with the morpheme –ξ–, even if this affects the rhyme: me tharos mi do uarethis one chie apocotisso / tin aformi apu se crati se uaros na rotixo (I 88-9); potes chie me ta matia mu mian horan estegnoxa / potes glichia ta sfaglissa chie anapapsi mu dhossa (III 13-4). Gradenigos on the contrary avoids using it in rhyme words. In the verbs ρίχω and δείχνω, -χν- is frequently replaced by –κτ–: rictusi, dhictusi. Some differences reflect Foskolos’s personal preferences, if compared with his autograph: the forms \textit{ene} and \textit{ignie} for the third singular and third plural of \textit{ime}, the systematic use of the

\textsuperscript{191} Vincent 2005: 84.

\textsuperscript{192} Vincent 2005: 84 gives the only example where Foskolos in his copy of \textit{Erofili} writes \textit{eghthrumas} instead of \textit{eghthrumsas} (I 269). But it is only one exception contrary to 13 cases where the s is preserved, 5 of which are rhyme words.

\textsuperscript{193} See previously, sections 2.4 and 3.4 of this Chapter, for a comparison with the other witnesses.
assimilated form *dhichimaso* instead of *dhochimaso*, the form *gdhimnos* instead of *gimnos*, the genitive *tu Sefs* (contrary to Gradenigos’s *τοῦ Ζεῦ*), the preservation of the archaic form *igharis* in the phrase *igharis tu Theu*, are all found in *Fortounatos*.

4.5. Versification

The versification of the Birmingham manuscript presents similar characteristics to the Athens manuscript. Hiatus is avoided with the help of final –ν (*apu ti gin egnixassi, m’ olon etuto*), with very rare exceptions which occur mostly at the caesura (*xoblia macra pu glipusi ecti dhichi sas ghora*, Prol. 59; *ma pago tin apofassi apu pes na ci dhoso*, II 303).

Consecutive vowels at the end and the beginning of words are usually preserved, resulting to a high number of synizesis (*piane i boressi mu; pugnie i dhoxes tos; figli ebistichisas*). However, contrary to the Athens manuscript, Foskolos more frequently elides vā, when followed by a verb starting with α- (*nanathiuano, nanaspasti*) and contracts the augment of verbs, without indicating it with apostrophe (*me came, mu tasse*).

4.6. Conclusions

The Birmingham manuscript is a very important witness, both for historical reasons and for the information it can give to scholars about the copying habits of the period. The manuscript also preserves interesting variants, which usually agree with the Athens manuscript, and which frequently give solutions to the textual problems of the other witnesses. The relation among the witnesses of the play will be dealt with in detail in the next chapter.
Table 2

The writing system in the Latin alphabet

The following table presents a comparison of the two Latin-script witnesses as far as their writing system is concerned. The first two columns present the correspondence between Latin and Greek letters and the three following columns note exceptions and peculiarities found in the manuscripts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Corresponds to</th>
<th>Birm. manuscript (Foskolos)</th>
<th>Birm. manuscript (Dedic.)</th>
<th>Athens manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>α</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>μπ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>very frequently</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ν π-</td>
<td>only once (in the title)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mb</td>
<td>μπ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>only once (in the title)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>κ (before a, o, u, consonants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τσ (before e, i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>χ before t?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cf. ecthros (ἐχθρός)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nc</td>
<td>γκ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>instead: siclapsome,</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>siclithi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-n c-</td>
<td>-ν κ-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-π is abbreviated: to-</td>
<td>occasionally: tin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cacoglosso</td>
<td>corfi (I 570),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ston cosmo (ii 412)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>before i (chiris)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi</td>
<td>before e (chieros)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>ντ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mainly for enclitic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ν τ- (to dopo, pedhidu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nd</td>
<td>ντ</td>
<td>only in the title (afendi)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>occasionally: panda (I 475, I 590), lioandari (I 594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dh</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ε, αι</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>ϕ (used also for ευ / αυ)</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td>γκ / γγ only in the beginning of a word: gremgnisi, gremgnisti, giostra, with rare exceptions when used in the middle of a word: agales (I 24) egremno (I 30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gg</td>
<td>γκ/γγ</td>
<td>systematically -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ge</td>
<td>γε</td>
<td>always, with few exceptions almost always very rare, gie is preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gie</td>
<td>γε</td>
<td>rarely, ge is preferred only twice: legie systematically, few exceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-gi-</td>
<td>γ- glide between article I and initial vowel</td>
<td>not frequent - not frequent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gh</td>
<td>χ</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghi</td>
<td>before e (ghieri)</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>in hora also in: horos</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i, ι, υ, etc</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>(euiégna, pauiógna) instead: eugenicotato, eugegna uiegnicos (rare, mostly eugiegnicos)</td>
<td>not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

194 Mostly used for the 3rd person plural of the past tense of verbs in-εύγω: pedheugie, ermineugie, esaleugie, perhaps as an influence from cratie, epatie etc.

195 Mostly some forms of the verb γενῶ: genude, gena, genate, but: giegnithi, giegni
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Second i (pijna)</th>
<th>Only in synizesis:</th>
<th>Few exceptions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>λ</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gl</td>
<td>before i (gli)</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gli</td>
<td>γλ (gligora, glitono)</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>μ</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>ν</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gn</td>
<td>before i: gni</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o, ω</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>π</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>usually avoided between vowels in case of misunderstanding between σ / ζ</td>
<td>σ only before consonants or beginning of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ</td>
<td></td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ss</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>between vowels, not consistently</td>
<td>always double ss between vowels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>τ</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u (V)</td>
<td>ου</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ϒ</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>ξ</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>το</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The Munich manuscript

The manuscript now preserved in the Bavarian State Library of Munich (cod. Gr. 590) is the only manuscript witness of Erofili written in the Greek alphabet. It is believed to date from the 17th century and was probably copied in the Ionian Islands, as sporadic Heptanesian linguistic features suggest, but no specific information exists about its origin. The only known fact about its provenance is that before ending up in the Bavarian State Library it belonged to Pater Fischer, godfather of the Emperor Maximilian of Mexico, who according to Bursian’s assumption had brought it from Italy.

5.1. Presentation of the manuscript

The manuscript preserves the whole play and the Interludes apart from the dedication, the title and the name of the author; it starts with the list of the dramatis personae and the Prologue of Charos.

The text presents the usual orthographic instability of the period: there is an effort to follow the historical orthography and accentuation system, but it is full of orthographic or accentuation mistakes. Some traditional abbreviations are used, for the endings -ὴν, -ῆς, -ου, -ας and the word ἄνθρωπος. Cases of phonetic representation of pronunciation, such as the y-glide or the voicing of initial plosives

---

196 The manuscript was acquired after the collection of Greek manuscripts (up to cod. gr. 574) was catalogued in 1812 (Hardt 1806-1812). For a brief description of the uncatalogued collection see Hörmann 1958, for Gr. 590 especially 61. More details about the description of the manuscript were given by Bursian 1870: 549. A new catalogue, which will include all the manuscripts of the collection, is going to appear soon (I would like to thank Dr Friederike Berger, who has prepared the catalogue, for providing me information about the cataloguing process).  
197 Bursian 1870: 551; Xanthoudidis 1928: λδ΄.  
198 Xanthoudidis 1918: λδ΄.  
199 Bursian 1870: 549.
after final -ν, appear sometimes (κιγίδια, ηγιόρα, ιγιαγάπη, ηγιαγάπη, ηγιαγάπη, ηγιαγάπη, ηγιαγάπη, ηγιαγάπη) but not systematically.\footnote{See also pp. 268-70 for illustrations.}

The second line of each couplet is indented and the first letter of each couplet is a capital. There is no punctuation apart from the symbol : at the end of each couplet, irrespective of the sense. There is no decoration apart from the calligraphic initials of each couplet. Italian terminology is used for acts and scenes (ἄτος, σένα) and their numbering (σεκόντα, τέρτζα, σέστα, σέτιμα). This is the only witness of Erofili where these terms are used, but Italian terminology is used in other manuscripts of Heptanesian origin, such as Katsourbos\footnote{e.g. Ἄττο πρῶτο, σένα πρῶτη.} and Panoria.\footnote{ms D, after V 420: τέλος τῆς ἐγλογῆς καὶ τοῦ ἄττου.} The terms however were not unknown in Crete, as Foskolos also sometimes writes attos instead of Praxis in his autograph of Fortounatos.\footnote{e.g. Attos dhefteros, schigni proti. See also Puchner 2001 on stage terminology in Cretan drama.}

5.2. Corrections and other notes by different hands

The first three pages of the Prologue (ff. 1'-2') contain many corrections in a different, darker pen and different handwriting. The same hand has added at the bottom of the f. 9\textsuperscript{v} the couplet I 217-8 that was missing from the main text. At the bottom of the first page there is the note in Italian: “tutti maiuscoli nel principio del verso”. The ink seems different from the one in which the corrections in the main body of the text are made. At the last page (f. 98\textsuperscript{r}) of the manuscript, a note in Italian and the couplet II 307-8 written in the Latin alphabet are found, which are probably
The handwriting does not look exactly the same as that of the Italian note in the first page of the prologue.

Many corrections on the first pages of the Prologue rectify orthographic mistakes (e.g. ἄγροια, δίχος, μαβρίζω etc), add breathings and accents or delete final vowels when they have to be counted as one metrical syllable with the following initial vowel (νὰ εἰδούμια ἂν ἀπομείνα M1 – νὰ δούμι ἂν ἀπομείνα M2). The Cretan forms of the article or pronoun τοί (written τζή) are written over the common forms της / τοὺς / ταῖς and the pronoun τῶς replaces τοῦς. The final -ν in verb endings, which should be dropped according to the rules of the Cretan dialect, is deleted when not needed for euphonic reasons (e.g. the rhyme λογιάζαν - ἐσπουδάζαν) or when it is mistakenly added by the scribe and distorts the metre (e.g. τῶν Ἑλλήνων οἱ βασιλιές). The initial letter of the second verse of each couplet is underlined, as well as the initial letters of proper names, such as ἅδη (v. 4), ἡλλήνων (23), ῥωμιῶν (23), ἀθήναις (26), and also the words βασιλιοὺς (11), ἀφέντες (12), κόσμως (22), ἄρματα, γράμματα (26). The underlining means that these letters should be capitalized (cf. the note tutti maiuscoli nel principio del verso).

More substantial corrections can be found, which restore corrupted passages:

- σ’ ὅσους μὲ συντηροῦσι (M 2) instead of ὅσοι μὲ συντηροῦσι (M 1)204 (6)
- τοὺς νιοὺς τοὺς ἄλλους instead of τζ’ ἀθρώπους τζ’ ἄλλους (14)
- ποῦ μὲ πολὺ θυμὸ instead of εἶναι πολὺς θυμὸς (21)
- Καρτάγω instead of Κατάργοι (27)
- μηδ’ ἔναι τὰ κορμία τῶς instead of κανένα ὅχ τὰ κορμία τους (49)
- χτίσα τὰ Κολώσα instead of χτίσα καὶ τελειώσα (51)
- μέρα καὶ νύκτ’ ἀντάμι instead of μὲ τόσο κόπο ἀνδάμι (54)

204 Bursian 1870: 549. The Italian notes are not very clearly written but they seem to refer to some kind of exchange (Ricevo con molta meraviglia le intercession del molto reverendo patre priore a favor di is(tesso) Reverend o...atteso che...il rento che ella).

205 M2 refers to the correction and M1 to the main text.
• vv. 57-8 restoration of the reversed order of the second hemistichs of each lines.

These corrections correspond to the relevant passages of all the other witnesses. In other cases the passages which are substituted are not problematic at first sight, but to not agree with the text of the other witnesses:
• τὰ κέρδη τα (M2) instead of κέρδη τους (M1) (28)
• λογιάζου ν’ ἀπομείνου instead of λογιάζουντα μείνου (37)
• σκορπούσανε τὰ πλούτη instead of σκορπίζασι τὸ βιό τους (44)

Another set of minor corrections appears sporadically in ff. 57-64 (Third Interlude and beginning of Act IV) but they are not as extended as the ones of the first pages, so it is not easy to conclude if they are by the same hand.

The nature of the corrections poses the question of their origin and their purpose. The detailed and exhaustive corrections in the first pages of the prologue, which restore not only problematic passages but also accents, punctuation and orthography, can be associated with interventions made by someone who intended to use the manuscript as the basis for an edition. The corrections agree with the edition of Gradenigos up to minor details, e.g. the iotacistic spelling of synizesis (πιός, ἐγνιες), the word division and the handling of final and initial vowels (τ’ ἀμμάτια, ἐβγῆκ’ ἀπὸ, τὸν κόσμ’ ὡρίσα), the initials which should be capitalized (Κόσμο, Ἀφέντες), the learned spelling of μπορᾷ and the hybrid θαράπευσι (a combination of the learned cluster ευ with the dialectal assimilation of θε to θα).

The most reasonable conclusion is that the corrections could have a close relation to the edition of Gradenigos: either one of the owners of the manuscript started correcting it on the basis of the edition, or the manuscript belonged to Gradenigos himself and at some stage he considered using it as a source for the edition of Erofili, but after collating it with another witness and realizing its low quality he abandoned it.
The corrections on the other pages do not help to clarify the situation. The couplet I 217-8 which is added later has ἕνας τ’ ἀλλοῦ δὲν εἶ χε φανερώσει, which disagrees with the other witnesses (γεῖς τ’ ἀλλοῦ), would be the correct version of Gradenigos’s ’νοῦς τ’ ἀλλοῦ. In IV 186 γεναμένα is corrected to καμωμένα, which agrees with all the witnesses, but in the following line κακό, which is written over καλό, does not agree with Gradenigós, nor does ὁ δόλιος Χάρος in IV 200. These corrections seem to have no relation to the text of the second edition and since the handwriting is not necessarily the same as that of the first pages, the author of these could be a completely different person. So the problem of the origin and the purpose of the corrections of the first pages remains unresolved. A possible connection with Gradenigós is an interesting hypothesis which seems worth investigating. Gradenigós had lived in the Ionian Islands (he was in Kefallonia 1653-7 and in Zakynthos between 1658 and 1662), where he could have obtained the manuscript. A sample of his handwriting has been published: it is the last two pages of the manuscript of Ἐπιτομὴ Ἱεροκοσμικῆς Ἱστορίας by Nektarios of Jerusalem which include some corrections by Gradenigós (in Greek) and his testimony as a corrector that the book is suitable for printing (in Italian). The samples are very short so it is not safe to identify them with the handwritten corrections or the Italian notes in the Munich manuscript, but they do not look so dissimilar as to exclude the possibility.

5.3. The condition of the text

Several lines are missing from parts of the play. Apart from I 9-10, IV 281-2, IV 567-600, V 225-6, V 283-6, V 289-90, V 303-4, V 425-8, V 495-6, V 589-90, which are

206 Manousakas 1959: 105-6.
missing from other witnesses as well,\textsuperscript{208} the couplets I 217-18,\textsuperscript{209} I 227-28, I 289-90, II 355-56, III 37-8, IV 275-76, V 235-38, V 333-34, V 649-50 are omitted from this manuscript only. The absence of I 9-10, I 217-18, I 227-28, V 333-34 and V 649-50 is definitely a sign of textual corruption, as these lines are necessary for the meaning; on the contrary the absence of I 289-90, II 355-56, III 37-8 and V 235-38 does not create any problems of comprehension. Regarding the couplet IV 275-6 Alexiou and Aposkiti have observed that it seems an unnecessary repetition which does not connect with its context.\textsuperscript{210}

The quality of the text is bad, as was already remarked by the first editor, Xanthoudidis.\textsuperscript{211} Although many of the mistakes could originate from its model, there are indications that the scribe was careless when he was copying, because sometimes he realizes his mistakes (especially when he is repeating or omitting a line) and corrects it immediately: in the First Interlude, at the beginning of v. 154 he repeats the first hemistich of v. 152 and then continues with v. 154. The repetition is not deleted but a colon is placed before the correct version. In the place of II 238 the scribe had written at first II 239 and then continued normally with II 238, repeating II 239 at the right place. After III 9 the first hemistich of III 5 is written, followed by the indication φάλος (meaning “error”, from the Italian fallo). In III 300, παντοστινό του χέταρι probably means that he started writing παντοτινό του χέρι, influenced by μαχέρι of the previous line, but realized the mistake and continued with the correct word. Finally, in V 173 he has copied κεῑδα τὸ πρόσωπο instead of πύργο but again immediately continued with the correct version.

Such instances where mistakes are spotted and restored immediately are very rare. The text is full of minor or major scribal errors. There are indications that it is

\textsuperscript{208} See section 3 of Chapter 2 for details.
\textsuperscript{209} It has been added later in the margins by a different hand.
\textsuperscript{210} Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 231.
\textsuperscript{211} Xanthoudidis 1928: λε’.
a copy of a text written in the Latin alphabet. First of all, in the stage direction after i 167, the word λασίβα (rare word, from the Italian lascivo)\textsuperscript{212} is written in the Latin alphabet, lasiua. Moreover, many transliteration errors can be found. Sometimes σ is confused with ζ, an error which can occur if someone is copying from a Latin-script text, where s can stand for both σ and ζ. This can cause a confusion very easily in the case of verbs ending in –ζω, where only the sense helps one to understand if –so means –ζω or –σω:

Μηδὲ θαρῶ καρπόφορε κορμὶ νὰ λαχταρίζει
tηνόρα ὅπου βγιένοντας ψυχὴ τοναποχορίζει
Sανελαχτάριζε και αὐτή βλέποντας πῶς μισεύω (I 213-5)

Καὶ κείνο ὅπου παριγορία πρέπει νὰ μοῦ χαρίσει
tζελπίδαις ποῦ μὲ ζοῦσανι σὲ φόβο μοῦ γυρίσει (III 175-6).

This mistake appears in other words as well: περίζια (I 281), μαζί instead of μὰ σῦ (IV 69 and IV 565), ἐσιμία (IV 491), σούσηνε (V 220). Other mistakes can be explained as a result of the similarities between certain letters or combination of letters in the Latin alphabet:

\begin{itemize}
\item κυνιγοί instead of κεῖνοι οἱ νιοί (chignigi - chigni (i) gni, i 166)
\item συχνιαῖς, instead of ζηλιὲς (sighgnies - siglies, II 519)
\item καίχω, instead of κι ἐγώ (chi egho, chi ego, III 5)
\item μέγνια instead of μόνια (mognia - m egnia, III 17)
\item κουρα instead of ηὔρα (iura - cura, IV 247)
\item μαχιᾶς instead of μαλλιᾶς (maghias – maglias, iv 40)
\item δαίγομαι instead of δέχομαι (dhegome - dheghome, iv 94)
\end{itemize}

Finally, the wrong word division could also be an indication of a Latin-script model, especially when confusion between the orthography of i, e and o is involved:

\begin{itemize}
\item τὰ δυσκοτηνιασμένα instead of τ’ “Αδη σκοτεινιασμένα (i 12)
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{212} The Dictionary of Kriaras cites only the example of the Interludes.
Apart from the transliteration errors, some passages are so heavily corrupted that the text is completely unintelligible:

- τὸ ρανίσου (Ι 615, τὸ θρονί σου)
- τὰ χίλει σοδομένα (ι 101, τὰ γλυκουσθεμένα)
- δουδοχνο στὸ μπισταμένο πόθο (ΙΙΙ 201, μοῦ δείχνει ὁ γεῖς τὸν μπιστεμένο πόθο)
- εἰς σεμαδί (ΙΙΙ 322, σ’ ὅλους ζιμιὸ στὸν Ἅδη)
- κλεναστέσου (IV 515, θὲ νὰ στέσου)
- σίστερη (IV 25, σιδερῆ)

Proper names especially are completely confused or corrupt:

- τζὴ τζέρτζης μας τζὴ αἴγυπτο τόρα στὴν γῆν πατεῖται (Prol. 112, στὴν Κρήτη πλιὸ, μὰ τὸ’ Αἴγυπτος τώρα τὴ γῆ πατεῖτε)
- τοῦτη ἐμένφη ἐξάκουστη (Prol. 113, τούτη ’ναι ἡ Μέμφη ἡ ξακουστή)
- Μὲ τὸ μπορῶ εἶχα κάμει (ΙΙ 383 Μὲ τῶ Περσῶ)

Many mistakes have occurred because of the influence of earlier passages, where a word used previously replaces a similar word, usually in the same metrical position:

- μόνος κι αὐτὸς κλινάρι (Prol. 106, instead of στὸν κόσμο ἀπομονάρι, cf. μόνος κι αὐτὸς κλωνάρι in the previous line)
- σπιονεγκρεμνὸ γυρίζω (Ι 30, instead of γνωρίζω, cf. πάντα μου νὰ γυρίζω in Ι 29)
- τοῦ πόθου περιδιάβασις τοῦ πόθου περιβόλι (ι 77, instead of το’ ἀγάπης περιβόλι)
καὶ φωτεραῖς ταῖς νίχταις μου σὰ μεσιμέρι ἐδίδα (II 326, instead of σὰ μεσημέριν
εἴδα, cf. φῶς μοῦ δίδα in II 325).

Words or phrases are replaced with others, usually with visual or acoustic
similarities:

- σανὶ ποθιμισμένος (Ι 63, σὰν εἶν’ συνηθισμένος)
- νὰ μὴ μὲ μαρτηρίσει (I 466, νὰ μὴ μ’ὀνοματίσει)
- τὸ λογισμότου ἀνιμπορῶ ποτὲ νὰ να ταναγνώσω (ΙΙ 250, ἀν ἡμπορῶ πῶς στέκεται νὰ
gνώσω)
- δύνονται νὰ χαθοῦσι (III 188, νὰ σαστοῦσι)
- τὸ νοῦ μου κατεχάλασα (IV 49, κάτεχε ἔχασα)
- σὲ τοῦτο τὸ εὐγενικὸ (IV 516, τὸ συγγενικὸ)
- μηδένας κατακρίνει (V 622, μηδένας τ’ ἀντιτείνει)

In many passages the sense is seriously affected because of errors in gender,
number or tense. The elaborate syntax and complicated word order seem to have
caused many confusions:

- καὶ δὲν μπορῶ στόση δροσιὰ χαρὰ νὰ’ εἰδῶ κ’ αὐτήνη
μὰ πλιὰ φωτιὰ καὶ πλιὰ καὶμὸ παρὰ ποτὲ τὴν κρήνη (I 3-4)
- ταῖρι ἔμενα ζιμιὸ τὸν ἀγαφτικότζη (II 496)
- χίλιαις ζωγράφισαις χαραῖς μέσα στὸ λογισμὸ μου
καὶ χίλιαις ἔδειχνα ὁμορφιαῖς πάντα τῶν αἰματιῶν μου (ΙΙΙ 35-6)

There are hypometric or hypermetric lines because of the omission or the
unnecessary repetition or addition of words:

- δὲν ἦτονα καθὼς θορεῖς ὦ βασιλιάμας (iii 64)
- καὶ ἃς νικηθοῦσι καθὼς θορῶ κ’ ὀλπίζω (iv 73)
- παρὰ νὰ δύσεις τζαλίπητῆς φύσις (V 144)
- σ’ τούτῃ τῇ βρύσῃ σήμερο σκύψετε τῇ δροσερῇ πλιθεῖται (ii 52)
Despite these signs of careless copying and lack of attention to the meaning or the versification, some other mistakes indicate that the copyist remembered verses from other parts of the play (not from nearby passages he had just copied), which he confused with the ones he was supposed to copy:

- κιολογισμός μου βάσανα μέρα καὶ νίχτα νάχη (I 28, instead of καὶ πρίκα ὁ νοῦς μου καὶ χαρά σ’ ἕνα καιρὸ σμικτά ’χει of the other witnesses): this is a repetition of I 34.
- μάμεταις λόχαις καὶ φωτιαῖς πάντα συντροφιασμένος (i 13, instead of πάντα τυραννισμένα): reminiscent of μὲ δάκρυα κι ἀναστεναμούς πάντα συντροφιασμένες from I 404
- δὲ μοῦνε μπορεζάμενο νὰ τονε ξεριζόσω (II 191, instead of δὲν εἶναι μπορεζάμενο νὰ τονε ξεριζώσει): reminds of δὲ μοῦ ’ναι μπορεζάμενο, κι ἀληθινὰ φοβοῦμαι (I 79)
- τὰ χίλιοι τρομάσουσι τὰ πολυπρικιαμένα (III 12, instead of τὰ χείλη μου ἐσκολάσαι): influenced by I 127, τὰ χείλη μου τρομάσουσι ν’ ἁρχίσου νὰ μιλοῦσι
- χίλιας φωτιαῖς μὲ δόξευγαις (III 19, instead of χίλιες φορές): influenced by χίλιες φωτιές τ’ ἀμμάτια του, κ’ οἱ ἐμιλιές του ἐδείχνα (V 96)
- Τάστρα τονίλιο τὸν λαμπρὸν τὴν νίχτα τὴν καθάρια (III 182, instead of τὴ νύκτα, τὴν ἡμέρα): influenced by I 261, δὲν φαίνουνται στὸν οὐρανὸ τῇ νύκτα τὴν καθάρια.
- μὰ γὼ ἔχω μόνο τάπρεπο σήμερο ἀπὸ σένα (V 400, instead of σιμά σου καμωμένα): reminds one of σὰν τὸ σιμπάθιο πόλαβα σήμερο ἀπὸ σένα (V 371)

Some less clear examples are:

- φωτιάς ὁποῦ σὲ παιδευγε σιμάδι νὰ σοῦ δόσω (I 232, instead of μὴ δώσεις) and τούταις ὁποῦ μὲ τυραννοῦ, τὸ νοῦμον νὰ σοῦ δόσω (III 238, instead of νὰ
σποδώσω): perhaps the copyist was influenced by the formulaic expression νὰ οὐ δώσω which is frequently used at the end of the verse (Dedic. 37, 65, V 73, and elsewhere as νὰ τοῦ δώσω / νὰ τοῇ δώσω).

- Καὶ λόγιασε μὲ πλιὸ καϊμὸ πρὶ νὰ τὸν ελογιάσω (Ι 209, instead of νὰ τονε μιλήσω): although λόγιασε from the beginning of the line is a plausible explanation for the repetition of the word at the end of the line, it is also similar to πρὶ μόνο νὰ λογιάσω from Ι 121.

- παρὰ μὲ θέλει πολεμά δίχος καιρὸ νὰ δώσει (ΙΙ 109, instead of δίχως ποτὲ νὰ δώσει): influenced perhaps by ΙΙ 499, δίχως καιρὸς ποτὲ νὰ μπεῖ στὴ μέση

At first sight it seems strange that a copyist for whom there exist signs of carelessness could easily remember phrases he had copied some hundreds of lines before. Of course we should not forget that memorization skills at this period were different from those of modern societies, so it is not improbable that the scribe retained phrases in his memory and used them in similar contexts. However, since he is sometimes influenced by passages which follow the one he is copying, this kind of mistake is perhaps an indication that he had previous knowledge of the text before he copied it, perhaps as a reader, or as a spectator of a performance.

The information about performances of Cretan plays in the Ionian Islands is scant and it is mostly a matter of indications rather than concrete references. The play had also become popular in folk adaptations, either in the form of ballads in Crete, or as folk theatre. No homilies of Erofili from the Ionian Islands have survived, although adaptations from West Mainland Greece and Thessaly have been recorded in modern times. Nonetheless the possibility that the copyist knew Erofili from performances of the whole play or from folk adaptations which circulated in oral or

---

213 See Puchner 2007: 248 for an overview of the available information.
214 See Polymerou-Kamilaki 1998 for an overview, a comparative analysis of various versions and the publication of some of the texts.
written form cannot be excluded. The fact that there are so many copying mistakes, especially substitutions of words, could also be an indication that the scribe was relying on his memory while he was copying and for that reason was not very careful.

Another indication of a possible relationship of the manuscript with the popular tradition is the name of the hero, which is frequently written as Πανάρατος. The folk adaptations which have survived from Mainland Greece are named Πανάρατος and since cultural contacts between the Ionian Islands and Mainland Greece are not unusual, the origin of the adaptations may well be the Heptanese. So, the name of the hero in the manuscript could indeed be an indication of links between the circulation of Erofili in the Ionian Islands and the adaptations from Epirus and Thessaly. It should also be mentioned that this is not the only appearance of this form of the name in the 17th century: the library of Francesco Zeno included a manuscript of a Greek literary text called Panaratos (Panaratos opera Graeca in the catalogue). Since Zeno had also a copy of Erofili in his library, Panagiotakis has supposed that Panaratos could not be another manuscript of the play, which was anyway known by a different name, but he was reluctant to connect it to the folk adaptations which have survived until now and supposed that it is another play which has not survived. The historical information is indeed not enough for a definite conclusion, but the existence of two references to the name Πανάρατος already from the 17th century is a strong indication of the circulation of folk adaptations and the interrelation between oral and written tradition.

---

217 Possible further evidence is the reference to a «παλαιώφλαδα τῆς Ἐρωφίλης καὶ τοῦ Πανάρατου, ἔτζη ὀνομαζομένη», mentioned in a notarial act from Lefkada in 1771 (Moullas 1964). Moullas considers παλαιώφλαδα as a terminus technicus for a chapbook and interprets ἔτζη ὀνομαζομένη as proof that the book is not one of the known editions of Erofili but an edition named after both heroes which is now lost. Since he takes it for granted that the book in question is a printed edition and not
5.4. Language and versification

The manuscript presents the typical feature of texts of Cretan Literature copied in the Ionian Islands, that is the elimination of Cretan dialectal characteristics and the occasional insertion of Heptanesian forms, as well as the distortion of the metrical character of the text.

The Cretan dialectal character of the text is by no means systematically altered, as has happened in the first edition by Kigalas. Dialectal characteristics like κιανείς, πρίκα, συχνίος, τζῆ / τζǜ, the endings -εύγω and -σσω are generally preserved and their non-dialectal equivalents appear occasionally.

Xanthoudidis has already remarked that the manuscript has many features of the dialect of Kefallonia and has given some examples: ἐξουρία, κυρά, ἣτουν, γιομίζω, ὅχ, ἀφουγκρούμαι, κάτου, ἀσηκώνω etc. Some more words which are not attested in Cretan texts but appear in texts from the Ionian Islands can be added: ἀνασβολεμένη (II 29) instead of ἀσβολομένη, ναύλερος (III 51) instead of ναύκλερος, ψευγάδι (I 161, Heptanesian form of ψεγάδι, replacing σκονάδι of the original), γνέφη (V 7, for νέφη), τὸ δάση (ΙΙΙ 8), κραίνω instead of κρίνω (Ι 75), βουλιασμένος (IV 24 and V 2) instead of βουλισμένος, περικαλῶ (IV 463, the only instance), καδηνωμένος (ΙΙΙ, IV 82, 608, 647, 753).

The linguistic interventions of the copyist do not take into consideration the metre and rhyme. For that reason many lines are hypermetric because of the

---

218 Xanthoudidis 1928: λδ.
addition of final –ν when it is not required by the Cretan dialect or for euphonic reasons, the substitution of the dialectal το’ with τις / τῆς / τοὺς and other linguistic changes:

- Σ’ ἐνα ἄνιγοσφάλισμα τῶν νεματιῶν ἀποσόνω (Prol. 77)
- Καὶ ἀνέ καὶ τούτοι οἱ βασιλεῖς ὅπου τὸν κόσμον ὥριζουν (Prol. 127)
- Παρὰ πασένα βασιλιῶν πλουσιότατον ἀπὸ τόπους (IV 307)
- Γιατί ἄνθρωπον χείρότερον δὲν ἔχωμεν ἀπὸ κεῖνον (V 278)

The inconsistent use of final –ν results also to a high number of hiatuses, in sharp contrast with the Cretan witnesses of the play.

The rhyme is also affected by the inconsistent use of final –ν and other changes in language or phrasing:

- τόσα - ἐπλακόσαν (Ι 1-2)
- τὴν τούσην - περιπλακώσει (178-9)
- φιλιά μας - ἀνάμεσό μας (Ι 115-6)
- ξεριζώσει – γεράσει (Ι 185-6, instead of ἀνασπάσει)
- ἀντάμα – κάμει (Ι 363-4, ΙΙ 39-40, IV 39-40 etc)
- αὐτήνο – φόνο (IV 489-90)
- βρώση – σκεπάση (V 419-20, instead of χώσει)

5.5. Conclusions

The condition of the text in the Munich manuscript, which, though linguistically less corrupt than Kigalas’s edition, in terms of content is much more problematic, does not make it a very useful witness for an edition of Erofili. The text however, even in this condition, seems to be most important for the study of the relation between the witnesses: the close affinities with Gradenigos’s edition which coexist with occasional similarities with Kigalas (especially the adaptation of the 3rd Scene
of the 5th Act), make this version a useful witness for the study of the various stages of the transmission of the play.²²⁰

²²⁰ See the relevant chapter for more details.
The relations among the witnesses of *Erofili* have not been presented in detail by previous editors or other scholars. However, previous researchers have made some observations about them, which can be used as a starting point. According to Alexiou and Aposkiti, the two Latin-script manuscripts constitute one branch of the tradition, another branch is represented by the edition of Gradenigos, while the Kigalas edition and the Munich manuscript are corrupt texts.\(^{221}\) They consider the tradition contaminated and point out that the inferior witnesses should not be completely overlooked because, even if rarely, they do present some authentic readings. They also stress the existence of variants of equal quality which could originate from different stages of revision by the poet himself.\(^{222}\) Examining the missing lines from each witness Kaklamanis reaches similar conclusions to Alexiou and Aposkiti: Gradenigos represents one branch, with the fullest text, and the other branch has two sub-branches, one containing the two Latin-script manuscripts and

\(^{221}\) Alexiou & Aposkiti 1992: 29.

\(^{222}\) Alexiou & Aposkiti 1992: 30-1.
the other the Munich manuscript and Kigalas. Bancroft-Marcus, finally, considers Kigalas’s edition more closely related to the two Cretan manuscripts and has also addressed the possibility of authorial revisions, making suggestions about certain passages which can be used as evidence.

These observations give an accurate idea about the general relations between the witnesses, but do not answer more specific questions, such as what are the exact relationships among the different groups of witnesses, or among the witnesses within the same group, what kind of variation appears in each group and to what extent any one of the main branches can be considered as superior.

The following analysis will present the relations among the witnesses of Erofili and the Interludes in two parts. The first is a brief introduction on the kind of variation which can be observed among the witnesses and the second is a detailed analysis of the various differences of the witnesses and the groups in which they can be classified.

1. The number of lines preserved

The witness which preserves the most lines of Erofili is the edition of Gradenigos (3281 lines): this edition includes a large passage in the Fourth Act (Scene 5, 567-600) which does not appear in any other witness, and a large passage in the Fifth Act (Scene 3, 277-326) which has survived in two other shorter versions. These passages are the only large-scale discrepancies as far the number of lines is concerned, with the exception of the absence of large sections of the play from some witnesses which is due to other reasons (the missing leaves from A, the absence of the Dedication in M and the First Choric Ode in B). In the other parts of the play

---

couplets are missing sporadically from a witness or a group of witnesses. So, 3008 lines are preserved in all the witnesses (A is excluded from the comparison because of the mutilated condition of the manuscript). To these we could add 67 lines of the First Choric Ode and 76 lines of the Dedication which are preserved in all but one witness. Regarding the Interludes, B is the fullest version with 606 lines and 594 lines are preserved by all the witnesses (again with the exception of A).

2. Kinds of textual variation

The overall structure of the play, the sequence of episodes and speeches and the division in acts and scenes, is virtually the same in all the witnesses. The only exceptions are the end of the Fifth Scene of the Fourth Act in K, which is placed 4 lines earlier than in the other witnesses, and the very end of the play, where there are serious discrepancies among the witnesses in the attribution of lines to speakers and in the stage directions clarifying the action in the part where Filogonos is murdered. An important structural difference appears in the Third Interlude, where in G, K and M three anonymous Turks appear (στρατηγοὶ Τοῦρκοι), while in A and B only two of them appear, named as Adrastos and Tisafernos, following Gerusalemme Liberata. So the variation among the witnesses concerns only the verbal and not the structural level, apart from these specific cases.

As a guide to understanding the kind of variation among the witnesses of Erofili and the Interludes we may employ the classification proposed by Bakker and

---

226 Only two cases of omission of more than one couplet appear in the rest of the play: II 101-8 from K and IV 437-42 from B. See sections 1.3 and 4.2 of Chapter 1 for more details. For the classification of the witnesses according to their common missing lines see section 3 of the present chapter.

227 See section 6.1.3 of the present chapter for details.
van Gemert for the possible ways in which the witnesses of an early Modern Greek text can vary. They have proposed six categories:

1. orthographic errors
2. copying and typographical errors
3. writing conventions of the period (use of final –ν, elision / aphaeresis)
4. learned vs dialectal / demotic orthography (e.g. πτ / φτ, ευσ / ψ)
5. learned vs dialectal / demotic phonology and morphology
6. verbal variants (use of a different word or difference in the meaning).

Having this guide in mind we can go on with the comparison of the witnesses. The typographical and copying errors of each witness have been presented in the previous chapter, and the errors shared by groups of witnesses will be discussed in the following sections. The orthographic conventions followed by the copyist of the manuscripts and the editors of the witnesses, as well as their linguistic characteristics have also been presented in the relevant sections of Chapter 1 and they can be summarized in the following points:

- As far as the writing conventions affecting the word boundaries are concerned, the two Latin-script manuscripts resemble one another in their tendency to preserve consecutive vowels (A more frequently than B) but do not follow the same pattern in the word division (e.g. n’ animegni in A, na gnimegni in B). The two editions on the contrary tend not to preserve consecutive vowels and use elision or aphaeresis instead. As far as final –ν is concerned, a dividing line can be drawn between the Cretan and the non-Cretan witnesses. The two Cretan manuscripts and Gradeningos systematically preserve final –ν for the avoidance of hiatus, while Kigalas and less systematically the copyist of the Munich manuscript do not pay attention in its

---

228 Bakker 1996 and van Gemert 1996.
euphonic function and frequently omit it where it would be needed to block hiatus, but preserve it in cases when it would not be used in the Cretan dialect.

As far as the language is concerned, the dividing line again is between the Cretan and non-Cretan witnesses. The Cretan witnesses preserve phonological, morphological, syntactical and lexical characteristics of the Cretan dialect, their main difference being the prevalence of East Cretan dialectal features in the two manuscripts, and Central-Western ones in Gradenigos’s edition. The Munich manuscript presents the typical linguistic character of the Heptanesian witnesses of Cretan texts: reduction of Cretan dialectal features and occasional insertion of Heptanesian characteristics; the Cretan character of the text however is not systematically altered or eliminated, as is the case of the first edition where one can speak about an intentional and systematic removal of dialectal characteristics.

These kinds of differences permeate the whole text and have an impact on the style, but do not affect the meaning, and since they are more likely to represent the personal choices of the scribe/printer than the real choices of the poet, they cannot give us much information about their exemplars and the text(s) that preceded them. So, if we do not take them into account, what remains are the actual differences in phrasing. There are the cases of the use of a different word, with the same or similar meaning, or of a slight alteration which does not affect the general sense of the passage, or the use of completely different phrasing. These kinds of variations will be presented in detail in the following sections. Here we can give some quantitative data which can give a general idea of the state of the text as it has survived in different witnesses.

For reasons of convenience, we can classify these variations according to the portion of the line they affect and the extent of the difference in phrasing and meaning. The minimum difference is when the words remain the same, but their
order is reversed in some witnesses (e.g. τὴν ψυχή καὶ τὸ κορμί μου δίδω / τὸ κορμί καὶ τὴν ψυχή μου δίδω, I 368). A word might be omitted without creating any gaps in the sentence and without affecting the metre (e.g. ποῦ τῶν Ἑλλήνω οἱ βασιλεῖς / ποῦ 'ν τῶν Ἑλλήνω οἱ βασιλεῖς, Prol. 22). A word might be substituted with one with exactly the same meaning (κάθα / πᾶσα, δίχως / χωρίς) or one which can be used in the same context with similar meaning (πληγωμένη καρδιά / βαρεμένη καρδιά, ἔχθρητες / μαλλιές) or a different word without significantly altering the sense (σκυλοκάρδης / σκληροκάρδης, παλάτια στὸν ἀέρα / περβόλια στὸν ἀέρα). The use of different words might extend to the whole half-line (βάσανα μέρα καὶ νύκτα νά 'χει / βάσανα καὶ βάρη πάντα νά 'χει) or a whole verse might be completely different (μὲ τὸ σπαθί μου ἐτέλειωνα μιὰν ὧρα τὴ ζωή μου / μιὰν ὧρα μὲ τὸ χέρι μου ἔπαιρνα τὴ ζωή μου, I 278).

In the first four acts, the proportions of the kinds of differences is stable: approx. 11.5% of the lines of each act have one word different, in 2-2.5% of them the differences affect a half-line, 1-1.5% have the same phrasing but the word order is altered and 1.5% of their lines present significant differences in their whole extent. In the Fifth Act the image is a bit different: 9% of the lines differ in one word only, 5% differ in a whole hemistich, 1% differ in the sequence of words and 2.3% of lines have more extended differences. In the Interludes we can observe a similar pattern as in acts I-IV: 14% of the lines have one word different, 1.7 % has a hemistich different and the same percentage is affected by an inversion of the word order and finally only 0.2% of the lines have more extended differences. What can be observed is that the majority of variants concerns the substitution of one word only and more extended differences are rare. In the Fifth Act, the picture changes, as differences affecting a half-line or a whole line are more frequent; there are further indications from omission of lines, discrepancies in speech prefixes and stage directions that
this act has undergone many alterations during the transmission of the play, as will be discussed below.

3. Evidence from missing lines

3.1. The edition of Gradenigos: the fullest version

Gradenigos’s edition is the only witness which preserves lines IV 567-600, as we mentioned previously. The passage concerned is part of the Counsellor’s speech in support of Panaretos and it actually repeats the argument that has already been presented, i.e. that the King should not forget that Panaretos’s services in the war saved his country. Its absence from the other witnesses does not affect our understanding of the text. The authenticity of the passage has not been disputed, and judging from the style, there seems to be no reason for considering it as an interpolation: the passage is characterized by the long and elaborate sentences so typical of Chortatsis’s writing, so it does not seem likely that they are not authentic. Moreover, it is almost an accurate translation of Orbecche III.2 496-544. As Alexiou and Aposkiti observe, the omission of this part is a way to avoid repetition, which could be attributed to the will of the poet himself or could be the result of adaptations of the play for the needs of performances.\footnote{Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 19.} Bancroft-Marcus has also considered this a sign of authorial revision.\footnote{Bancroft-Marcus 1978: 103.}

The same can be said for the passage V 285-318. Gradenigos again gives the fullest version of the emotional discussion between Erofili and Nena on their way to meet the King: Erofili says that she is afraid of hearing an unpleasant decision from the King and she is sure that she is going to die, Nena tries to comfort her and to persuade her that there is no need to worry, and the King is watching them and
making comments on their reluctance to meet him. Two shorter versions of the scene have survived, so there is an original version and two adaptations of the scene.

Gradenigos’s edition is also the only witness for I 9-10, IV 281-2, V 495-6 and V 589-90. None of these passages is crucially essential for the plot or for the expression of an argument, so their absence from the other witnesses could be a further sign of deliberate omissions. An interesting feature, concerning a part of the Fifth Act again, is the appearance of the couplet V 251-2 twice, after V 244 and again after V 249-50. In B it is placed after V244. The omission of 253-6 from K and M suggests that various stages of the reworking of this passage have been circulating in different manuscripts.231

On the other hand, in two cases Gradenigos’s edition agrees with the Munich manuscript against Kigalas and the Birmingham manuscript: they both include a couplet missing from K and B (I 237-8) and they also omit a couplet found in K and B (I 133ab).

The Interludes present a quite different image as far as Gradenigos’s text is concerned: the edition is missing four couplets which have survived in all the other witnesses (i 24ab, iii 26ab, iii 98ab, iv 90ab). The authenticity of these couplets has not been disputed: they have been accepted in Alexiou and Aposkiti’s edition and two of them, i 24ab and iii 26ab, correspond to passages from the Interludes’ source, Gerusalemme Liberata.232

231 See also Bancroft-Marcus 1978: 109, who suggests that this passage has been reworked following Orbecche.
3.2. The Munich manuscript and Kigalas’s edition

In these two witnesses the passage V 280-324 is adapted in the same way. Three couples are missing (283-4, 289-90, 303-2; M is also lacking 285-6) and in K the order of the couples 287-8 and 285-6 is reversed. These couples are part of the emotional dialogue between Erofili and Nena as they are going to appear before the King and belong to Erofili’s speech. Nena’s part remains intact, exactly as it appears in the edition of Gradenigos:

Gradenigos

Ἐρωφ. Μάλλισις γιατί μοι μήνυσε μὲ τὸν Α’μιδῆ, κρίνω,
Γιατί δήθεν χειρότερο δὲν ἔχωμ’ ἀπό ’κεινο, 280
Πῶς ἐκαμεν ἄποφαι κακή για ’μᾶς περίσσα, 281
Κι ἀπόστεν ἤρθε κ’ εἶπεν τὰ σωθικα’ ἔλασα, 282
Τὸ πνεῦμα μ’ ὀλο χάθηκε, καὶ δὲ μπορά μιλήω, 283
Καὶ δυὸ ἄν ὑπάγω ζάλα ὀμπρὸς, τέσσερα στρέφ’ ὄπισω, 284
Νένα καὶ Μᾶνα μ’ ἀκριβῆ, τάχα νὰ χωριστοῦμε, 285
Γιατί κατέχω σήμερο, πῶς ἔχω ν’ἀποθάνω, 286
Καὶ πῶς σ’ἀφήνω δίχως μου σ’τοῦτο τὸν Κόσμ’ ἀπάνω, 287
Παρακαλῶ σε, Νένα μου, περίσ’ ἀγαπημένη, 288
Καθὼς μ’ ἀγάπας ζωντανὴ, μ’ ἀγάπ’ ἀποθαμένη, 289
Καὶ τ’ ὄνομά μου τὸ γλυκὺ κιαμιὰ φορά νὰ λέγῃς, 290
Καὶ τὸν πρικύ μου θάνατο λυπητερὰ νὰ κλαίγῃς. 291

Kigalas, with semantic variants from M

Ερ. Δειλείω [Μ Μάλλιος] γιατί μοι μήνυσε μὲ τὸν Α’μιδῆν κρίνω [Μ Ἀρμόδη]
Διατι ἄνθρωπον χειρότερον δὲν ἔχομεν ἀπ’ ἄτεκεινον 280
Πῶς ἐκαμεν ἄποφαι κακὴν διὰ μείζᾳ περίσσα, 281
Καὶ ἀφότης ἦλθεν κ’ εἶπεν μοι τὰ σωτικά μου’ ἄλοσαν, 282
Γιατί πνεῦμα μ’ ὀλό χάθηκεν, καὶ δὲ μπορ’ ἀμήιλω, 291
Καὶ δύο ὑπάγαι τάχαν μπρόσ, τέσσερα στρέφ’ ὄπισω [Μ Ἀλα] 283
Διατι κατέχω σήμερον πῶς ἔχω ν’ αποθάνω 285
Καὶ πῶς σ’ ἀφήνω δίχως μου, στούτον τὸν κόσμ’ ἀπάνω 286
[M om 285-6]

Bay. Μὴν κλαίεις θυγατέρα μου, σώπασε μίρησά μου 291
Διατι μὲ δίχως ἀφομίνην μοι καίεις τὴν καρδιάν μου
Πρὶν δῆς τὸ τέλος τῆς δουλίας, νὰ ξημίζῃ τὸ κορμίδου
Γέτοια παραστήματα μὴν κάιμης ἀπαίτησο. 292
Ερ. Ναίνα ποθοῦ λέγωσος, καὶ ἀν εἶναι μπορετόν σου, 293
Σ’ ἀναλάμπε με τὸ πέρι του ἀλήρον νὰ μέ εἰς χάως, 294
Καθὼς τὸ κακορίζηκα κορμὶ με ψυχὴν στὸν ἅδην νὰ γενοῦν τὸν πικραμμένον ἕναν. 295
Καὶ ὅσο γλυκὰ μὲ πότιζες γάλαν παρακαλῶσε, 296
Τόσα νεκρὶ πὴ τὴν σήμερον δάκρυα πικρὰ μοῦ δῶσε. 297
Βασ. Τί πρᾶγμα συντυχέννουσιν, καὶ ἀργοῦσι νὰ σημώσουν, [Μ συντιφοσίνη] 302
Καὶ ἄφθονον γύρευσιν στράταν νὰ μὲ κοπήσουν. 298

Bay. Μὴν κλαίεις θυγατέραμου, σώπασε μίρησάμου 291
Οὐκ ἀκούσαν ποτὲ καίεις τὴν καρδιάν μου
Πρὶν δῆς τὸ τέλος τῆς δουλίας, νὰ ξημίζῃ τὸ κορμίδου
Γέτοια παραστήματα μὴν κάιμης ἀπαίτησο. 292
Ερ. Ναίνα ποθοῦ λέγωσος, καὶ ἀν εἶναι μπορετόν σου, 293
Σ’ ἀναλάμπε με τὸ πέρι του ἀλήρον νὰ μέ εἰς χάως, 294
Καθὼς τὸ κακορίζηκα κορμὶ με ψυχὴν στὸν ἅδην νὰ γενοῦν τὸν πικραμμένον ἕναν. 295
Καὶ ἄφθονον γύρευσιν στράταν νὰ μὲ κοπήσουν. 298

Bay. Ω’ χου καὶ πῶς τὰ λόγια αὐτὰ σφαζόμεν τὰ σωτικά μου,
Καὶ νὰ κρατήσω δὲν μποροῦ ποσῶς τὰ κλάματά μου. [Μ δάκρια]  300
Γάσιν νομίσας μοι κάτωσα πικρὰ μοῦ δῶσε. 302

Great Books of the Greek World
The two witnesses have other lacunas in common, again from the Fifth Act: V 225-6, V 253-6, V 425-8. It seems that some parts of this act have been revised, so these lacunas are not necessarily a problem of the transmission. This can be said especially for V 253-6 because there is evidence that the passage V 245-256 underwent different stages of reworking. Each one also has its own lacunas, so there is no direct dependence on one another, but they certainly had a common ancestor. The Interludes give further evidence for this, as they have both omitted lines iii 45-9.

3.3. The Birmingham and Athens manuscripts

3.3.1. Evidence from the part which has survived in the Athens manuscript

The evidence from missing lines is not enough to classify the Birmingham and the Athens manuscripts as parts of the same branch, because the Fifth Act is completely
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The two witnesses have other lacunas in common, again from the Fifth Act: V 225-6, V 253-6, V 425-8. It seems that some parts of this act have been revised, so these lacunas are not necessarily a problem of the transmission. This can be said especially for V 253-6 because there is evidence that the passage V 245-256 underwent different stages of reworking. Each one also has its own lacunas, so there is no direct dependence on one another, but they certainly had a common ancestor. The Interludes give further evidence for this, as they have both omitted lines iii 45-9.

3.3. The Birmingham and Athens manuscripts

3.3.1. Evidence from the part which has survived in the Athens manuscript

The evidence from missing lines is not enough to classify the Birmingham and the Athens manuscripts as parts of the same branch, because the Fifth Act is completely
missing from A. An argument for grouping them together is the presence in both of
a couplet after III 50, not found in any other witness:

\[
\begin{align*}
\textit{chi astrapes chie i vrodes chie to perisso ghiogni} \\
\textit{canu chie de bora crati o naftis to timogni}
\end{align*}
\]

Alexiou and Aposkiti have omitted this couplet from the edition considering it of
lower quality because of the hiatuses and the improbable image of snow in the
sea.\textsuperscript{233} It should be mentioned, though, that images of snow and stormy seas appear
in Erotokritos:

\[
\begin{align*}
\textit{κι ωσὰν ὁ ναύτης στὴ χιονιὰ καὶ στὴν πολλὴν ἀντάρα,} \\
\textit{όντε τὴ νύκτα κυβερνά μὲ φόβο καὶ τρομάρα... (B 555-6)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\textit{κι ὧρες στὸ νέφος τ’οὐρανοῦ μὲ τὸ κατάρτι γγίξη} \\
\textit{κι ὧρες στὰ βάθη του ὁ γιαλὸς νὰ τὸν ρουφήξη,} \\
\textit{νὰ χαμηλώνη ἢ συννεφιά, νὰ βρέχη, νὰ χιονίζη,} \\
\textit{ν’ ἀστράφτη, νὰ βροντᾶ οὐρανὸς κι ὁ κόσμος νὰ μουγκρίζη (D 657-60)}
\end{align*}
\]

However, Alexiou and Aposkiti are right about the hiatuses which make the couplet
look incompatible with Chortatsis’s style. Perhaps it was an addition by a copyist
who was inspired by other images of stormy seas in Cretan literature, since this is a
quite frequent motif for describing distress and anxiety.\textsuperscript{234}

Apart from IV 281-2 and IV 567-600, which are found only in Gradenigos, they
do not have any other lacunas in common: the Athens manuscript does not have
any missing lines in the pages which have survived, so it is not lacking lines III 337-
8, which are absent from B. B is also missing lines IV 437-42, which belong to a part
of the A manuscript which has not survived, but the analysis of the number of lines
in each page in A suggests that these lines where originally there. A is missing the
pages containing lines 353-446, that is 94 lines. Every page in the manuscript has 24

\textsuperscript{233} Alexiou & Aposkiti 1998: 229.

\textsuperscript{234} For this motif in the love poetry context see Lassithiotakis 1996a. For the image of the sea in
Erotokritos with brief references to other works see Bakker & Philippides 1988.
lines of text, apart from the pages where there is a change of scene: then it has 22
lines of text, plus two lines with the number of the new scene and the persons that
appear. The passage 353-446 includes a change of scene, after 442, so if the six lines
missing from B (437-42) were in the lost pages of A, there would be 96 lines: the 94
lines of the play (353-446) plus the two introductory lines for the new scene. Divided
by 24, that gives us exactly four pages, so we can conclude that lines 437-42 did exist
in the Athens manuscript.

3.3.2. Evidence from the Birmingham manuscript only

In V 285-324 B omits a big part of the discussion between Nena and Erofili and the
comments of the King: lines 285-6, 291-2 and 295-318 (with the exception of 301-2)
are missing. Two extra lines are added at the end of the abridged passage (after 322),
to make easier the transition to the lines that follow. Contrary to the adaptation of
the passage in K and M, where only some couplets from the first speech of Erofili are
missing, here this part is found intact, apart from lines 285-6, and the abridgment
affects Nena’s reply and Erofili’s second speech: after Erofili expresses the certainty
that she’s going to die, Nena tells her that there is no reason to have such
pessimistic thoughts and then both of them stop in front of the King. So, the
shortening of the passage was made independently of the shortening of the
exemplar of K and M, i.e. from the full version of the scene, not the shortened one.

The omissions do not cause problems of coherence to the text. On the
contrary, it could be a revision of the text with the purpose not only to avoid
repetitions, but to solve practical problems as well: the complete version of the
scene requires that Erofili and Nena are walking together from Erofili’s room to
meet the king and as they are approaching, the King eavesdrops on their
conversation and makes comments; the person responsible for the version of B
seems to have preferred to avoid parallel action, so the King remains inactive until the two women arrive at his room and see him.  

**Gradenigos**

'Ἐρωφ. Μάλλις γιατί μοι' μήνυσε με τὸν Α’ρμόδη, κρίνω,  
Γιατί ἄθρωπο χειρότερο δὲν ἔχω ἀπὸ 'κείνο,  
Πῶς έκαμεν ἀπόφασι κακὴ γιὰ 'μᾶς περίσσα,  
Κι ἀπόσταν ἦρθε κ' εἶπε μοι τὰ σωθικαὶ ἔλοσα.  
Τὸ πνέμα μ’ ὄλο ‘χάθηκε, καὶ δὲ μπορᾷ μιλῆσω,  
Καὶ δυὸ ἐν υπάγω ζάλα ὄμπρος, τέσσερα στράφ’ ὅπιο.  
Νένα καὶ Μάνα μ’ ἀκριβῆ, τάχα νὰ χωριστοῦμε,  
Σήμερο μιὰ τὴν ἄλλη μας πλιό μας νὰ μὴν ἰδοῦμε  
Παρακαλῶ σε, Νένα μου, πολλά μου ἀγαπημένη  
καθὼς μ’ ἀγάπας ζωντανὴ μ’ ἔχε κι ἀποθαμένη  
Κι ὅσο γλυκὺ μὲ πότισες γάλα, παρακαλῶ σε  
τόσα νεκρῆς τὸ σήμερο δάκρυα πρικιὰ μοῦ δῶσε.  

**Birmingham manuscript (transliterated)**

'Ἐρωφ. Μάλλις γιατί μοι' μήνυσε με τὸν Α’ρμοδη, κρίνω,  
γιατί άθρωπο χειρότερο δὲν ἔχω ἀπὸ 'κείνο,  
πῶς νά ‘καμεν ἀπόφασι κακὴ γιὰ ‘μᾶς περίσσα,  
κι ἀπόσταν ἦρθε κ’ εἶπε μοι τὰ σωθικαὶ μοῦ ἔλοσα.  
καὶ πηαίνοντας μοῦ φαίνεται τὸ πῶς γιαγέμνω ὀπίσω  
καὶ τρέμουσι τὰ μέλη μου κι ἀπὸ μπορά μιλῆσω  
νένα καὶ μάνα μου ἀκριβῆ, τάχα νὰ χωριστοῦμε,  
σήμερο μιὰ τὴν ἄλλη μας πλιό μας νὰ μὴν ἰδοῦμε  
pαρακαλῶ σε, νένα μου, πολλά μου ἀγαπημένη,  
καθὼς μ’ ἀγάπας ζωντανὴ μ’ ἔχε κι ἀποθαμένη  
κι δοῦ γυλικ μὲ πότισες γάλα, παρακαλῶ σε  
tόσα νεκρῆς τὸ σήμερο δάκρυα πρικιὰ μοῦ δῶσε.  
καὶ τ’ ὄνομα μου τὸ γλυκὺ κιαμιὰ φορὰ νὰ λέγῃς  
καὶ τὸ πρικὺ μου θάνατο λυπητερὰ νὰ κλαίγεις.  

See Puchner 1983a: 45-6 for a theatrological analysis of the scene. The passage from the Birmingham manuscript is transliterated so as to facilitate the comparison between the witnesses.
Τὸ τέλος τοῦ Πανάρετου τάχα ἰχει ὁρισθῇ
Νεν. Τοῦ Βασιλιοῦ μοῦ φάνηκε κι ἄκουσα νὰ μιλήσῃ

Γλήγορα, Θυγατέρα μου, πάψε τὰ κλαίματά σου,
Τὸ πρόσωπό σου μέρωσε, σύστεψαι τὰ μαλλιά σου,
Γιατὶ θωρῶ τὸ Βασιλίο στὸ θρόνο καθισμένο,
Καὶ ὁλόχαρος σὲ καρτερεῖ, κ’ εἰς ἔγνια πλιὸ δὲ μπαίνω.

Ἐρ. Ἐτζη καὶ τ’ ἄγρια κύματα τὸ κάνου τζή θαλάσσου,
Σάν πνίξουσι τὸν ἄνθρωπο πάφτου καὶ κατατάσσου.

Apart from V322ab, which seems to be an addition resulting from the adaptation of the whole passage, the Birmingham manuscript has another couplet not found anywhere else: V336ab (παρὰ μὲ τοῦ Πανάρετου μόνο τὸ θάνατόν του / θάνατο καὶ θαράπαψη ὁλονῶ τῶν ὀχουθρῶν του), which does not seem authentic for stylistic reasons (words seem to be repeated in an effort to fill the line as the metre requires).

3.4. Summary

Two large passages of the play (IV 467-600 and V 280-324) show signs of adaptations, because of the omission of some lines and the rearrangement of the order of others, in a way which does not disrupt the sense. Gradenigos’s edition preserves the fullest text; all the other witnesses omit IV 467-600 and V 280-324 appears in two shortened versions, one represented by Kigalas’s edition and the Munich manuscript and another one, which is the shortest, represented by the Birmingham manuscript (the Athens manuscript does not include Act V in the state it has been preserved now).

Other missing lines suggest an affinity between the Athens and the Birmingham manuscript, which include a couplet after III 50 not found anywhere else, between K and M, which both omit some couplets from other parts of the fifth
Act (225-6, 253-6, 425-8), and between G and M against B and K (B and K omit I 237-8 and G and M omit I 133ab).

As far as the Interludes are concerned, Gradenigos’s edition distinguishes itself again, but this time because of missing couplets which have survived in other witnesses. K and M again show signs of affinity, because they both omit lines iii 45-9.

4. Common errors

The missing lines cannot justify the grouping of the witnesses on that basis only, as they do not affect a large part of the text. But they can be used as a guide to further analyze the relations of the witnesses with the help of common errors between them and other lexical variants. The distinction between correct and erroneous readings is not always easy: there are cases when a variant seems less preferable in comparison with the variant of another witness, but would not be spotted as a mistake on its own, while in other cases readings seem of equal value. For the needs of this analysis, when I refer to mistakes I mean cases when a reading does not make sense on its own, unless otherwise indicated.

4.1. Corrupted passages and errors common to all the witnesses

The fact that a number of errors or corrupted passages are found in all the witnesses suggests that they had occurred at an earlier stage in the transmission of Erofili, in a common source from which all the witnesses derive. In some of these cases all the witnesses present the same errors, in other cases a passage is problematic in all of them but not it the same way. The latter can be explained as an attempt by different scribes to restore an unintelligible or incomprehensible passage in their exemplar and it can sometimes be helpful to distinguish subgroups among the witnesses.
I 171-3

B Chiales na laxu to simio chiales na gennithusi
messā sto numas pethimies

G Κιάλλιως ν’ αλλάξη τὸ ζημιῶ, κιάλλιως νὰ γενηθοῦσι
Μέσα στὸ νοῦμας πεθυμιές

K Κὶ ἀλλέως νὰ ἀλλάξη παρευθὺς, κὶ ἀλλέως νὰ γενηθοῦσιν
Μέσα εἰς τὸν νοῦν μας πεθυμιαῖς

M Κιαλιῶς νὰ λάξει παραυτίς κιαλιῶς νὰ γενηθοῦσι
μέσα στὸ νοῦμας καὶ τῶν δυὸ

G, K and M present the same version, but neither this, nor the version of B is satisfactory: ἀλλιῶς ν’ ἀλλάξει is a repetition, while ἄλλες ν’ ἀλλάξου do not refer to anything mentioned in the previous lines:

ΠΑΝ: Μὰ, πράμαν ἀνεπίστευτον, ἐκ τῆ φορὰν ἐκείνη
Καρπόφορε, ἢ ἀγάπη μας πλιότερα νὰ πληθύνει
ΚΑΡ: Μὴν τὸ ’χεῖς γιὰ παράξενο, γιατὶ τ’ ἀμποδισμένο
πράμα ἀγαπᾶται πλιότερα καὶ πλιά ’ν’ πεθυμισμένο.
Alexiou and Aposkiti have corrected the passage as κι ὅλη ν’ ἀλλάξει παρευθὺς, which refers to ἡ ἀγάπη μας of the previous lines.236

I 274

B1 sto bolemo olomonaghos na bena midhe crino
B2 sto bolemo olomonaghos ibena midhe crino
G Σ’ τὸ μπόλεμ’ ὁλομόναχος νὰ ἔμπω μηδὲ κρίνω
M Στὸ μπόλεμο ὁλομόναχος νὰ μπαίνω μιδὲ κρίνω
K Στὸν πόλεμον ὁλομόναχος νὰ ἐμβαίνω οὐδὲν κρίνω

The versions of K and M agree with each other, with the exception of Kigalas’s more learned ἐμβαίνω instead of μπαίνω, while the first version of B is very similar. The

correction in B is made with the same ink: na is deleted and i is added in front of bena, so it could be a correction done by Foskolos himself at the stage of copying. Xanthoudidis had proposed the reading νὰ ἐμπω μέσα κρίνω but in his edition preferred the reading of Gradenigos. Alexiou suggested the correction νὰ μπαίνω μ’ εἶδες, κρίνω, based on M, a correction accepted by Politis.

• I 591

A Maglios ossa ta uroghia ta edhicassu
ghiglia, chie me t’ afts tossi eghu ghari
chi’ opio, chi ane berdhessu efcaristassu

G Μάλιως τὰ τόσα βρόχια τὰ ἀεγκά σου
γλυκιά, καὶ μετ’ αὕτα τόσι ἔχου χάρι,
μ’ ὄπιο κι ἀν ἐμπερδέσα θυχαριστά σου

M Μά λυόστα σάν τὰ βρόχια τὰ ἀεγκά σου
γειά καὶ μὲ ταφτα τόση ἔχου χάρι
ὅπως καὶ ἐμπερδέψαι εὐχαριστά σου

K Μ’ ἀλλέως δοσι στὰ βρόχια τὰ ἀεγκά σου
γλυκιά, καὶ μετ’ αὕτα τόσην ἔχουν χάριν,
καὶ δοσιν καὶ ἀν ἐμπερδέψουν εὐχαριστά σου

The passage is heavily corrupted in all the witnesses and the testimony of B is missing, as it does not include the First Choric Ode. Xanthoudidis has introduced the emendation π’ ὄπιο κι ἀν ἐμπερδέσα, but the first line of the tercet had not been adequately interpreted until Alexiou proposed a correction based on M: μᾶλλιος τόσα ’ν τὰ βρόχια τὰ ἀεγκά σου. Alexiou also prefers μπερδέσου of A (μπερδέψου in K)

---

237 Xanthoudidis 1921: 84.
238 Alexiou 1954b: 245.
239 Politis 1958: 316.
instead of ἐμπερδέσα of G, in accordance with the tense of the other verbs, and changes μετ’ αὐτὰ to μετ’ αὐτὸ (referring to the sweetness of the nets of love).\(^{240}\)

- II 101-2

B foui ci agapis ci aprepis pada ti sidrofiasu
chie achiera metagniomata xopisotos spudhasu

A Foui ci agapis ci aprepis pada ti sidrofiasu
chie achiera metagnomata xopissotos spudhasu

G Φόβοι τζ’ ἀγάπης τζ’ ἄπρεπης πάντα τζή συντροφιάζου
κ’ εὔκερα μεταγνώματα ’ξωπίσω τως σπουδάζου

M Φόβοι τζαγάπης τζέπρεπες πάντατζη συντροφιάζου
ταυκαιρα μετανόματα ξοπίσω τζη σπουδάζου

K om

The corruptions in this passage are quite easy to explain palaeographically and also easy to restore: M again gives a hint for the solution, as it is the only one to write ἄπρεπες, which is the only version which agrees with συντροφιάζου, and with the help of ξοπίσω τως the passage can be corrected as φόβοι το’ ἀγάπες το’ ἄπρεπες πάντα τσι συντροφιάζου.\(^{241}\)

- II 121-4

B ... pos smia scotigniasmegni
strata thoro chie uriscome mogniamu sfaglismegni
se dhedri dhassi chie nera chie agria me trigirisu
theria chie pos me trossine tagha me fouerisu

A .. pos mnia scotignasmegni
strata thoro, chie euriscumu mognamu sfaglismegni
Se dhedri dhasila picnerá, chie agria me trigirisu
theriá, chie pos me trossine tagha me fouerisu

\(^{240}\) Alexiou 1954b: 247-9. See also Politis 1952: 148, an attempt to interpret the passage before Alexiou’s proposal, and Politis 1958: 317-8, for a different opinion about μετ’ αὐτό and μπερδέσου.

This passage presents various textual problems. As Alexiou has observed,²⁴² μια should be corrected to σ’ μιὰ, according to B and K. Βρίσκομου of G and A does not accord with the present θωρῶ, so βρίσκομαι of B, K and M is preferable.²⁴³ Σὲ δέντρη, δάση πυκνερὰ of A was preferred by Xanthoudidis and Alexiou & Aposkiti and is the only version which makes sense in comparison with G or B.²⁴⁴ K and M are similar to A with the exception of the use of μὲ instead of σὲ. Σήμερο of G seems very weak in comparison with μόνια μου or δίχως του, which correspond to the relevant passage in *Il Re Torrismondo*, the model for Erofili’s dream: *e senza lui solinga / gir per via lunga e tenebrosa errando.*²⁴⁵

• II 300

B ode ci proxeneugusi chioghi alono na lessi

---

²⁴² Alexiou 1954b: 249.
²⁴³ Politis 1958: 319 maintains the opposite view. However, it should be noted that in his treatment of problematic passages he always shows a distrust for Kigalas’s edition, although he has pointed out that it should be taken into account for the restoration of the play. Also, since he was not aware of the Birmingham manuscript, he is reluctant to accept even variants from the Athens manuscript.
²⁴⁴ However, Politis 1958: 319 prefers μὲ instead of σὲ.
A chi ode ci proxeneugussi oghi alono na lessi

K Πανάρετε νὰ κλαίουσιν καὶ νὰ μὴ δὲν γελοῦσι

G ὃντα τζῆ προξενεύγουσι, κιĎχι ἀλλονῶ νὰ λέσῃ

Μ ὃντα τοὺς προξενεύγουσι καὶ ὃχι ἀλονῶν νὰ λέσι

Kriaras suggests writing ὁλονῶ, as Sathas did. However, ὁλονῶ is not attested by B, as Alexiou says. A and o, in conjunction with the following letter, are sometimes difficult to distinguish, hence the misunderstanding, but in this case alono is very clear.

• II 417

BA Neschie ma naghi apomogni chiego chiafti tighiegni

G Ναίσκε, μὰ νὰ ἵππομονῆ κιαὐτῆ κ’ ἐγὼ τυχένει

Μ Ναίσκαι μανάχει ἀπομονῆ κιαὐτῆ καὶ γὼ τυχένει

K Ναίσχε μανά ἵππ ὑπομονῆν κιαὐτῆ, καὶ γὼ τυγχένει

Although the passage is not unintelligible, the surviving versions are not completely satisfactory. A and B especially, where the inverted order of κι αὐτῆ κ’ ἐγὼ does not agree with νὰ ’χει, seem like an effort by the copyist of their common ancestor to improve a passage that he realized was problematic.

• III 3

BA giaftos masi girissusi chie t’ ona t’ alo alassi

GΚΜ τὸ νὰ τ’ ἄλλο ἄλλασσει

The passage can be restored with the addition of σ’: τὸ νὰ στ’ ἄλλο ἄλλασσει.247

• i 28

B chie lefteria stus ghrisianus ci eghthrusmas na girissu

246 Kriaras 1935: 242; Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 227. Sathas does not state in the apparatus if he has corrected the passage, but since all the previous editions (1676 to 1820) write ἀλλωνῶ, it must have been his own correction.

καὶ λευτεριὰ στοὺς χριστιανοὺς το’ ἐχθρούμας νὰ γυρίσου ABM ] τοὺς χριστιανοὺς
Κ, τζὴ χριστιανοὺς G

Alexiou and Aposkiti restore the passage as κ’ εἰς λευτερὶα τοὺς χριστιανοὺς, a
version which agrees with Gerusalemme Liberata (IV 562 torniam in libertade). 248

AB Scatha glicheri chie onostimo figli apo sena piano
GM Σ’ πᾶσα γλυκὰ κιόνστιμο φιλὶ ἀτὸ σένα πιάνω
Κ εἰς πᾶσα γλυκὴν, καὶ νόστιμον, φιλῆ ἀτὸ σένα πιάνω

A relative pronoun is needed here, as Kriaras had first observed. 249 He has suggested
that the original version was σ’ πᾶσα ὀνόστιμο φιλὶ ἀπ’ ἀπὸ σένα πιάνω. Alexiou and
Aposkiti suggest an emendation which avoids hiatus between πᾶσα and ὀνόστιμο
and the repetition of ἀπ’ - ἀπὸ: σ’πάσα γλυκὰ κι ὀνόστιμο φιλὶ ἀπὸ σὲ ποὺ πιάνω. 250

AB Giaftos sopo ma stuta mu ta matia carfectissu
G Γιαύτως σωπῶ, μα ἃ τοῦτα μου τὰ μάτια καρφικτήσου
Μ Γιαυτο σοπομας τοῦτο μου τὰ μάτια καθρευτίζου
Κ Γιαύτο σιωπῶ μα στοῦταζκου τὰ μμάτια ἡ ἀρετή σου
Xanthoudidis followed G, σ’ τοῦτα μου τὰ μάτια καρφικτήσου. This makes sense and
corresponds to the scene from GL XVI 20: Ella del vetro a se far specchio: ed egli / gli ochi
di lei sereni a se fa spegli, but then the line would not be connected with the next one.
Alexiou and Aposkiti suggest τοῦτα μου τὰ μάτια δὲς καρφικτίσου: the eyes as a
mirror of the soul is a widely used motif of the love poetry of the period. 251

251 For the role of the eyes in Petrarchan and Cretan Literature see Lasithiotakis 1996a: 146;
Lassithiotakis 1996b: 213. See also Rodosthenous 2006: 42.
4.2. Passages correct in only one witness

* P 116-9

B .... xoμειίi πάοι’ énas II, γιά νά μπορέ λά πάρη
Sci exoIes tu Filogonu perissaa na fouaste
t’ adhicon osso dhineste pada na to missaste
Megali na pomenete me ton alo to copo

G ....ξόμπλι πάοι’ énas II, γιά νά μπορέ λά πάρη
Τζ’ εξoδες του Φιλόγονου περίσIIa λά φοβάIIαι
Τ’ ádiko, κιόσο δύνεστε όλος σας νά μισάIIe

M .... ξόμπλι πασάνασIIα για νά μπορεII νά πάρεII
Τξέξoδες του φιλόγονου περίσIIa λά φοβάIIαι
tάδικο κί όσο δύνεσται όλος σας νά μισάIIe
Μεγάλη ναπομένει με τών άλλων τόν κόπον

K .... ξόμπλην καθ’ énas IIα διά νά μπορέ λά ’πάρη
Στά πάθη του Φιλόγονου, περίσIIα λά φοβάIIσε
Τ’ ádikoν κ’ όσον δύνεσθε πάντοτε νά μισάIIe
Τήν ρπαγήν όπο Ϝά κάμνετε, είς τούς πτωχούς τόν κόπον

G only preserves the correct version and the elaborate style of the passage makes it easy to understand why φοβάIIai became confused with φοβάIISTe, and in B we can see an attempt to restore the rhyme, writing μισάIIe.

* I 190-1

B ....chie nan apu boesssi
Tetia sclauia na glitrothi tha crasussi megalo

G ....κιέναν όπο Ϝ καπορέη
Τέτια σκλαβία νά λυτρωθῇ θα κράζουσι μεγάλο

K ....μ’ Ϝκεινος όπο μπορέη
Κτέτοιαν σκλαβίαν νά λυτρωθῇ, τόν κράζουσιν μεγάλον

M .... Ϝκεινον όπο μπορέη
Τέτοια σκλαβία νά λυτρωθῇ θα κράζουσι μεγάλο

K gives the solution here, as it is the only witness to preserve ’k, necessary for the sense.
I 204

B chi lega stossi pedhomī pos thegli m’ apothagni.

G K’ ἥλεγε ἢ τόση παιδωμή πώς θέλει μ’ ἀποθάνη

M Καίλεγα είς τόση παιδομή πώς θέλει μαποθάνει

K K’ ἥλεγε ὁ τόσος παιδευμός, πώς θέλη μ’ ἀποθάνη

K is the only witness to preserve the correct version, except for the substitution of the more learned παιδευμός instead of παιδωμή, which is one of his frequent interventions.252

I 311

B Cathos padamu sclauosu chie dhulos bisticsu

chie udhena praman icama dhighos ton orismosu

G Καθὼς πάνταμου σκλάβοςσου καὶ δοῦλος μπιστικόςσου,
Οὐδένα πράμμα ἐκαμα δίχως τὸν ὁρισμόσου

Μ Καθὼς πάνταμου σκλάβοςσου καὶ δουλευτής πιστόςσου
κι οὐδένα πράμα ἐκαμα δίχος τὸν ὁρισμόσου

Κ Καθὼς παντ’ ἡμουν σκλάβος σου, καὶ φίλος πιστικόςσου,
K’ οὐδέναν πράγμα ἐκαμα δίχως τὸν ὁρισμόνσου

Alexiou had supported the variant of Kigalas, κι οὐδένα, before the discovery of the Birmingham manuscript gave further evidence for the validity of this reading, interpreting μου as (ἠ)μου(v). Politis again, reluctant to accept Kigalas’s version and unaware of the Birmingham manuscript, had preferred the version of the more trustworthy Gradenigos, interpreting μου as the personal pronoun.253

I 372

B rodha idha me ta matiamu to botho na xaplossi
sta ghiognia tu prossopucı

252 See Table 1 (pp. 34-7) for details.
The metaphorlic image of the personified πόθος who spreads roses on the girl's cheeks has led to misinterpretations: the version of K and G seems to be a misunderstanding of the version which has survived in M, which is the one adapted by Alexiou and Aposkiti. The version of B looks like a further misunderstanding of the image.

This is another corrupted passage from the heavily problematic First Choric Ode, which is preserved correctly only in G. The confusion between ogli and oghi is easily explained because of the similarity of the two words in the Latin alphabet. A and K have another problem as they don't preserve σ’ ἔχουσι of the next line. This mistake could have occurred independently, perhaps in the effort of a scribe to improve the passage, but given the fact that K and A present other common mistakes in this Choric Ode, it is not impossible to suspect an affinity between them, at least as far as this part of the play is concerned. Alexiou also prefers ἀκοινομένα of M instead of...
χρυσωμένα of the others, although the model of this Ode, the Third Choric Ode from Sofonisba, writes dorati strali (golden arrows).

* I 608

A ... chi' udhe oranos ogia dhichidu

G ..... κ' ἡ Γῆς γιὰ σένα δὲ γυρίζει
cαι μιὰν ὁ Ὄρανός κρατεὶ 'δικήντου

Μ καὶ μιὰ ὁ οὐρανός κρατεῖ δική του

Κ καὶ μιὰν στράταν οὐρανὸς κρατεῖ δικήν του

With the help of the hypermetric K and the corrupt version of G the verse can be restored as καὶ μίαν ὁδὸ οὐρανὸς κρατεῖ δική του. Sathas used this passage as an example of Kigalas’s contribution for some emendations. Given the editorial habits of the period – a tendency to avoid synizesis with the help of elision – it would be interesting to consider if the corrupted version of Gradenigos was actually an error of the composior, who mistook ὁδ’ (ὁδὸ) for two words.

* II 277

Β G K M Κόλαση καὶ κακομοιριὰ τυχαίνει νὰ τὴν κράζεις,
Α Κόλαση καὶ κακομοιριὰ τυχαίνει νὰ τὸν κράζεις

According to the next line (κι ὅχι ποτὲ παράδεισο τὸν πόθο νὰ όνομάζεις), the only correct version can be A. However, Alexiou and Aposkiti edit according to the other witnesses.

* II 527

B chie chinon apu terici ci egigni
ghari na mi ti ulapsusi ci dhosse

---

254 Alexiou 1954b: 249.
255 See Pecoraro 1969: 371-5 for a comparison between the two texts.
256 Sathas 1879: ξε’.
A and G have the non-existent form τσην, which is obviously a way to avoid the hiatus between τσῆ and ἐγίνη. Alexiou and Aposkiti suggest that the common type of the pronoun was used (ταίρι της). The following line has caused some trouble as well: νὰ μὴ τὴ βλάψουσι is certainly wrong, as it should refer to ἐκεῖνον. Kriaras has suggested writing τὸν βλάψουσι. Politis does not find such a correction necessary, as he interprets the first τση as fulfilling the role of ethic dative. Alexiou accepts this suggestion and adds that τοὺς from the Munich manuscript could be a substitution for the Cretan τοῖς, following the usual practice of the Heptanesian scribe.

258 Politis 1952: 150-1.
The erroneous reading σώσει of A, G and M, probably occurred after the misunderstanding of an elided σώσ'. Kigalas keeps the elision, but the comma at the caesura does not help the reader to understand the structure of the phrase.

- III 122

B chi psighies pagli ston adhi a pasi
   pos thelu smixi chie dhechi me pglissa agapi olpiso

A chi psighies pagli ston Adhi passi

K k' ἡ ψυχαῖς πάλιν στὸν ἄδην πᾶσιν

G k' ἡ ψυχαῖς πάλι 'στὸν Ἄδη ἄς πάσῃ

M κι ψυχαῖς πάλι στὸν ἄδη ας πάσει

The correct version is the one of B, ἄ(ν) πᾶσι. As ἄν would normally be written without the final –ν and the voicing in πᾶσι would not necessarily be indicated, it would be very easy for the ἄ to be completely omitted (as in A and K) or misunderstood (as in G and M).

- III 108

BKGM σ' τοῦτο τὸν κόσμο ζωντανὸ, στὸν Ἅδη ἀποθαμένο

Α μέσα στὸν Ἅδη ζωντανὸ, στὸν κόσμο ἀποθαμένο

At first sight the passage in BGKM makes sense, but the version of A is superior, because it corresponds to the commonplace of love poetry, that the strong feelings and the pain of love make someone feel as if he is dead: it is the motif of “life-in-death”, Petrarch’s *viva morte*, a theme exploited by Chortatsis elsewhere (cf. *Panoria* II 358, γιατί στὸν Ἅδη ζωντανὸς πώς βρίσκεται λογάται).

- III 129-30

Τοῦτα τ' ἀμάττα, ἀφέντρα μου, καλὰ καὶ δὲ θωρούσι
   πῶς στὴν καρδία σου βρίσκομαι, τοῦ νοῦ τὸ συντηρούσι

260 The correction was already introduced by Xanthoudidis (1921: 85).

261 See Forster 1969: 5-6 and 19-20 for this motif. See also Lasithiotakis 1996a: 159, 1996b: 229-30 and 1996c: 164-5 for the use of the motif in Erotokritos, Cretan drama and Cypriot love poetry.
Alexiou and Aposkiti have rejected the variant of B. However, a careful reading of the previous lines suggests that this version is superior: Panaretos cannot see with his eyes that Erofili keeps him in her heart, but he can see with the eyes of his mind, which can see what is hidden in someone else’s heart (not someone else’s eyes).

*III 406*

B Ma china pareuthis chio pothos mono
ci orestes proxena chie ci cardhiestos situn giamia chie pernu dhīghos pono

A Ma agapi pareftis, chie pothos mono
ci orestes proxena, chi pethimiatos sita giamia chie pergni dhīghos pono

G Mâ keîno âpt’ áretη kai póthos mûno
tζ’ òrēzis prozevâ kai tζ’ kârdiaâ toûs ζητοû giamia kai póîrnu dîkhos pûno

M Mâ keînoi àparetaïs kai póthos mûno
tζôrēzis prozevâ kai tζ’ kârdiaâstos ζητοû giamia kai póîrnu dîkhos pûno

K Mâ ëkeîna pareuðous π’ ò póthos mûnon
tûs òrēzis prozevâ, kai tûs kârdiaâ touûs, ζητοûn giamiaûn, kai pârnu dîkhos pûnon

Xanthoudidis edited the passage following G, but the only version which makes sense here is K, as Pecoraro observed. Alexiou and Aposkiti are right to point out, however, that pareuðous and giamia repeat the same thing, but still there seems to be no other possible version: áretη of G and M does not fit at all in the context,

---

while A could be an indication of a different version, but in its present condition it cannot be restored. Alexiou and Aposkiti claim that B writes *pareschi* where A and K write *παρευθὺς*, and interpret it as *ἀρεσκειά*: 263

Μὰ κεῖνο ἀπ’ ἀρεσκειὰ καὶ πόθος μόνο
tο’ ὀρεξῆς προξενᾶ καὶ τοή καρδιὰ τώς,
ζητοῦ γιαμιᾷ καὶ παίρνου δίχως πόνο

It would indeed be strange to see *pareuthis* written with *eu* instead of *ef*, since it is not used elsewhere, but the handwriting looks more like the usual combination *th*, than *ch*. Moreover, there seems to be another instance in *Fortounatos* where Foskolos seems to have used *eu* instead of *ef: xeutisse*, perhaps corrected to *xeulisse*, although the manuscript is not very clear. 264 This passage has a parallel in Guarini’s *Pastor Fido: non qual le destinaro / o gli uomini o le stele / ma qual le diedi Amore* and the affinities are more obvious in the Cretan adaptation: 265

Λέγω τὸν νιὸν ἐκεῖνον ὁποῦ διαλέξει
cαὶ θέλει ἡ ὀρεξή της,
cαὶ κεῖνο ὁποῦ ὁ Πόθος
gλυκὺν ἀγαφτικὸν τῆς θέλει δώσει

However, neither *Pastor Fido* nor *Pistikos Voskos* can help us trace the authentic reading in *Erofili*.

- **IV 186**

B chi ane chie prepu mu cala ta m’oghi camomena

πρέπει μου AGKM

Πρέπου μου is the only correct version for syntactic reasons. 266

- **IV 283**

B Chie pos i gnossi chi adria chi gharites adami

---


264 Vincent (1973: 294-5) makes the same observation about the strange use of *eu* instead of *ef*, but he admits that it is not possible to read the manuscript with certainty.


266 Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 231.
tus uasigliadhes na genu sto cosmon igha cami
AGKM εἶχε κάμει

Only B preserves the correct version. The problem in the other versions is again caused by the omission of final –ν: εἶχα(ν).

* IV 518
BA topos pote me dhinami na parun eborussa
GM Τὸ πῶς ποτὲ μὲ δύναμη νὰ πάρουν ἐμποροῦσα
K ὅτι ποτὲ μὲ δύναμιν διὰ πάρουν δὲν μποροῦσαν
K is the only witness to preserve the correct version: κ’ ἐκεῖνο μᾶςε πάρουσι μὲ τέχνη, ἀποῦ θωροῦσα, τὸ πῶς ποτὲ μὲ δύναμη νὰ πάρου δὲ μποροῦσα.267
* V 108
B chialos sti raghi tu cruge chialos thori na ugagli
G κι ἄλλος στὴ ράχη τοῦ ’κρουγε κι ἄλλος θωρεῖ νὰ βγάλει
K Κιάλλος στὴν ράχην του διδεν κιάλλος θωρείς, και βγάννει
M κι ἄλλος τῇ ράχι του κρουγε κι ἄλλος θοριὰ ναυγάλι
Xanthoudidis had already remarked that θωρεῖ does not make sense and suggested θωρῶ,268 a correction accepted by Alexiou and Aposkiti.269 K gives in interesting variant which makes the messenger’s narrative more dramatic, as he is addressing the Maids. This variant is accepted by Bancroft-Marcus in her recent edition.
* V 183
B tegliogni neschie nus cormiu ta pathi..
G τελειώνει ναί, κ’ ἐνὸς κορμιοῦ τὰ πάθη
M τέλειον εἶναι καὶ νοῦς κορμιοῦ
K τελειώννη ναί σ’ ἐνὸς κορμιοῦ τὰ πάθη

267 Cf. Xanthoudidis 1921: 85.
268 Xanthoudidis 1921: 86.
**i 7-8 B1**

Κ Γ Μ Τόσα 'χαμεν ἀντίδικη τὴν τύχη, ἀπ' ὅλοι ὁμάδι κάτω μὲ τόση μας ντροπὴ μᾶς ἐρίξε στὸν Ἅδη

B2 tossa ghamen adidhichi ti dighi apu olus omadhi cato me tossi mas dropi mas erixe ston adhi

A Tossa ghamen adidhichi ti Tighi apo ugli omadhi
cato me tossimas dropi epessame ston Adhi

A is the only syntactically correct version. B2 makes an attempt to restore the sense, but the result is a hypermetric line.  

**i 16**

ΑΒ chie monaghas tin colasi chie loghin ifichiemas

Κ στῆς κόλασις τὴν λόχην ἄφηκέ μας

G τζή Κόλασις τὴ λόχη ἄφηκε μας

M στὴν κόλαση τὴν λόχην

The confusion here seems to have resulted from different attempts to interpret *ci* which can correspond to τοῇ or σ’ τοῇ. The more satisfying version is the one of G (the one Alexiou and Aposkiti have followed): “he left to us only the torments of hell”. It refers to the previous lines, ἐκούρσεψε τὸν Ἅδη κι ἔγδυσέ μας: “God robbed the Underworld and left only torments for the demons”. *GL* is clearer: “he robbed the Underworld by setting the souls free”:

E trarre l'alme a noi dovute in sorte
E riportare al Ciel si ricche prede (IV 11)

**i 86**

ΑΒ chie tutos olos omorfos o topos o dhicosmu

GM καὶ τοῦτος ὅλος ὄμορφος ὁ τόπος ὁ δικός μου

---

270 Kriaras (1935: 251) first observed the anacoluthon. Alexiou and Aposkiti edit according to A (1992: 101).
Κ καὶ τοῦτος ὅλος ὁ εὔμορφος ὁ τόπος ὁ δικός μου

Kriaras had suggested that the article was needed before δομορφος.\textsuperscript{271} It is one of the few cases which show that Kigalas has preserved some authentic readings.

- ii 87 piaste to rodho ci figlias chiagaftichi logiaste ABG
  λογάται M, ἀς λογάστε K

K is the only correct version as the context demands that the sentence expresses an order or advice.\textsuperscript{272}

4.3. Errors shared by the Birmingham and Athens manuscripts

The two manuscripts have a number of common errors, which support the possibility that they had a common ancestor.

- I 384  \textit{Ma opu pothu na smixusi}\] δυὸ πού ποθοῦ να σμίξουσι GKM\textsuperscript{273}
- II 144 ta ghusi na rthu na simadheug[\] τά 'χουσι νά τόρθου σημαδεύγου GKM

Perhaps the common ancestor of A and B wrote νά 'ρθοῦνε instead of νά τόρθου which was later confused to νά 'ρθοῦ νά.

- III 86 gia na se dhusi  \textit{treghusi ta matia ta dhicamu}\] ἐτρέχασι GKM

The whole passage refers to the past: Panaretos was rushing to meet Erofili, after Nena informed him that she was waiting for him, but he had first to fulfil the King’s orders and that’s why he did not go to Erofili immediately (γιὰ κεῖνο μετὰ σένα / δὲν εἶμαι ἀπόστα μ’ εὐρήκεν ἡ ἀκριβή σου νένα).

- III 130  \textit{sto nu to sidirusi ta matia } τοῦ νοῦ GM, μὲ νοῦ K

The version in B was later corrected to τοῦ νοῦ, probably in Foskolos’s own hand.

- III 160  \textit{pian aformi pote mu / se came}\] σοῦ 'δωκα GKM

\textsuperscript{271} Kriaras 1935: 251.
\textsuperscript{272} Alexiou & Aposkiti 1992: 108.
\textsuperscript{273} The readings of GKM are presented normalized in modern orthography because in this chapter I am interested in semantic variants and not slight linguistic/orthographic differences which do not affect the meaning. This principle if followed in this Chapter in all cases when I am citing a semantic variant from a group of witnesses, because I want to place emphasis on the important information.
At first the manuscript had *dhochie*, which is deleted and *se came* is written between the lines, most probably in Foskolos’s hand. It is interesting that a mistake is replaced by another mistake. Probably Foskolos was puzzled by the reading of his exemplar and introduced a reading of his own, or from another manuscript.

- III 308 *dhidhi tu fiesti* tiueci chiero na metagniosi] διὰ νά ἥχει ὁ φταίστης τίβοτας καιρό νά μεταγνώσει GKM

The version of A and B is an attempt to simplify the syntax, but the phrase does not connect with the following lines:

κι ἀνὲ κι ἀργεῖ κιαμιὰ φορὰ τὴν πλερωμῆ νά δώσει

διὰ νά ἥχει ὁ φταίστης τίβοτας καιρό νά μεταγνώσει,

πάλι θυμᾶται κ’ ἔρχεται μὲ μάνητα μεγάλη.

- III 310 tin ora apu *gorgoterα* ti carterusin agli] λιγόterα GKM

The meaning, according to the context, is that the punishment sometimes may not come immediately after the unjust act, but might be imposed later, when it is not expected.

- IV 130 me to dhoxari *cochιaστος]* κοκιαστὸ ΓΜ κοκευτό κ

- IV 131 Chie echigni pughu ti cardhia petrini *dhe* borusi / ci dhinamis tu ci poglis na paradistathusi / gligi sto cosmo uriscude ] καὶ μποροῦσι GKM

This is a common mistake because *chie* (καὶ) and *dhe* (δὲ) look very similar in Latin-script handwriting.

- IV 225-6 na uris tropo / na gdhitchiotho chie *gdhichiomo* naresi ton athropo] κ’ ἥ δίκη μου ν’ ἀρέσει GKM

- IV 489 chie chigni dhe ci theglise *m’ adra na pari aftono*] κι ἄντα τη πήρε αὐτόνο GKM

- IV 505 chie eghu na ghisun acomi *mono* gia na gdhichiosu] κ’ ἤχου νά χύουν ἀκομή κι ἄλλο γιὰ νά γδικιώσου GKM
Χύσουν refers to αἷμα from the previous line: the hands (of the enemies) who shed the blood of their countrymen, are going to shed even more, in order to take revenge (cf. Orbecche, III.2 364-5, e ha da far di tant’altri vendetta, / che morti son da la sua parte).\(^{274}\)

- IV 705 elate pros emena] ἐλάτε μετὰ μένα GKM
  The King asks his servants to follow him to the place where they are going to punish Panaretos.

- IV 749 tutti axose ci eghthusras mas na chierdhesi] τί τοξίζε GKM
- i 10 omorfo asteri ghiglio] GKM ὀμορφῳ ἀστέρῳ χῤῆω
  This is probably a misunderstanding of the phonetic orthography: omorfo was interpreted as ὀμορφο instead of ὀμορφω(ν).

- i 20 ma giada ci paglius caimas chie ton paglio mas pono / tora xanathmisodas s’ olusmas fanerono ] κατινουργιώνω GKM
  The meaning here is “why should I remind you of the old griefs and pains and renew them?”, which corresponds to GL, IV 12 (Ma chè rinnovo i miei dolor parlando?).

- i 42 me tin adriadu ti pogli ta tighi pos ghalussi] τῆς Σιὼν τὰ τείχη GK, τῆς ζωῆς M
  Σιὼν is preferable as lectio difficilior.

- i 43 giachino opu ecti ghieradu ghiglia erima apomina] χίλια ἀρφανὰ ἀπομείνα GKM

- i 47-8 omadhi / stu pothu ci xefadoses stechi purno chie uradhi] στέκου GKM

- i 95 apu ti mirismegni su chie splaghgnichi su agagli] δροσερή σου ἀγκάλη GKM
  Σπλαχνική is a repetition of τὸ σπλαχνικό σου πρόσωπο from the previous line.

- i 99-100 olo to cosmo oriso / ci ctissis ] τὴν κτίση ὁρίζω / τοῦ κόσμου GKM

- i 123 puri eftaxes ci topusu puri eftaxes chieramas / parigoria ton amatio chie dhrossos ci cardhiasmas / na dhossis ] ΑΒΚ πούρι ἔσωσε κερά μας GM

\(^{274}\) All the passages from Orbecche are quoted according to Ariani 1977.
Ἐφταξὲς is a repetition of ποὺρι ἐφταξὲς from the beginning of the line.

- ii 114 ποιοὶ φόβοι τόσα δυνατοὶ σὲ τρόμο σὲ γυρίσα AB] τόση δύναμη σὲ τρόμον ἐγυρίσα (KM σοῦ γυρίσαν)

The superiority of the GKM version is very subtle: “which fears turned you to fright” is a tautology, while which fears turned your power into fright has a slightly more accurate meaning.

- ii 158 chida bori mia magnita dhichia na s’ adinepsō] νὰ σ’ ἀρμηνέψω Β2 GKM

The mistake could be an influence by the phrase δίκια νὰ σ’ ἀντιμεύμει (II 382).

- ii 14 ta pseficotata] τὰ δυνατότατα μάγια

Ψευτικότατα is a repetition of ψευτικές from the previous line, while δυνατότατα is more suitable.275

- ii 147-8 ma tutta apu sa pnemata chie ta theria ecrrustas / theria na scotothusine pos chie apo pio eborussal ἂν ἦσαν πνέματα ... καὶ τῷ θεριῶ κρατοῦσα θωριᾶ GKM

Θεριὰ is probably a misreading of τῷ θερίῳ (l. 147) and thoria (l. 148), while ἁπού ἦσα is more preferable to ἀπού ὅσαν as lectio difficilior.276

Apart from these common errors, each manuscript has some of its own,277 and since B is also missing some lines which are found in A, this means that they had a common ancestor, but they are not directly dependent on one another.

4.4. The Munich manuscript and Kigalas’s edition

The errors found in both K and M, most of which could not have occurred independently, support the argument that they had a common ancestor.

- I 324 διατὶ ἦτον πληγωμένο Κ γιατίτου πληγωμένο M] τοῦ πόθου πληγωμένο ΒG278

---

277 See sections 1 and 5 of Chapter one for details.
The expression τοῦ πόθου πληγωμένος is used by Chortatsis elsewhere as well: μιὰ καρδιὰ τοῦ πόθου πληγωμένη, Erofili I 467, Panoria V 225.

I 136 Κ’εἰς τὰ χαράκια ἀποσκορπῶ K γισταχαρα κιαποσκορπῶ M] πῶς σκορπῶ G, πῶς κτυπῶ AB

Ἀποσκορπῶ of K and M are a false word division of στὰ χαράκια πῶς σκορπῶ, of G, which was found in the common ancestor of the three witnesses.

III 301 ὁ ἥλιος πῶς ἐμπόρει M ὦ ἥλιε πῶς ἐμπόρειες K ] ὦ θεὲ καὶ πῶς ἐμπόρειες ABG

III 197 δόσι στὸ νοῦ μου λογισμοὶ γίνονται] γενοῦνται ABG

III429 κάνοντας το’ ὁφθαλμοὺς κλάματα βρύσες] κλαμάτω βρύσες ABG

IV 69 μᾶ σὺ μήν δεῖς τὸ κρίμα τους K, μαζὶ δις M] νὰ ζεῖς, μή δεῖς τὸ κρίμα τους

IV 419 χῶμα νεκρό στὸν Ἀδη] χώμα κριγίο ABG

V 3 φιλιὰ τῆς ἀπονιᾶς] φωλιὰ τῆς ἀπονιᾶς BG

V 70 σὲ φόβο κ’ εἰσὲ σκάσῃ M μὲ φόβο καὶ μὲ σκάσῃ K] μὲ φόβο καὶ μὲ τάξη BG

V 337 τὸν πόνο τὸν ἀξάκουστον M, ἐξάκουστον K] τὸν πόνο τὸν ἀξείκαστο BG

V 448 τὰ χείλη καὶ γελοῦσι] καὶ μιλοῦσι ΒG

V 473 στὴν καρδιὰ μου / δὲν σχίζεται] δὲν ἀγγίζετε BG

V 614 σ’ ὁποιο καἱρὸ κἀ λάχει K σοὶ καὶρὸ M] σ’ ὁποια μερὰ κἀ λάχει BG

i 26 τόσοι πιστοὶ τοῦ χριστιανοῦ ] στρατηγοὶ ABG

ii 105 ποῦ βρίσκομαι τὸ σήμερο ] ποῦ βρίσκομαι; τὸ τι θωρῶ; ABG

iii 26 νὰ μείνω πλερωμένη KM ] γδικιωμένη ABG

Armida wants to find justice (νὰ μείνω γδικιωμένη). The version of K and M is probably inspired by the phrase μένω πλερωμένος which is used with the meaning that a crime gets the punishment it deserves (τόση μεγάλη σου ἀτυχία νὰ μείνει

---

278 The readings of A and B are transliterated for reasons of convenience, because we are interested in the the semantic variants shared with the other witnesses and not the linguistic variations or the differences in the writing system, which are presented thoroughly in Table 2 (pp. 84-6).
πλερωμένη, V 648) or a good deed the reward it deserves (πᾶσα σου δούλεψη καλά νὰ μείνει πλερωμένη IV 703).

• iii 91 ὥσαν λόγον μοῦ φανίστηκε κ’ ἐγροίκησα περίσσο K, σάλογον M ] σάλαχο (salagho) AB, σὰ ζάλο G

The versions and K and M look very similar, but this is not necessarily an indication of derivation from the same source, as the error could have occurred independently for palaeographic reasons.

• iv 39 μὴ στέκεσαι τὸ λοιπὸνις, κάμετε τὸ σημάδι ] μὴ στέκετε BG

All the other verbs in this couplet are in the plural (κάμετε, μπορεῖτε), so στέκετε must be the correct reading.

4.5. The family of G, K and M

Gradenigos’s edition has a number of mistakes of its own, but also presents some errors common to both K and M or with one of them individually. This makes it necessary to treat them first as a group, in order to clarify their relations. We will then examine cases where two of the three have the same error.

4.5.1 Errors found in all of them

• P 18 τοι δικιοσύνες διασκορπῶ ] δικιοσύνες B
• I 115 τὸ θάρρος κ’ ἡ φιλιά μας ] τοῦ φιλιᾶ μας Β
• I 434 Κι ἀνὲ κ’ ἡ τύχη ἀδικη ] ἀντίδικη BA

This is a mistake not only because of the hiatus, but also because τύχη (or μοίρα) ἀντίδικη is a common expression found elsewhere in Erofili, the Interludes and Katsourbos (III 9, V 485, i 7, Katsourbos I 100) and corresponds to a similar expression in Orbecche (fortuna nemica II.1. 7).

• I 251 σ’ τὸ 'στερον ἐμοιράστηκα ] σ’ δυὸ ἐμοιράστηκα B
• I 269 τέλος τοῦ κορμοῦ μου ] τοῦ καθμοῦ μου B
Xanthoudidis had suggested this correction without knowing the version of B.²⁷⁹

I 306 δοξασμένον ὄνομα στὸν κόσμον εἶχα βγάλει ] εἶχε βγάλει B.

The King organized the tournament because he, not Panaretos, had returned glorious from the war.²⁸⁰

I 358 τὴν ὄραν ποὺ τῇ χώρᾳ μας ἐξήγωξες το’ ἐχθροῦ μας ] ποῦ ἐκ τῇ χώρᾳ B

I 522 γιὰ νὰ πάντα ἀδύνατοι ] ἀδυνατοὶ B

The Kings should take precautions for the future in order to keep their rule powerful, not immortal. This could be a problem of transliteration, as the two words appear very similar in the Latin alphabet: *athanati – adhinati*.

II 133 Κι ὧρες πὼς εἶμαι μοναχὴ μέσα σ’ καράβιν ἐχθροῦ μας ] μέσα σ’ καράβι, νένα AB

A very common mistake due to faulty word division. A similar one is found in G and M in V 556, (μέσα σ’ βατσέλι, Νένα is read as βατσέλιν ἐνα).

III 67

GKM Τὰ περιστέρια τοῦ βροντὲς καὶ τὸ νερὸ γροικοῦσι
κι ἀποῦ τοῦ κάμπους μὲ σπουδὴ πρὸς τοῦ φωλί σ’ πετοῦσι (ΚΜ ταῖς βρονταῖς, ταῖς φωλαῖς, τοὺς κάμπους)

AB Τὰ περιστέρια ὅντε νερὸ καὶ ταραχὴ γροικοῦσι
ἀποῦ τοῦ κάμπους μὲ σπουδὴ πρὸς τοῦ φωλίς πετοῦσι

The version of AB can be considered as *lectio difficilior* which seems more related to Chortatsis’s style than the paratactic syntax of GKM.

III 109-10

GKM πάντα μὲ θέλει πολεμά δίχως καιρὸ νὰ δώσει (Κ μὲ θέλουν πολεμεῖν)
tέλος ποτὲ, γῆ ἀλάφρωση στὴν κρίση μου τὴν τόση

AB πάντα μὲ θέλει πολεμά δίχως ποτὲ νὰ δώσει
tέλος γῆ ἀλάφρωση κιαμιὰ στὴν κρίση μου τὴν τόση

Δίχως καιρὸ is a common expression meaning “without delay” and a similar phrase appears in *Erofili* a few verses before, at the end of the Second Act II 499 (δίχως

²⁷⁹ Xanthoudidis 1921: 84.

- III 120 και πλιώ ἀπό κτίσμαν ἄλλο / μέσα στὰ φύλλα τοῦ καρδιὰς τὸν ἕκαμα μεγάλο GMΚ] τονε κρατῶ μεγάλο AB

Κάμω μεγάλο is a commonly used phrase in Chortatsis (I 453, IV 333), but κρατῶ complements μέσα στὰ φύλλα τοῦ καρδιὰς better.

- IV 613 τὸ νοῦ μου να σκοτίσει... ἀγδίκιωτο ν’ ἀφήσει [ να σκοτίσω ... ν’ ἀφήσω AB

As Alexiou and Aposkiti observe, although the version of GKM is correct grammatically and syntactically, the version of AB is more appropriate for the sense, because the King is going to decide about the punishment that should be imposed on Panaretos. This is also supported by an analogous passage in Orbecche (Il cervello intorniato avermi in guisa / Ch’io non debba mostrare al traditore).

- IV 644

AB1 γιατί έναν ἁποῦ βλάψουσιν κι έκεινος τ’ ἀπομένει νὰ τὸνε ξαναβλάψουσι χειρότερα τυχαίνει B2 GKM νὰ τὸνε ξαναβλάψουσι χειρότερα ἀνιμένει (Κ ἐμεταβλάψουσιν)

Τυχαίνει of B1 and A is the correct version: if someone tolerates being harmed, he will be harmed again.282 The correction in B2 is not made by Foskolos’s hand.

- iii 119

GM Δὲν πάγει περιδιάβασι ἄλλη ποτὲ τῆ σκόλη τέτοιας λογῆς καλόκαρδοι, καθὼς ἐμεῖς στή μάχη (Μ πάει γιὰ περιδιάβασι)

Κ Δὲ πὰ γιά περιδιάβαση ἄλλην ποτὲ τῆν σκόλην τέτοιας λογῆς καλόκαρδην καθὼς ἐμεῖς στήν μάχην

AB dhe bai gia peridhiauassi alos pote ti scogli .... calocardhos cathos emis

The versions of GKM do not make sense as they stand. However, the reading of K could be interpreted as πᾶ(ν) γιὰ περιδιάβασιν, which would justify the use of plural (ἄλλοι, καλόκαρδοι) and this version could be a reasonable alternative to the one of A and B. The confusion in GM could have occurred from a misinterpretation of a manuscript in the Latin script: Dhe pa(n) gia peridhiuassis agli pote ti scogli / tetias logis calocardi cathos emis sti maghi.

4.5.2 Errors shared by G and K

- I 216 κ’ εἰς τόπους ὁγιὰ λόγου της τόσα μακρά ὁδεύγω (K διὰ τοῦ λόγου της)] ἀπὸ λόγου τη BM

Panaretos is not leaving because of Erofili, he is going far away from her: this is not the case of the exilium amoris, the common motif in love poetry according to which the lover wanders in lonely places in order to forget his love, as in Erotokritos's first exile.

- I 220 κ’ ἐκεῖνο ἀπού ’χε ἡ πεθυμιὰ ἔκρυβε νοῦς (K ὁ εἷς) τ’ ἄλλου μας] πού ’χε πεθυμιὰ BM

- I 316 θέλημα καὶ τῇ χέρα σου (K τὸ χαίρησου) τὴν ἀκριβὴ μοῦ δῶσε ] τῇ χάρη σου BM

The context does not allow us to suppose that Panaretos could ask for Erofili's hand, because they have not yet revealed their feelings for each other.

- II 488 δίχως τὴν ἐρθομένη αὐτή τὴν τόση ] τῇ φτώσῃ BM

- i 85 θές εἶσται πάλι ἄφεντη μου τῶρα καὶ βασιλιὸς μου ] ἄφεντης μου ΑΒΜ

It seems more probable that ἄφεντης is another attribute in the series of φῶς, μάτια, ἀνάπαψι, βασιλιός etc., than an address to Rinaldos.

- ii 88 κ’ ἐσεῖς ποῦρι ἀγαπάστε ] μπορά ἀγαπάστε AB μπορυ Μ


284 The error was already spotted by Xanthoudidis, probably based on M, although he did not have the evidence from B (Xanthoudidis 1921: 84).
Papatriandafyllou-Theodoridi has observed the superiority of the version μπορά, which is also supported by GL (si puote riamato amando).  

4.5.3. Errors shared by G and M

- Prol. 60 ξόμπια μακρά πού λείπουνται 'κ τὴν ἐδική μας χώρα ] ἐδική σας χώρα BK
   This error has probably occurred because of the similarity between μ and ss. Similar examples are found elsewhere as well.

- II 349 στὸ λογισμό μου ἀρχίνισε κι ἐμέναν ἡ ἀγάπη / γροικώντας τέτοια εὐγενικά λόγια νὰ ξεφουντώνω, κ’ εἰς τὴν καρδιά μου τὸ ζιμιὸ πλιώτερα νὰ τρίζωντο G, ποὺ ξεφουντώνον M ] νὰ ξεφουντώνει, νὰ τρίζοντει BK
   This is a misunderstanding of the complicated structure of Chortatsis’s diction: the two verbs refer to ἀγάπη, not λόγια.

- II 370 νὰ κατεβῶ στὸν Ἅδη ] νὰ κατεβοῦ στὸν Ἅδη ΒΚ
- II 1 μὰ τὴν ἀλήθεια ἐγὼ θαρῶ ] θαρῶ ΒΚ
   This mistake is probably a result of the usual confusion between α and ο.

- II 41 τὸ πρᾶμα έκεῖνο ποὺ ἐγὼ αξιὰ μιὰν ώρα νὰ χαρίσω ] ποὺ ἀτάξα ΒΚ
   This variant seems less probable because the other version agrees with Nena’s answer: τὸ πρᾶμα έκεῖνο ποὺ ἀτάξες...

- II 55 ποιάν ἀπὸ τοῦτο δύνεται χαρὰ νὰ δῇ ἡ καρδιά μου] ὁγία τοῦτο AB διὰ τοῦτο Κ.
   However, Kriaras had interpreted ἀπὸ τοῦτο as what other joy can I have, apart from this, referring to ἔλευθεριά.

- II 232

B to praman opu mia fora tu igliu i actines dhusi
curfo agniboreto pote ine na to cratusi

G τὸ πρᾶμαν ἀπὸ μιὰ φορὰ τοῦ ἱλιοῦ γιάκτινες δοῦσι,
κουρφὸ ἀνημπόρετο ποτὲ δὲν εἶν' νά τὸ κρατοῦσι

Μ τὸ πράμα ὁποῦ μιὰ φορὰ ἡλίου ἀχτήναις δόσει κρυφὸ ἀνημπόρετο ποταὶ δὲν νὶ νάν τὸ κρατοῦσι

Κ τὸ πράγμαν ὁποῦ μιὰν φοράν, τοῦ ἡλίου ἀκτίνες δοῦσιν, δὲν εἶναι ἐμπόρετον κρυφὸν, πάντα νά τὸ κρατοῦσιν

Before the Birmingham manuscript was discovered, Kriaras interpreted the passage preserved in G and M as a combination between ἀνημπόρετο εἶναι νά μείνει κουρφὸ and κουρφὸ δὲν εἶν' ν' τὸ κρατοῦσιν. Kigalas offers a simplification of a more complicated syntax, which provides adequate meaning, while B makes perfect sense and this is the version which was preferred by Alexiou and Aposkiti.

- II 285 γιά νά μπορῆ τὰ κάλλη τως νά πάρη τὸν κάλλιον τως AB, τὸν κάλλιστον Κ
- II 286 μὲ τὴν εὐκή μας καὶ τῶ δυό, καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ χάρῃ τὴν εὐκή μας ὁλονῶ ABK

It is not probable that Nena and Panaretos would give their blessing to Erofili’s marriage with one of the foreign Kings.

- II 401 γιατὶ κ’ οἱ δυὸ συβαστικοὶ ξεύρω μηνύσασί μου ξεῦρε ABK
- IV 316 μὰ τ’ ἄλλο νά τὸ τάσσωμε στέκει στὸ θέλημά μας νά τὸ σιάσσομε ABK
- V 422 ψυχή, πῶς δὲ χωρίζεις / ἀποὺ τὸ δόλιο σου κορμί; δόλιο μου BK

Another example of a mistake because of the similarity between m and ss.

- i 5 καὶ πῶς τῇ μάχη ἐκείνη ΑΒΚ καὶ πῶς στῇ μάχη ἐκείνη ΑΒΚ

This is a simple misunderstanding of the word division, a quite frequent error which does not necessarily indicate a common source.

- i 7 τόσα ἑχομεν ἀντίδικη ΑΒΚ τόσα ἑχωμεν ἀντίδικη ABK

Another mistake which does not indicate a common source as it can occur independently.

---

288 Kriaras 1935: 249.
• i 31 ἀποὺ το’ Ἀνατολῆς τὰ μέρη εἶχε σώσει ] ἐκεῖ εἶχε σώσει ABK

ἐκεῖ is necessary for the avoidance of hiatus. ²⁹¹

• i 151 δοῦλος σας κορασίδες μου, σκλάβος καὶ δουλευτής σας ] καὶ ἀδερφός σας ABK

Ἀδερφός σας is the only reading which rhymes with φχαριστῶ σας of the following line.

• ii 45 τούτο τὸν τόπο σήμερο τὸν ὄμορφον ὀρίζει ] ὁρίζει BK

The subject of the verb is βασιλοποῦλα ὄμορφη, so ὁρίζει is the correct reading.

• ii 110 Σ’, τούτο τὸν τόπο τῶν χορτῶ ] τὸν χωστὸ AB, τὸν ψευστὸν K

4.6 Other cases

Other groups of witnesses very rarely coincide in sharing the same error.

• I 13 ὅποιος ποτὲ BM ] ὅποιος ποθεῖ KG

• I 44 ἀπ’ ἄλλους μεγαλύτερος BM ] ἀπ’ ὅλους μεγαλύτερος

• I 330 περιτοπλιὰς ’πωμένα νά ’ναι μὲ τέχνη κι ὄμορφα περίσσα σοθεμένα BG ] ὄμορφα M, εὔμορφα K.

As Kriaras has observed, it should be either μὲ τέχνη και μ’ ὄμορφα περίσσα σοθεμένα, or ὄμορφα περίσσα σοθεμένα, so the reading of K and M is the most appropriate. ²⁹²

• I 587 σὲ μερκοὺς (σ’ μερικοὺς) μισῶντας τσ’ ἄλλους AK ] τοὺς μικροὺς G, τοὺς μικροὺς M

• II 121 πῶς μιὰ σκοτεινιασμένη AGM ] πῶς σ’ μιὰ σκοτεινιασμένη B κ’ εἰς μιαν σκοτεινιασμένη K

• II123 εὐρίσκομου AG ] βρίσκομαι BK ²⁹³

• III 44 τὴν ἀγάπη ἄρχίζει ] τὴν ψεύτικη ἀποῦ μοῦ ’τασσε B

μοῦ ’δωκε A

²⁹³ See previous pages for the last two passages.
μοῦ ἑδειχνέ GKM

Ἔτασσε of B is probably a repetition influenced by the ἔτασσα of v. 42 (χίλιες ἔτασσα χαρές). Ἐδωκε does not fit with the aspect of the other verbs of the sentence (ἐκρατούμου, ἔτασσα).

IV 200 ὤφου, καὶ ποῦ ὁ ὄγια μὲ τότες ὁ δόλιος Χάρος ABGM ] τὸν δολερὸν Κ, τὸ δόλιο M2

IV 544 γιὰ νὰ τελειώση / ἡ πρίκα ἀπό ἰχεις στὸ ἵστερο (Κ ὅστερον) τὸ νοῦ σου νὰ πλακώσει ΑΚΜ ] ἀπὸ ἰχεi GB

“The King is going to kill himself in order to be relieved of the great sorrow that is going to fall upon him.” This is a mistake which could have occurred independently because of the misunderstanding of the word division.

IV 550 οἱ τάξεις του κ᾿ οἱ χαρές του οἱ χιλιάδες (Α οἱ διάξεις του) / ξάζουσιν ἄλλους βασιλιοὺς ABM

G ἡ τάξειςτου, κ᾿ ἡ γνώσειςτου, χιλιάδες / ξάζουσιν ἄλλους βασιλιοὺς K ... διατὶ ἀπὸ βασιληάδαις / δὲν καταβέννη ἡ τάξη του. μ᾿ ἡ χαραίςτου ἦν μεγάλαις. / Ξιάζουσιν δι᾿ ἄλλους βασιλείς

Alexiou and Aposkiti have edited according to ABM, but the sense of G seems better: although he does not come from a royal family, his virtues and his manners are equivalent of those of thousands of kings. K has altered the passage, probably because the long period confused the editor.

V 449 πάντα, ἀκριβέ μου, ταίρι μου, μ᾿ ἐθρεφεν ἡ καρδιά σου B1G ] θωριά σου B2KM

4.7 Summary

All the extant witnesses of Erofili must derive ultimately from the same exemplar, as they have a substantial number of common mistakes or corrupt passages. However, further groups can be distinguished: the Athens and Birmingham manuscript have a

number of common errors, which are not found in the other three witnesses. Similarly, the two editions and the Munich manuscript have also a number of common mistakes, in passages which have been preserved correctly in A and B. Within the group of G, K and M, common mistakes between G and K, G and M or K and M can be found. Only very rarely do common errors appear between other groups of witnesses.

5. Paratextual material

The stage directions and other paratextual material in Erofili and the other dramas of the Cretan theatre have been analysed by Puchner,\(^{295}\) however his analysis is incomplete because he did not take the Munich manuscript into account, so he conceives the variations in the stage directions as a result of the different aims of copyists of manuscripts (who intended them for performance) and publishers (who intended them for reading). This distinction is not accurate, because generally the stage directions confirm the close relation among the two printed editions and the Munich manuscript on the one hand against the two Cretan manuscripts on the other. This is clear mainly in the case of the Interludes, where the stage directions are more frequent and more extended.

5.1 Paratexts in Erofili

The names of the main characters and the scene division are the same in all the witnesses. The only exception is in Act IV in Kigalas, where the order of the King to his guards to bring him the imprisoned Panaretos (IV 607-610) is placed at the end of the Fifth Scene instead of the beginning of the sixth, as in the others. The only

\(^{295}\) Puchner 1991: 363-444.
part of the play where significant discrepancies among the witnesses appear are the two last scenes of Act V, where there are differences regarding the attribution of speeches to characters, the persons appearing in each scene and the sequence of some actions. In the rest of the play the stage directions are very few and their differences are stylistic and do not affect the action.

5.1.1. The dramatis personae

The list of the dramatis personae appears in all the witnesses, with the exception of the Athens manuscript which is missing the beginning of the play. The only major difference in the characters’ description is the name of the Phantom of the King’s brother, which appears as Σκιὰ (Shade) in B in the list of the dramatis personae, the scene headings of Act III Scene 4 and the stage direction at the end of Act V. This corresponds to the Shade of the dead Queen Selina (ombre di Selina) in Orbecche. In K and M the Ghost is referred to as Ψυχή (Soul) in the dramatis personae and the stage direction before its appearance, whereas in G the phantom is named Ψυχὴ in the dramatis personae but Ἀσκιὰ in the Stage directions. This probably means that Gradenigos followed Kigalas in the introductory material of the edition, as other indications show.²⁹⁶

5.1.2. Stage directions

Stage directions in Erofili are rare: apart from the scene headings, where the participating persons are indicated, stage directions are found only at the end of the third Act, (the Ghost of the dead King appears from Hades accompanied by the Furies), and the end of the Fifth Act, (Erofili commits suicide and the women of the Chorus kill Filogonos).

²⁹⁶ See section 2.2.3 of Chapter 1 for details.
The appearance of the Furies is signalled in almost the same way in the Birmingham and the Athens manuscript, the only difference being the term used to refer to them: δαίμονες (B) and πνέματα (A). The noise and the disturbance they are causing is referred to as τραβάγιες (noise). In the group of the other witnesses, they are named φούριες and the description of their action is more detailed: they are holding fire and run across the stage making a noise (τρέχοντας σὲ μιὰ μερὰ κ’ εἰς ἄλλη τζή Σένας στρεπιτάρουσι). Erofili’s suicide is signalled in a very brief stage direction in B (εἰς τοῦτο σφάζεται) while the other witnesses have more detailed, but not identical, references to the knife which was inside the casket with Panaretos’s body.

The other group of stage directions appears in the final scene of the murdering of Filologonos. This scene presents various serious discrepancies among the witnesses, so it will be dealt with separately.

Apart from the stage directions which interrupt the text of the play and clarify the action, the scene headings, where the names of the participants appear, can have a similar function. Before the appearance of Charos and the Phantom, which would probably be accompanied by visual or auditory effects, the most detailed information is given by the Birmingham manuscript and not the editions, contrary to the actual stage directions:

G: Ἐδὼ πιάνει τὸ μαχαίρι, ὁποῦ ἤτονε στὸ βατζέλι, καὶ σφάζεται, καὶ πέφτει σκοτωμένη. καὶ εἰς λιγάκιν ἔρχουνται ἡ Κορασίδεςτζη, γυρεύγοντάς τηνε. Κ Τότε σφάζεται μὲ τὸ μαχαίρι ὁποὺ ἦταν εἰς τὸ Βατζέλλι μὲ τὸ ὁποῖον ἐσκότωσαν τὸν Πανάρετον. Μ Εἰς τοῦτο σφάζεται μὲ τὸ μαχερί ὁποῦ ἦταν στὸ βατζέλλι μέσα.

See section 6.1.3 for details.

297 Τραβάγια is used in the Cretan dialect with the meaning of noise (Xanthinakis 2001, s.v.; Idomeneos 2006, s.v.). Τραβάγιο /τραβάγια appears also in the Heptanesian dialect with the meaning of fever and anxiety (Konomos 1960, s.v.; Zoes 1963, s.v.).

298 The word seems not to be used in the Cretan dialect. It appears though in Zakynthos, meaning vomiting (Zoes 1963, s.v.)

299 G: Έδω πιάνει τὸ μαχαίρι, ὁποῦ ἦτονε στὸ βατζέλι, καὶ σφάζεται, καὶ πέφτει σκοτωμένη καὶ εἰς λιγάκιν έρχουνται η Κορασίδεςτζη, γυρεύγοντάς τηνε. Κ Τότε σφάζεται μὲ τὸ μαχαίρι ὁποῦ ἦταν εἰς τὸ Βατζέλλι μὲ τὸ ὁποῖον ἐσκότωσαν τὸν Πανάρετον. Μ Εἰς τοῦτο σφάζεται μὲ τὸ μαχερί ὁποῦ ἦταν στὸ βατζέλλι μέσα.

300 See section 6.1.3 for details.
euiegni apu ton Adhi me astrapes urodes chie taraghi dhemono (Act III Scene 4). As Puchner has observed, this information is not crucial because it can be inferred from the text itself.301

The authenticity of many of the stage directions found in Cretan plays has been disputed.302 In the case of Erofili, however, we don’t have the kind of stage directions which repeat unnecessary information which can be found in the text, as happens in many of the stage directions in manuscript A of Panoria, which frequently simply mentions that a person enters or leaves the stage or is speaking, information which is included in the dialogues. So there seems to be no reason to assume that the few existing ones are later additions.

5.1.3 The end of the play

The end of the play needs to be analysed separately from the rest of the play because at the end of the Fifth Act the stage directions and the speech attributions have survived in such a diverse condition among all the witnesses that serious problems are created. The greatest confusion stems from the fact that there seem to be two Choruses, or the main Chorus is divided in two: one is the Chorus that sings the Odes, but in this Act another group of women also appears, Erofili’s Maids (κορασίδες τῆς Ἐρωφίλης / τῆς Βασιλοπούλας in the list of dramatis personae). Up to that point the Chorus has taken a small part in the action (apart from singing the odes) in the Fourth Act and in the dialogues between Erofili and the King (Scene Four) and the King and Panaretos (Scene Seven). However, its role there is really limited: the Chorus is actually commenting on the action, rather than taking part in the conversation. The Chorus has a more active part in Act V Scene 1, when the women listen to the Messenger’s description of Panaretos’s tortures and death. The

two different groups of women appear in Scene 5, after Erofili’s suicide, with the exception of the Birmingham manuscript, where the persons taking part in Scene 5 are a Maid (κορασίδα), the Chorus (Χορός) and Nena, while in the heading of Scene 6 the Chorus is not mentioned, but a group of women (κορασίδες) appears instead of only one.

In the Fifth and Sixth Scenes of Act V the conversation alternates between Nena, the Chorus and the Maids (Scene 5) and the King, Nena, Chorus and the Maids (Scene 6). The attribution of each phrase to a person varies greatly in the witnesses, mostly between the Chorus and the maid(s), but in some cases there is confusion also about the lines attributed to Nena. The abbreviations of the speech prefixes for the Chorus (ghor.) and the Maids (cor.) is a plausible explanation for the confusion, but since the confusion extends to parts attributed to Nena, we must assume that there has been some kind of textual corruption during the transmission of the play.

At the beginning of Scene 5 (V 525-560) the Maids and the Chorus enter the stage, where they find Erofili dead. Nena enters shortly after them and asks the reason for their lament. The division of the conversation among the characters shows great discrepancies among the witnesses. It is not always easy to distinguish who is speaking with the help of the context; only sometimes do the grammatical person and the sense give some clues. Judging from that, it seems that none of the witnesses is more accurate than the others and the passage needs extensive interventions by the editor. Alexiou and Aposkiti do not follow a specific witness, but try to restore the speech prefixes according to the sense. Bancroft-Marcus has also proposed an interpretation of the speech attributions, intervening more heavily.

---

The only indication for grouping the witnesses is a mistake shared by K and M in 557-8, a couplet which is attributed to the Maids but should definitely be Nena’s words, as it refers to the previous dialogue between Nena and Erofili:

τούτα θὲ νά 'ναι ἡ ἄφορμή κ’ ἔσφαγηκε καὶ τούτη.
Τούτη τοι τὴν ἀπόφαση σήμερον εἶπε μοὐ τη.

After Nena’s lament (561-594), the women see the King approaching. According to G, K and M the Chorus declares that they are going to punish him for his cruelty (V 595-8). This is attributed to the maid in B. This seems more reasonable, as it agrees with the stage direction which describes the King’s murder, where one of the women knocks the King down while pretending that she is pleading for justice.306 K and M share a mistake in this part as well: the speech prefix is missing from vv. 601-2, leading to the assumption that the couplet is uttered by Nena, which is not probable in the context, as it should be attributed to the Chorus or the Maids, who insist on their decision to kill the King. As the beginning of the line is corrupt in both witnesses (instead of νὰ ζεῖ εἶναι κρίμα K writes νά 'συρνεν and M μάσηναι), it is possible that the first part of the line, including the speech prefix, was unintelligible in the common ancestor of these witnesses.

The divergences among the witnesses, as far as the Chorus and the Maids are concerned, continue in Scene 6. The most important difference among the witnesses here is in B, where the Chorus is given a very limited role. The scene heading mentions only the Maids (Κορασίδες) and not the Chorus (Χορός); however the Chorus takes a small part in the dialogue (V 609-12) and delivers the last choral speech at the end of the play. Other parts which are attributed to the Chorus in the other witnesses in B are uttered by the maid (V 547-8, V 607-9, V 621-8, V 637-42, V 659-64). It is not clear whether this is a sign of textual corruption in B or if it is an indication of a different approach to the role of the Chorus, perhaps after the

---

306 Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 241
intervention of a director of a performance, or because this manuscript reflects an evolution in the role of the Chorus in Foskolos’s time.

B also has fewer stage directions for the murder of the King, as it keeps the information to the absolute minimum, not referring to things which can be deduced from the dialogue: when the maid pushes the King down (after v. 640), the direction in B is *chi apochis legi* (κι ἀπόκεις λέγει), while G, K and M have κράζει ὅλας νὰ ράξου, γιὰ νὰ τονε σκοτώσωσι (quote according to G), which is not needed as these are her words in the following lines (γυναῖκες μ’, ὅλας τρέξετε). In B also the two different directions which follow in G, K and M (ἐδῶ ράσσουσιν ὅλας καὶ κολλοῦσιν τοῦ, after 642 and ἐδῶ τονὲ σκοτώνουσι κ’ εἰς τοῦτο βγαίνει ἡ ἀσκία τοῦ Ἀδερφοῦ του, after 644) are merged into one after v. 644 (εἰς τοῦτο σιμώνουσιν ὅλες καὶ σκοτώνουσιν τονε), something which probably implies that the King cries for help before they knock him down. B is also the only witness which correctly attributes the words before the murder to the Maid and not the Chorus: the stage direction which follows refers to a maid in all three witnesses (γονατίζει, κάνει νὰ τοῦ φιλήσει τὰ πόδια etc).

It is probably the same maid who, according to B, declares that she will kill the king at the end of the Fourth Scene (V 595-8), while the other witnesses attribute the words to the Chorus.

The most important difference in G is the presence of the last stage direction according to which the dead body of Erofili is carried behind the stage by Nena and her Maids, while the Chorus drags off the dead body of the King while singing the last verses (after 666, Εἰς τοῦτο τῇ συκώνουσιν η Κορασίδεςτζη καὶ πάσι μέσα μὲ τήν

308 Puchner (1991: 376) erroneously claims that lines V 636-40 are attributed to Nena in Gradenigos’s edition. He must have been misled by Sathas’s edition where indeed these two couplets are attributed to Nena. Strangely, this mistake does not exist in the 1772 edition (British Library and Historical Museum of Crete copies, p. 162), which is supposed to be Sathas’s exemplar and where the couplets are attributed to the Chorus, nor to the 1804 edition (British Library copy). However, it exists in the 1820 edition.
Nένα, καὶ ὁ Χορὸς τῶν Γυναικῶν ἀπομένωντας καὶ λέγωντας τὰ κατωγεγραμμένα βέρσα, σέρνου καὶ τὸ Βασιλιά μέσα, καὶ χάνεται). It does not appear in other witnesses and is not really needed: the previous dialogue implies that Erofili is carried away, while the body of the King will be left there, to be eaten by dogs. So the direction in G contradicts this statement and seems more likely to be a spurious addition.309

To sum up, the condition in which the last scene of the play has survived does not give much information to aid the classification of the witnesses, but gives indications that the text has either survived in various stages none of which was the definitive one, or that it survived in a highly corrupted condition.

5.2. Paratexts in the Interludes

5.2.1. The names of the main characters

In the Birmingham and Athens manuscripts the secondary roles of the two Christian soldiers who are looking for Rinaldo and the Turks who offer to take revenge for Armida are named. In the Second Interlude, the two Christians are called Κάρλος and Οὐμπάλντος (just as in GL) and are referred to as στρατηγοί. In the other witnesses they remain unnamed and they are simply mentioned as Καβαλέροι (Καβαλάροι in K). In the Third Interlude, in B and A the two warriors are named Ἀδραστός and Τισσαφέρνος (as in GL), while in the other witnesses three Turks (τρεῖς τοῦρκοι στρατηγοί) appear and vv. iii 87-8 are spoken by the third Turk, while

309 Bancroft-Marcus 1978: 192-3; Puchner 1991: 313-4. Bancroft-Marcus goes further in suggesting a different reconstruction of the end: the Maids and Nena leave, carrying Erofili and perhaps the remains of Panaretos, leaving the King lying on the stage, and that is the point when his brother’s ghost appears (instead of V 645-8). This is a plausible suggestion, since it seems that either all the witnesses have some kind of deviation from the original in the whole of the fifth act, or that actually what has survived from the fifth act is different stages of the composition by the author, none of which is definitive.
in B and A they are spoken by Τισσαφέρνος. Σολιμάνος is king of Jerusalem in B and A but king of Egypt in GKM. Solimano in GL is the Sultan of Nicaea and Armida presents herself to the King of Egypt. Since the sequence of events in the Interludes is adapting its model and the action takes place in Jerusalem, the version of A and B seems more plausible. Finally, in the Second Interlude the two young girls who try to seduce Carlos and Ubaldos are presented as δαίμονες εἰς πρόσοψη κορασίδω in A and B and simply as κορασίδες in GKM.

5.2.2. Stage directions

The Interludes have extended and detailed stage directions, which specify the scenery and the special effects and clarify the action. They all appear in the same place in all the witnesses, but differences in phrasing are found between the two Latin-script manuscripts on the one hand and the two editions and the Munich manuscript on the other:

- i 165 AB χορεύοντας ] GKM μορεσκάντο
  μιὰ τζόγια εἰς τὴν κεφαλή ] GKM γιρλάντα
  A εἰς τὸ τούτο τὸν καιρό, Β μέσα σ’ τούτο ] GKM καὶ γυνώντας καὶ ντύνοντάς τον
  AB τὰ τραγούδια] GKM τὰ βέρσα

- i 174 AB χορεύοντας ] GKM μορεσκάντο
  AB κρασόνερο ] GKM νερό καὶ κρασί

- ii 61, ii 95, ii 99, ii 139 AB στρατηγοὶ ] G καβαλιέροι KM καβαλάροι

- ii 61 οἱ στρατηγοὶ ξεσπαθώνουσι καὶ ζυγώνου τοίς μορεσκάντο καὶ φεύγουσι AB ] οἱ
  Καβαλιέροι μορεσκάντο τοῖς ζυγώνουσι

- ii 121 σηκώνεται καὶ ρίχθει τοῖς τζόγιας καὶ τὰ ρούχα ποῦ ἐφόρει Β, σηκώνεται καὶ ρίκτει τοίς τζόγιες ἀπό τὴν κεφαλή του καὶ σκίζει τὰ ρούχα ἀπὸ

Sometimes Kigalas’s edition and the Munich manuscript present slight differences from Gradenigos’s edition:

- V 644 BG ἀσκιὰ ] KM ψυχή
- i 121 AB δαίμονες εἰς πρόσοψη κορασίδω ] G δαίμονες μετασχηματισμένοι ὡς ἀν κορασίδες ] KM κορασίδες
- ii 61 ABG δαίμονες ] KM κορασίδες
- ii 64 AB μπαίνουσι μέσα ] G γιαγέρνουσι ] KM ρετιράρουσι
- ii 131 BG δαίμονες ] KM κορασίδες
- iii 95 τότες μισεύγουσι καὶ προβαίνει ὁ Γοφρέδος μὲ τὸ Ῥινάλδο AB ] εἰς τοῦτο ἔρχεται ὁ Γοφρέδος G, om KM

To sum up, it is clear from the stage directions of the Interludes that B and A follow the same tradition which differentiates them from GKM, while in the other group sometimes K and M present close affinities.

6. Variant readings

Apart from the obvious errors and the cases when there are strong arguments to reject one variant in favour of another, many other instances can be found, when variant readings seem of equal value, or only very subtle stylistic differences could support one reading against another. The study of these variants confirms the preliminary classification in two groups: the first one, which exhibits more diversity than the other, consists of the two printed editions and the Munich manuscript,
while the second comprises the two Cretan manuscripts. The second group is more uniform than the other, as far as the mutilated state of the Athens manuscripts permits us to suppose. The witnesses comprising the first group are more loosely connected, as K and M frequently share the same mistakes and Kigalas’s edition sometimes agrees with the other group. Since the dividing line between the two groups is quite strong, it permits us to focus first on the general relation between the two groups, and then to specify the relation among the witnesses in each group in more detail.

6.1. The two main groups: G – K – M against A and B.

Since the Athens manuscript is missing almost one third of the play, it is not safe to assume that every variant found only in B in the parts missing from A would have been found there as well, but their close relation in the surviving parts allows to treat them as a group for the preliminary investigation of the relationship between the two main groups.

The variant readings between the two groups vary from a simple inversion of the word order to more extended adaptations of passages, which never exceed the limits of a couplet.

Starting from the most minor differences, here are some characteristic examples of the inversion of the word order:

- ΙΙΙ 18 GKM δὲν ἔδειχνα τὰ πάθη μου ] τὰ πάθη μου δὲν ἔδειχνα AB
- ΙΙΙ 124 GKM πιστότατα πῶς μ’ ἀγαπᾶς ] πῶς μ’ ἀγαπᾶς πιστότατα AB
- ΙΙΙ 140 GM ποτὲ κιαμιὰ νὰ πάρει ] κιαμιὰ ποτὲ νὰ πάρει AB
- i 50 GKM νὰ χάσουσι τὰ πάσχου ] τὰ πάσχουσι νὰ χάσου AB
- iii 3 GKM τοῦ θέλει πάρει τῇ ζωῆ ] θέλει τοῦ πάρει τῇ ζωῆ AB
- Prol. 38 GM κέρδη σὰν κάμουσι πολλὰ ] σὰν κάμου κέρδητα πολλὰ B
- Ι 97 GKM σὲ κάποιο φταίσιμον ἔπεσα AB ] σὲ κάποιον ἔπεσα φταίσιμο B
Other variants affect the linguistic level, such as the use of a newer instead of an older form or ending, the use of a dialectal form instead of a non-dialectal one or the use of different syntax:

- **IV 59 AB τίς** GKM ποιός

Τίς appears only once more in *Erofili*, this time in all the witnesses (V 609), twice in *Panoria* (II 251, IV 98) and once in *Katsourbos* (V 341).³¹¹

- **I 43, II 194, IV 350 AB τινὰς** GKM κιανεῖς

G uses τινὰς two other times, I 131 (together with BK) and V 256 (KM omit this line and B has a different variant). Τινὰς appears in *Panoria* only once (V 205), in manuscripts D and A only.³¹² Generally τινὰς seems not to be used frequently by Chortatsis, who prefers κιανεῖς instead.

- **III 102 AB καίσινε** GKM καίγουσι

- **III 332 AB γυρίσει** GKM ἀλλάξει

- **Prol. 60 BK λείπουσι** GΜ λείπουνται

- **Prol. 121 B σφάνετε** GΜ σφάλλετε

- **II 64 ABK θέλεις δεῖ** GΜ θὲς ἰδεῖ

- **III 57 AB δὲ θέλω ἀφήσει** GKM δὲ θὲ ν’ ἀφήσω

G, K and M avoid the use of the relative pronoun τὸν / τὴν / τὸ when it is referring to a previous noun (e.g. τὰ λόγια τὰ γροικῶ) and use ποὺ / ὁποὺ instead. The same can be said for the witnesses of the other plays of Chortatsis, where the more archaic form of the pronoun is rarely used.

- **I 202 B ἐξαναγιάγερνε** GKM ἐξαναγύριζε

³¹¹ See also Pidonia 1977: 197 and Politis 1964: 44.’

³¹² See also Pidonia 1977: 178-9.
Frequently a word is replaced by a synonym, or one with quite similar meaning, so that the sense remains unaltered:

- Prol. 31 ὅλα ἀπὸ μὲ διαβήκα (B only)] ὅλα ἀπὸ μὲ χαθῆκα GKM
- 74 τοῖ méres πῶς διαβαίνουσι (B only)] λιγάινουσι GM λιγώννουσιν K
- 88 τὴν ὀψή σβήνω (B only)] τὴν ὀψή λιώνω GKM
- 12 τῇ δοξεμένῃ μου καρδιὰ (B only)] τὴν πληγωμένη μου καρδιὰ GKM

Both adjectives appear in Chortatsis in similar contexts: τῇ δόλια μου καρδιὰ τῇ δοξεμένη (Panoria Π 340); τὴν καημένη μου καρδιὰ τὴν πληγωμένη (Panoria 332).

I 72 χίλια καλῶς ἀπόσωσε φίλε μου ἡ ἀφεντιά σου (B only) ] ἡ εὐγενειά σου GKM

Ἀφεντιά is used frequently as a polite form of address, however εὐγενειά does not otherwise appear in Erofili in this use.

I 128 βουβὰ νὰ στέκου προτιμοῦσι (B only)] βουβὰ νὰ στέκου πεθυμοῦσι GKM

Προτιμοῦσι could be preferred for stylistic reasons, because it expresses more vividly the antithesis with the previous line (τὰ χείλη μου τρομάσουσι ν’ ἀρχίσου να μιλοῦσι).

II 156 νὰ μὴ ζεῖ μιὰν ὥρα πλιὸ ἐβουλήθη ΑΒ ] νὰ μὴ ζεῖ μιὰν ὥραν ἐβουλήθη GKM

Μιὰν ὥρα + negation means “never”, so the version of GKM can stand even without the use of πλιὸ of AB.

II 316 νὰ μὴν παραπονᾶται ΑΒ ] μοιρολογᾶται GKM

Παραπονοῦμαι appears only one other time in Erofili (πῶς νὰ μοῦ παραπονεθεῖς, V 465) and more frequently in Panoria (e.g. ὅσοι τοῦ πόθου σὰν κ’ ἐμὲ πολλὰ παραπονοῦναι, I 30). Μοιρολογοῦμαι appears in Erofili once (γιάντα σκληρὰ σκοτώνεστε, γιάντα μοιρολογᾶστε, V 546) but there refers to an actual lament.

II 351 AB κάλλη ] ἦθη GKM
“Ἠθὲ is used rarely with the meaning of physical appearance, so it can be considered as the lectio difficilior. It appears in Panoria (ὁλάργυρα χρυσὰ μαλλιά, νεράιδας ἴδιας ἠθὲ, I 82) and Rodolinos (τὰ ἦθη τοῦ προσώπου της, IV 419).

- II 399 τὰ βάσανα κ’ οἱ ἐχθρητες ΑΒ καὶ οἱ μαλιὲς GM ταῖς μαλλιαῖς Κ

The version of A and B could be preferred because it avoids the hiatus.

- III 164 AB σπλαχνικᾶ γκαρδιακά ΚΜ καρδιακά G

Both σπλαχνικός and γκαρδιακός are used by Chortatsis in Erofili and Panoria.

- III 236 δὸς τῷ καρδιὰς μου ἄνεση AB δύναμη GKM

With δύναμη the hiatus is avoided.

- III 245 Τὸ φῶς τοῦ μέρας τὸ λαμπρὸ ΑΒ στὸ φῶς GKM

The version of GKM is superior as lectio difficile because of the enjambment (ἀπὸ τὸν ‘Ἄδη ... βγαίνω / στὸ φῶς τοῦ μέρας), while the other looks like a simplification (τὸ φῶς τοῦ μέρας τὸ λαμπρὸ καὶ τοῦ καθάριου κόσμου / τὰ κάλλη ἀκόμη δὲν μπορεῖ καλὰ νὰ δεῖ τὸ φῶς μου), although it should be noted that it does not contradict syntactic or logical rules.

- IV 327-8 το’ ἀγνωσὲς τως κράζει / χάρες ΑΒ το’ ἀτυχιές τως GKM

Both ἀτυχιὰ and ἀγνωσὰ are used by Chortatsis with the meaning of thoughtless or mean acts.

- V 104 ἀμπώθει γεῖς τὸν ἄλλο (Β only) σποδώνει GM

Both σποδώνω and ἀμπώθω are used by Chortatsis elsewhere. Kigalas has δαγκάνν’, trying to avoid the use of a dialectal word.

- V 172 ἔδειχνε στὰ χέρια τως (Β only) ἔμεινε GM ἀπόμεινεν Κ

Since this is the second part of an extended simile, δείχνω is more fitting: the dead body was looking like a withered rose.

- i 14 ἠπέψε AB GKM ἔδωκε
The two versions have the same meaning; an argument in favour of ἔδωκε would be the passage in GL, ma in preda a morte, / Sol per farne più danno, il Figlio diede (IV 11). Alexiou and Aposkiti have preferred ἥπεψε.

- i 18 ἐγύρισε περίσσα τιμημένος / στοὺς Οὐρανοὺς ΑΒ] στὸν Οὐρανὸ GKM
- i 35 μάχες ἐσηκωθήκασι AB] μαλιές GKM (μαγλιάς K)

The two words would be written very similarly in the Latin alphabet (mághies, maglies), so it is impossible to say which reading is authentic.

- ii 18 γιατ’ εἶν’ φαρμακεμένα (φαρμακωμένα K)] γιατ’ εἶναι μαγεμένα B

Fortuna here warns the warriors of the danger that food and drink in Armida’s garden have magic powers (κι ὡς τὸ Ρινάλδο, τὸ ζιμιὸ θέλουσι σᾶς σκλαβώσει), not that they are poisoned.\(^\text{313}\) GL refers to poisonous waters, but it is clear from the context that it is not a lethal poison but one with magic powers: Ma dentro ai freddi suoi cristalli asconde / Di tosco estran malvagità secreta; / Chè un picciol sorso di sue lucide onde / Inebria l’alma tosto, e la fa lieta (XIV 74). B could be a correction by the poet himself who wanted to make the line more clear, instead of faithfully following his model.

- ii 101 σ’ ποιὰν εὐκαιριὰ κοιμᾶται AB] ἐξοριὰ GM ἐρημιὰ K

Alexiou and Aposkiti have preferred ἐξοριὰ. This could correspond to GL XIV 12, where Rinaldos’s absence is referred to as lontano exilio. However εὐκαιριὰ (meaning idleness, laziness) can be considered as lectio difficilior, because it is a rarer word, and also fits the sense perfectly: Rinaldos is in an idle condition, while his fellow warriors are preparing for battle. References to Rinaldos’s idleness are also made in GL (XV 44, fra cibi, ed ozio, e scherzi, e fole / Torpe il campion della Cristiana fede; XVI 32, Te solo, o figlio di Bertoldo, fuora / Del mondo, in ozio, un breve angolo serra). Εὐκαιριά is

\(^{313}\) Alexiou & Aposkiti 1992: 105.
used by Chortatsis with this meaning in Panoria V 10: ἀπ’ εὐκαιρία κι ἀναγελια στὸν κόσμο γεννημένο.

- iii 12 κ’ αἵμα νὰ βγάζει ἀπο’ το’ ἔχθρούς καὶ νὰ τοι θανατώνει AB ] το’ ἀποζυγώνει GKM
- iii 106 νὰ μπαίνουσι AB ] νὰ μπαίνουσι GKM ἐμβαίνουσιν Κ
- iv 89 Μ’ ἀργιοῦ ν’ ἀνοίξου AB ] νὰ βγοῦσι314

More extended variants can be found, but they do not exceed the limits of a hemistich:

- Prol. 6 νὰ φανερώσουσι ζιμιὸ σ’ ζούς μὲ συντηροῦσι (B only)
- GM νὰ φανερώσουσι σήμερο (in K the passage is completely paraphrased)

The version of B seems to fit better with the context: the mere appearance of Charos can reveal his identity to the spectators immediately, without him introducing himself to the audience. Ζιμιὸ places the emphasis to the fact that no introduction is needed.

- Ι 226 ν’ ἄφτου καὶ νὰ λαβρίζου / καρδίες ποτὲ μὲ στὴ φωτιά, καὶ νὰ μηδὲν καπνίζου; (B only)
- GKM ν’ ἄφτου καὶ νὰ λαβρίζου / τὰ σωθικὰ μιὰς κορασίας, καὶ νὰ μηδὲν καπνίζου
- Ι 230 καὶ νὰ μποροῦ τὰ χείλη τοσ νὰ στέκου σφαλισμένα / δίχως νὰ κράζουσινε σκιὰς λυπητερὰ τ’ ωιμένα (B only)
- GK δίχως το’ ἅγατος το’ ἐμιλιεῖς καὶ δίχως τ’ ὀχ ωίμενα

314 Some more examples:

- Ι 283 τού πόθου AB ] το’ ἅγατος GKM
- Ι 383 τού πόθου AB ] το’ ἅγατος GKM
- Ι 404 τοί νόκτες πρικαμένες AB ] βαρμένες GM βαρμένες Κ
- II278 κι ἧν στέκο αφαλισμένα / δίχως νὰ κράζουσινε σκιὰς λυπητερὰ τ’ ωιμένα (B only)
- ΙΙ38 AB μπιστεμένο ] ἀγαπημένο GKM
- ΙΙ384 AB γροικήμενο ] μαθημένο GKM
- ΙΙ384 AB μπιστεμένο ] μαθημένο GKM
- V 192 σὲ χίλια μέρη τοί κορμί τοῦ δόλιο νὰ ξεκινίζει (B only)] GKM νὰ χωρίζει
- V 545 κοράσι μου (B only)] GKM γυναῖκες μου
- V 627 κι ἀλύπητους καλοῦσι (B only)] GKM κι ἀλύπητους καλοῦσι
- Ι 146 τῆν πρίκα AB] GKM τῆν ἔγνοια
I 254 Β μ’ ὡλα τὰ πάθη ἀπού ἑγνωθα ] GKM μὲ χίλια πάθη καὶ καϊμοὺς
I 302 πόθου φωτιὰ βαστοῦσι Β ] γρικοδισι GKM
Both verbs are used by Chortatsis in similar contexts: τόση φωτιὰ στὰ σωθικὰ βαστὼ συναφομάς του (Panoria V 177); γροικῶ στὸ στῆθος μου καμίνιν ἄφτωμένο (Panoria I 3) etc.
I 408 μιὰν ὥρα με τὸ χέρι μου ἤπαινα τὴ ζωή μου ΑΒ ] μὲ τὸ σπαθί μου ἐτέλειωνα μιὰν ὥρα τῇ ζωή μου GKM
III 112 μὲ πάσα (κάθα Α) λίγο τίβετας ΑΒ ] μὲ πάσα λίγην ἄφορμή GKM Ἄφορμή is used very frequently by Chortatsis. It is more reasonable to suppose that A and B are a simplification.
III 304 Γιὰ νὰ τοῦ δώσει στὴν καρδιὰ πρίκα πολλὴ καὶ πόνο AB ] GΚΜ γιὰ νὰ γροικήσει σήμερο πρίκα πολλὴ καὶ πόνο
An argument to support the reading of GKM would be that σήμερο could be considered as a technical reference to the unity of time.
III 342 σ’ ὅλους τοῖ τόπους μπαίνει[ στοὺς ξένους τόπους μπαίνει ΚΜ / τζή ξένους κόσμους G
This variant is less convincing than GKM because of the context: strong courage starts wars and invades foreign lands.115
IV 62 Κι ὅλους νὰ τοῦ κομπώνουσι νὰ μὴν τὸ συντηροῦσι GΚΜ τ’ ἀμμάτα νὰ κομπώνουσι
IV 120 καὶ πὼς δὲ φτάνει ἢ γνώση / μηδὲ καίμα ἐκ τὴν μπόρεσι τοῦ πόθου νὰ γλυτώσει G καὶ πὼς δὲ φτάνει ἢ γνώση / τ’ ἀθρώπου ἀποῦ τὴν μπόρεσι τοῦ πόθου νὰ γλυτώσει (K τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, Μ τζανθρώπους, slight variation of the reading of G)

Καὶ ποιός, ἀφέντη μου, ἄκουσε πὼς ἔχει τόση χάρη / γιὰ νὰ μπορεῖ νὰ πεῖ ποτὲ κ’ εἶναι ἄξιος νὰ μὲ πάρει;

The variant of K is very problematic but it seems to be closer to the version of GM:

καὶ πῶς ἀφέντι χ’ ἄκουσι ‘ктὸν ἔναν τους μίαν χάριν

Alexiou and Aposkiti have preferred GM because it corresponds to a similar passage from Orbecche:316 Che gli dorrà d’avermi unqua veduto.

The reference to the dream is a clearer reminder to the audience of the reason why Erofili was afraid of her death.

The meaning of the two versions is different but the overall sense is the same, as Armida promises to give herself as a reward to the soldier who will kill Rinaldo and take revenge for her. The reading of GKM corresponds to the relevant passage from GL: *si guideron mi chiede* (XVII 48).

Finally, an important difference appears in these witnesses as far as two proper names are concerned: Τσέρτσα of GKM (homeland of Panaretos) is written as Cirza in AB (IV 676) and Θρασύμαχος (Panaretos’s father) is written as *Trissimaghos* (IV 676). *Trissimaghos* reminds us of Tripolemos in *Erotokritos.* The form Θρασύμαχος appears

---

only in the accompanying material of the edition of Gradenigos and not the main text, where the King is called Τρασίμαχος, which is closer to Trissimaghos. Moreover, this name appears in varying forms in the Munich manuscript (Τρασίμαρχος and Τρασίμαθος) and Kigalas (Τρασίμεγος and Τρασίμαχος), so probably some corruption had occurred in the early stages of the transmission and the name was transmitted in different forms.

6.2 Relation among the witnesses within each group

6.2.1. Relation between A and B

Despite being very close, sometimes one of the manuscripts might agree with the group of GKM against the other, or give a different variant. These cases concern mainly minor differences:

- I 486 Μπορεῖς ποτέ σου δίχως τοι μιὰν ὥρα πλιὸ νά ζήσεις; BKGM
  A Μπορεῖς μιὰν ὥρα δίχως τοι ποτέ σου πλιὸ νά ζήσεις
- II 358 τοι πόρτες τοι Παράδεισος BKGM A τὴν πόρτα τοι Παράδεισος
- III 46 καὶ τὸ μαντάτο τὸ πρικὺ θὲ νά 'χει μαθημένο BKGM A θέλει ἔχει μαθημένο
- III 110 τέλος γη ἀλάφρωση κιαμιὰ στὴν κρίση μου τὴν τόση BKGM A στὴν πρίκα μου τὴν τόση
- IV 111 κ’ ἐκεῖ ποῦ τρέχου οἱ ποταμοί μὲ δίχως νά κτυποῦσι BKGM A βροντοῦσι

Both βροντῶ and κτυπῶ are attested in descriptions of turbulent water: ἀκούω νερὰ ἐβροντοῦσαν (Pikatoros, Rima Thrinitiki, 188); κουτσουναράκι ἐκτύπα (Erotokritos V 895); κι ἂν εἶδες τὸ θαλάσσι / τὸ πῶς κτυπᾶ κιαμιὰ φορὰ (Erofili I 320-1)

- i 25 εἶναι μαζωμένοι BGKM εἶν’ πρεμαζωμένοι A
  Alexiou and Aposkiti prefer πρεμαζωμένοι because it is more dialectal.319
- i 106 κ’ ἔτσι νεράιδα μου ἀκριβῆ BGKM νεράίδα μου ἄλφρωση A

• I 120 παισάρας BGKM ] χαιράμενες Α

• II 68 κείτεται BGKM ] στέκεται Α

• III 32 τὴν κεφαλὴ του χάρισμα κομμένη νὰ μοῦ δώσει BGKM ] νὰ φέρει νὰ μοῦ
dώσει Α

• I 569-573

Β γιατί δοσ πιὰ τονε θωρεῖς στὰ ὑψη πὼς καθίζει...
tόσα θά γδέχεσαι νὰ δεῖς πεσμένη τὴν τιμή του....
κι δοσ τονε στοχάξεσαι βασανισμένο πάλι....
θέλεις ν’άλπιζεσι σε ψηλὸ σκαλούνι καθισμένο
νὰ τον δεῖς...

AGKM γιατί δοσ πιὰ τονε θωρεῖ στὰ ὑψη πὼς καθίζει...
(Γ θωρεῖς ’στὰ)
tόσα θά γδέχεσαι νὰ δεῖς πεσμένη τὴν τιμή του...
(Κ ἀκαρτερεῖ νὰ ἴδῃ)
κι δοσ τονε στοχάζεσαι βασανισμένο πάλι....
θέλεις ν’άλπιζεσι σε ψηλὸ σκαλόρι καθισμένο...
(Κ σκαλῆ)
νὰ τον δεῖ...

The third person in AGKM refers to κιανεῖς from I 567 (δὲν πρέπει πρίχου δεῖ κιανεῖς
tὸ τέλος νὰ παινέσει). Both versions make sense, but B corresponds to the passage
from Orlando Furioso (XLV 1) on which this passage is based.320

Quanto più su l’instabil ruota vedi
di Fortuna ire in alto il miser uomo,
tanto più tosto hai da vedergli i piedi
ove ora ha il capo, e far cadendo il tomo.
Alexiou and Aposkiti have also followed B.

• II 118 τὴ βαρεμένη μου καρδιὰ σκίζου καὶ σφάζουμο τη ΑΓΚΜ] Β τὴ δοξεμένη

Δοξεμένη in Erofili appears in B only in I 2 as well (where A is missing). The word
though appears in Panoria (II 340, II 374). Βαρεμένη appears also in Erofili (I 502) and
Panoria.

• II 152 σώνει στῇ μέσῃ καὶ τῶ δυῶ περίσσα θυμωμένος ΑΓΚΜ] Β μανισμένος

• III 15 στῇ δούλεψη κ’ εἰς τοι καίμους μικρὴ περίσσα ἐμπῆκα ΑΓΚΜ] Β στὰ βάσανα

320 See Spadaro 1994 for details.
Examples of more extended differences are very rare:

- ΠΙ 239 καθώς μπορεί το ριζικό δίχως περίσσο κόπο (Κ κανέναν κόπον]) Β μ’ ένα και μ’ άλλον τρόπο

- ΠΙΙ 238 και τούτες ἀπο υ τυραννοῦ τὸ νοῦ μου νὰ σποδώσω (Κ ποσώσω) / τοὶ προξενίες ΑΓ (Κ νὰ ποσώσω, because he always replaces σποδώνω, Μ νὰ σοῦ δόσω, probably misreading of σποδώνω)) Β νὰ ξηλώσω

- ΠΙ 243 'Απὸ τὸν Ἀδῆ τὸν σκληρὸ καὶ τὸ σκοτεινιασμένο AGΚΜ] Β ἀραχνιασμένο

Both ἀραχνιασμένος and σκοτεινιασμένος appear in the imagery related to Death and the Underworld: τὸ ἁραχνιασμένες πόρτες ( Erotokritos V 848); γυμνοί κι ἀραχνιασμένοι (Penthos Thanatou 160); στὸν Ἀδη πώς πορεύγουνται, σ’ τόπο σκοτεινιασμένο (Palaia kai Nea Diathiki 72, see also 5037); στοῦ Ἀδη τὰ μέρη εὐρίσκονται τ’ ἀποσκοτεινιασμένα (Palaia kai Nea Diathiki 563).

- ΠΙΙ 726 ρουμπιὰ ΑΓΚΜ ] ρουμπί Β

- ΙΙ 140 μυρισμένη ἀγκάλη AGΚΜ ] σπλαχνικήν ἀγκάλη B

На примерах более разработанных различий встречается очень редко:

- ΠΙ 239 как бы можете в ризико без лишнего резкого (К как вы и не поднимали) Β м’ една и м’ другой способ

- ΠΙΙ 223-4 Каким образом, ну плюшер, там пайдоми и ζάль / стоят Парадиса кают и та джж и та мегалы (К пайдемон М пефумиа)] Β м’ пайдоми мегалы – оно плоумицена θάλλη

Пайдоми и ζάль появляются и в других случаях в Erofili вместе: как тогда пайдоми и тогда ζάль (I 603). Плоумицена θάλлη is also a stereotypic expression (κ’ ηύρηκα το’ Εροφίλης μου та плюомицена θάλлη, Ι 360).

- ΠΙΙ 59-60 Тача кайносургия пали / какомориа ν’ ἀπόσωσε νὰ σμίξει μὲ τὴν θάλλη;]

А киамиа логиазио пали / какомориа ν’ ἀπόσωσε νὰ σμίξει μὲ τὴν θάλλη;

The version of A is semantically equivalent, but the other is almost a faithful translation of Orbecche: sarsa forse giunto novo dolore al nostro affanno (ΠΙ.3.20)
IV 73-4 Γιατί ἔτσι καὶ τὸν ἑναν / σὰν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀγαπῶ. Σ' τούτη μου τὴν ἀγκάλη / μπορώ νὰ πώ το' ἀνάθρεψα (Κ σὰν καὶ τὸν ἄλλον])
Α γιατί ἔτσι καὶ τὸν ἑναν / σὰν καὶ τὴν ἄλλη ἀνάθρεψα σ' τούτη μου τὴν ἀγκάλη, / γιαῦτος περίσσα το' ἀγαπῶ

I 509-10 Πὼς μ’ ἀγαπᾶς, Καρπόφορε, καλὸτατα γνωρίζω / κ’ εἰς τούτα μου τὰ βάσανα μόνο σ’ ἐσένα ἐλπίζω ] Α καλὸτατα κατέχω – μόνον ἐσέναν ἔχω
The rhyme κατέχω - ἔχω appears in Katsourbos in a very similar context: πὼς μ’ ἀγαπᾶ ἡ Κασσάντρα μου καλὸτατα κατέχω, / μ’ ἀντίδικη τη μοίρα μου σ’ τούτον τὸν πόθον ἔχω (I 99)

Generally the most prominent and extended variants found in the family of the Athens and Birmingham manuscripts appear in both manuscripts. That means that they both originate from a common ancestor, which presented some important divergences from the rest of the tradition of Erofili. This ancestor is free from many problems found in the other group of witnesses, although not all of them, but is not completely devoid of other errors and minor textual problems. Given the very close relation between B and A, the variants found in B in the parts of the play for which A has not survived belonged most probably to their common ancestor.

6.2.2. The two printed editions and the Munich manuscript
The errors and the frequent significant differences of these witnesses in comparison to the two Latin-script manuscripts make possible their treatment as a separate group; however, exceptions to this pattern do occur. The relative scarcity of these cases justifies treating them as exceptions:
• G rarely presents a variant not found in any of the other witnesses.
• K and M present a number of common readings, most of them errors, or inferior variants, while at the same time G coincides with B and A.
-K occasionally and M rarely agree with B (and A, where it survives) against G.

6.2.2.1. Gradenigos’s edition against the other witnesses

The cases when Gradenigos’s edition has a reading not found in any of the other witnesses are very rare. The differences are mainly minor changes in phrasing. Frequently the differences affect words which do not offer new information in the phrase, so none of the variants can be considered as superior:

- I 278 Κὶ ἀπονα μὲ τὴ χέρα μου νὰ πάρω τὴ ζωή μου ἀτός μου ΒΚΜ
- I 463 γιατὶ ἐκομπώθηκα κι ἐγὼ, περίσσω ἀναστενάζω γιὰ κεῖνο ΑΒ γιὰ τούτο Μ, διὰ ταῦτο Κ

In both of these cases, it is hard to say which reading is better, because the variants affect parts of the text which do not give information, but repeat something or give emphasis. They could be attempts on the part of the poet to improve a verse which does not look very satisfactory.

- IV 559 γιατὶ τὰ ἔχει τὰ πολλὰ καὶ τὰ περίσσα πλοῦτη μεγάλα ΑΒΚΜ

The differences usually concern synonyms, or words with very close meaning, or the syntactic structure:

- I 424 πὼς τὸ μαθαίνει ὁ Βασιλιός, καὶ θέλει μὲ σκοτώσει πὼς θέλει μὲ σκοτώσει ΒΚΜ
- II 128 κ’ ἡ κορασίδες φεύγουσι ζιμιὸ κ’ ἀφήνουσι με οἱ κορασές ΑΒΚΜ
- II 448 παρὰ τὸν πόθο μοναχὰς τῆς κόρης τοῦ ὀμορφῆς μου τῇ ἕδυκής μου ΒΚΜ
- IV 404 κι ἀπὸ τὸ φόβο ζωντανὴ στὴν Ἅδη κατεβαίνω τὴν τρομάρα ΒΚΜ
- I 58 καὶ τῆ θωριὰ ν’ ἀλλάξομε G] κ’ ἐδὰ θωριὰ ν’ ἀλλάξομε ΑΒΚΜ
- I 63 κι ἄλλοι κοράσα ἃς γενοῦ G] κ’ ἄλλοι κοράσα ἃς δεῖξουσι ΒΚΜ δείκτουσι Α
The version of G creates a hiatus and furthermore it seems more like a replacement of the quite rare sense of δείχνω as “transform”.\(^{322}\)

- II 69 καρδούλα μου G καρδίτζα μου ABKM
- IV 14 τόσες φορές στόν πόλεμον ὅλοι νὰ μποῦμε ἀντάμι G νὰ πᾶμε ἀντάμι BKM

The phrase μπαίνω στόν πόλεμο is used elsewhere in Erofili (I 274).

Examples of more extended differences are very rare:

- II 114 στὸν Ἅδη / μὲ βασανίζου G μὲ βάνουσι ABKM

An argument to reject the version of G is that the other version corresponds to similar expressions such as στὸν Ἄδη κατεβαίνω (I 294, IV 404), στὸν Ἄδη τῇ φτωχή μὲ βάνει ἡ ἀσκημιά σου (V 450), στὸν Ἄδη νὰ περάσω (Panoria I 360).

- II 52 σ’ τούτη τῇ βρύση σκύψετε τῇ δροσερή νὰ πιεῖτε G πλυθεῖτε BKM

According to Papatriandafyllou-Theodoridi,\(^{323}\) πλυθεῖτε corresponds to GL (ma pria la polve in queste acque deporre vi piaccia). However, Alexiou & Aposkiti observe that πιεῖτε is connected with the warning that the food and drink are poisoned and consider that both variants are of equal value, perhaps the result of a revision by the poet.\(^{324}\)

- III 43 κ’ ἡ χέρα σου ἡ εὐγενική κιανένα δὲ σκοτώνει G πληγῇ ποτὲ ἐκ τὸ χέρι σου κιανένα δὲ σκοτώνει ABKM
- IV 24 καὶ τὰ τασσίματά μας / νὰ πᾶμε νὰ κρεμάσομε ὅλοι μας τ’ ἅρματά μας G νὰ πᾶμε νὰ κρεμάσομε σὰν εἶναι ἡ πεθυμιά μας BKM

The version of G is a misunderstanding of the syntax, perhaps because of the enjambment. It is interesting, however, that the detail of hanging up the weapons corresponds to Goffredos’ s act at the end of GL (XX 144): *E qui l’arme sospende.*

---


\(^{323}\) Papatriandafyllou-Theodoridi 1972: 421.

6.2.2.2. K and M agree against Gradenigos and A-B

Sometimes K and M present slight linguistic differences from the other witnesses:

- II 151 γείς λούπος πεινασμένος KM] λούπης ABG
- III 194 σά λείψει ἀπὸ κοντά μου KM] ἀπὸ σιμά μου BG

Chortatsis seems to prefer σιμά instead of κοντά.

- IV 677 κερδεμένος KM] νικημένος GB
- V 60 κι ἀκρογελᾶ δαμάκι KM] λιγάκι BG

This is the only case when K and M have a more dialectal word in comparison to G and B. Δαμάκι does not appear anywhere else in Erofili, once in Katsourbos and is rare in Panoria.

- i 6 τῇ μάχη ἐκείνη / τῇ φοβερῇ KM] φοβερῇ ABG
- ii 84 νὰ ξαναγυρίσουσι KM] ξαναγιαγείρουσι ABG

This is another case of elimination of dialectal characteristics.

Minor differences such as the inversion of the word order or the substitution of a word with a synonym appear:

- P 100 τόσα πολλὰ τὸ 'κράτει KM] τόσα περίσσα ἐκράτει BG
- I 59 κι δχί οἱ καλές του τάξες KM] διάξες BG
- I 142 σ’ τάξες καὶ τοί πράξες σου KM] τοί διάξες BG
- I 309 βασιλοπούλα εὐγενική KM] βασιλοπούλα μου ἀκριβῇ
- IV 749 σκλάβος το’ ἑρωτιάς KM] το’ ἑρωτιάς σκλάβος BG
- V 174 καὶ νεκρὰ κορμιὰ ν’ ἀναστενάξου KM] κορμιὰ νεκρὰ BG
- ii 109 κ’ ἐσύ Ρινάλδο στέκεσαι σ’ ἀνάπαψη μεγάλη KM] κείτεσαι ABG

κείτομαι and στέκομαι are interchanged in other cases as well, but here κείτεσαι is more expressive, since Rinaldos is found asleep.

- ii 135 νὰ φύγομε σπουδακτικὰ KM] νὰ πηαίνομε σπουδακτικὰ ABG

Φύγομε is probably influenced by the previous lines (μ’ ἃς φύγομεν ἀπὸ ’δεπά)
Cases of more extended differences appear only rarely:

- I 34 κι ὁ λογισμός μου βάσανα μέρα καὶ νύκτα νά 'χει ΚΜ νά 'χει BG
- V 287 Παρακαλῶ σε Νένα μου, πολλά μου ἀγαπημένη ΚΜ περίσσια ἀγαπημένη GB
- V 322-3
  ΚΜ Γιατί πολλά 'ν' πασίχαρος, κ' εις ἕγνοια πλιὸ δὲν μπαίνω
  μὲ πρόσωπο σὲ καρτερεῖ περίσσα μερωμένο
  GB γιατί θωρῶ τὸ Βασιλίο περίσσα μερωμένο,
  κι ὁλόχαρος σὲ καρτερεῖ, κ' εις ἕγνοια πλιὸ δὲν μπαίνω
- V 498 κι ὃρις ἐγίνη τὸ ζιμιὸ κ' ἔφαγε τὸ κορμί μου ΚΜ κ' ἐπῆρε τῇ ζωῇ μου BG
- V 567 πῶς νὰ καταλυθοῦσι / στὸν Ἅδη τόσες ὀμορφιὲς ΚΜ και πῶς νὰ κατεβοῦσι / στὸν Ἅδη τόσες ὀμορφιές BG
- V 419 τῶν λιονταριῶν μου ἐγίνηκε καὶ τῶν σκυλιῶν μου βρὼση ΚΜ θροφὴ ἐγίνη τῶ σκυλῶ, τῶ λιονταριῶ μου βρώση BG
- ii 95
  ΚΜ Σύντροφε τοῦτα δαίμονες εἶναι, καὶ δὲν μποροῦμε κανένα τους νὰ βλάψουμε τῶρα καθὼς θωροῦμε
  BG Σύντροφε τοῦτα Δαίμονες εἶναι, καθώς θωροῦμε καὶ νὰ τὰ βλάψωμε ποτὲ μ' ἄρματα δὲν μποροῦμε

The variants of K and M which are not obvious errors or elimination of dialectal characteristics very rarely seem worth taking into account as interesting alternatives. It should be noted however that the most interesting variants of this group appear in the Fifth Act, for which it is clear that three different versions have survived.
6.2.2.3. K agrees with B and A against Gradenigos

Apart from the cases when K and A-B have preserved a correct reading when G and M are wrong, there is a substantial number of examples of K agreeing with the group of A and B when both variants can be considered of equal quality. But K never follows B and A in the most extended differences they present. Their agreement concerns linguistics matters or other minor details:

- I 42, I 170, III 84, i 122, iv 46 πεθυμημένα BK ] πεθυμισμένα GM
  The form πεθυμημένος appears in Fortounatos and the Dapergola manuscript of Panoria. Πεθυμισμένος appears in the two other manuscripts of Panoria, Pistikos Voskos, as well as Pastor Fidos and the Kritikos Polemos by Bounialis.

- I 66 ἐδῶ BK ] δεπὰ GM
  Given Kigalas’s tendency to replace dialectal forms by common ones, this similarity does not necessarily indicate a common ancestor of K and B.

- I 175 ποῦ θέλει νὰ τελειώσει BK ] ποῦ θέλει νὰ τελειώσει
  Ξετελειώνω does not appear anywhere else in Chortatsis’s works.

- II 94 πρίχου ἀλλη μεγαλύτερη κακομοιριὰ πλακώσει ABK ] πρὶν ἀλλη GM

- II 482 περιφάνεια AB περιφάνισε K ] περιφάνεια GM

- Ded. 53 παρακαλῶ τὸ λοιπὸνὶς τὴν ὑψηλότητά σου BK ] ἐξοχότητα σου G
  It is not possible to say which form of address Chortatsis would have preferred. The Dedication of Panoria to Viaros has survived in only one witness and there the nobleman is addressed as ἐκλαμπρότατος καὶ εὐγενέστατος while Katsourbos has survived without a dedication to a patron. Foskolos uses the address ἐκλαμπρότατον in Fortounatos, together with φωτερότατον (and φωτερότητα).

- Prol. 23 ποῦ εἶν’ ... BK ] ποῦ G
  It is more logical to assume that εἶν(α) was in the original and was omitted. If the original was written in the Latin alphabet, pu in ton Eglino would be written as pu don Eglino, and that would later be simplified to pu ton Eglino.
Both adjectives are used by Chortatsis in *Erofili* (φίλε μου ἀκριβέ, I 347; πώς εἶσαι μπιστικός καλά ἵμα χω γνωρισμένο, I 120).

The meaning is identical in both cases; the only difference is that in B and K the syntax is simplified with two independent clauses instead of a subordinate one.

The same phrase appears in the dedication, as περβόλια στὸν ἀέρα, in B K and G (A and M have survived without the Dedication).

Alexiou and Aposkiti prefer δούλους because the Turks are slaves to the demonic powers and not friends (Armida is a friend). However, φίλους would mark the contrast with the next line, τοι Χριστιανοὺς τοι ἐχθροὺς μας.

Finally, B and K agree as far the name of the messenger who asks Erofili to meet the King at the Fifth Act (V 277). Both witnesses write Ἀσμώδη (Asmodhi),

---

while in the others he is called Ἁρμόδης. Ἀσμόδης could be an influence from Asmodeus; such a name could be appropriate for that person, for whom Erofili says that he is the worst in the Palace.

6.2.2.4. M agrees with B and A against Gradenigos

The similarities of M with the group A-B are extremely rare, apart from the passages where K and G have the same mistake and M has preserved the correct version, as B and A. Again, as in the case of the agreement of K with A-B, we don’t find M presenting any of the major differences of A and B:

- Prol. 84 καὶ κάνω  θλίψη  τὴ χαρὰ καὶ κλάηματα τὰ γέλια ] ξόδια GK
- I 37 σήμερο μετὰ κεῖνο ] μετ’ αὐτεῖνο GK
- I 61 πρίχου  ἄρχίσει ] πρὶν ἄρχίσει GK
- I 495 Λοιπὸν ἀνισώς καὶ δὲν μπορεῖς νὰ τὴν ἄφησει πλιό σου ] ἀνὲ καὶ GK
- III 228 μετὰ σου νὰ γυρίζει ] μὲ σένα νὰ γυρίζει GK
- V 410 καὶ μ’ ἰντα μοῦ ὅφαξες μαχαίρι τὴν καρδιά μου ] μὲ τὶ μαχαίρι μοῦ ὅφαξες, κύρη μου, τὴν καρδιά μου GK
- V 528 τὶ ἔχεις καὶ χάμαι κείτεσαι ] καὶ κείτεσαι χαμαὶ GK

The most important similarity between M and B is the omission of the second hemistich from Erofili’s last words before she commits suicide: βούηθα μου τσῆ βαρόμοιρης (completed by καὶ δέξου τὸ κορμί μου in G and K). This omission, which adds a dramatic effect to the tension of the scene, must stem from a version older than both these witnesses, as it seems to have been known to Troilos who used a similar effect in his play Rodolinos, published in 1647, in the scene of the heroine’s suicide (Ε 580):

μαχαίρι ἔσο, ἀπὸ πάντα σου μ’ ἔβγανες τιμημένο,
γιαμιὰ ἀνοίξε, τὸ στήθος μου σφάξε.
The editor has completed the missing part of the line (τὸ στῆθος μου σφάξε <τὸ πρικαμένο>) without discussing the possible relation to the manuscripts of Erofili.\textsuperscript{326} Puchner and Vincent, however, have suggested that there might be a connection, since the scenes are very similar.\textsuperscript{327}

6.3. Other cases

- II 306 ζωὴ πολλὰ χαριτωμένη ΒΜ, καλὴ χαριτωμένη Α, καλὴ κι ἀναπαημένη GK
- II 52 το’ ἐξουσίας μου τὰ κλειδιὰ B, τῆς ἐξῆς μου A, τῆς καρδιάς μου K, το’ ὀρεξῆς μου GM
- III 20 μ’ ἑνα καὶ μ’ ἄλλο τρόπο BK, μ’ ἑνα γη μ’ ἄλλο τρόπο AKM
- III 284 οὰν ἀδερφοῦ μου μπιστικοῦ BG πιστώτατου K ἡ καρδιακοῦ AM
- III 367

B μάνητες, πρίκες και καιμοί, πολέμοι και θανάτοι
K μάνητες, πρίκες, βάσανα, πολέμοι και θανάτοι
AGM μάνητες, πρίκες, βάσανα, κλάηματα και θανάτοι

The second hemistich, πολέμοι και θανάτοι, appears in Panoria (V 7). However, κλάηματα και θανάτοι is a faithful translation of the relevant passage of Orbecche (I. 1 116): pianto e morti. Καιμοί and βάσανα both correspond to strazi from the same passage (dolore / e strazi e pianto e morti, 115-6).

- IV 274 διώξε τὴν ὄργητά σου Β, σβῆσε τὴ μάνητά σου Α, πάψε τὴ μάνητά σου GKM
- IV 698 μάρτυρες BK μαρτυρίες AGM

Panaretos claims that he has either proof or witnesses that he is the son of a King. Μάρτυρες cannot be excluded because it is mentioned at the beginning of the play that there is one person apart from Panaretos and Karpoforos who knows about

\textsuperscript{326} Aposkiti 1987: 188.

\textsuperscript{327} Puchner 1990: 629; Vincent 2005: 80.
Panaretos’s origin, the person who brought him to the palace when his family died (I 145-6).

- τζόγιες BK ] πέτρες AGM

Τζόγια appears also in Panoria (V 400), meaning a diadem.

- V 42

σ’ τουνοῦ τοῦ πύργου τοῦ ψηλοῦ B 1
στοῦ πύργου τοῦ ψηλότατου B2 (correction by Foskolos’s hand)
κείνου τοῦ ψηλοῦ K
τοῦ ψηλοῦ έτουνοῦ G
tὸν ψυλότανε M

All the versions (apart from ψηλότατου) seem to be different efforts to translate quest’ alta torre from Orbecche (IV.1 60). The corrupt version of M could derive either from G or from B 2. It should be mentioned also that superlatives like ψηλότατος are a distinct characteristic of Chortatsis’s style and appear in his works more frequently than in other texts.\textsuperscript{328}

- i 23 BK πὼς πάσχει δὲ στοχάζεστε
GA πὼς πάσχει καὶ στοχάζεται
M πὼς πάσχει δὲν στοχάζεται.

Both versions BK and GA could make sense. Actually the version of BK is accepted by Bancroft-Marcus. As chie (καὶ) and dhe (δὲ) are frequently confused, the variant of M stems from the variant of GA.

- ii 123-4

Β γλυκὰ παραπονέματα καὶ τακτικὰ περίσσα
λόγια κι ώριότατες θωριὲς, μαλιὲς κι ἀγάπες ίσα

Α γλυκὰ παραπονέματα καὶ τακτικὰ περίσσα
λόγια, γλυκότατες θωριὲς, μάχες κι ἀγάπες ίσα

\textsuperscript{328} Pidonia 1977: 191-3.
G γλυκὰ παραπονέματα καὶ τακτικὰ περίσσα
ζυγώματα, κι ώριότατες μαλιὲς κι ἀγάπες ἵσα

Κ συγγνώματα κι ώριότατες μαλιὲς
Μ συγόνοντα κι ώριότατες μάχες

G, K and M follow the same tradition. Ζυγώματα has been corrupted in M or its exemplar and Kigalas perhaps changed it to συγγνώματα in order to avoid the dialectal word which perhaps could not be understood by a wider audience. The passage corresponds closely to GL XVI 25, although it is not a word-for-word translation. The general idea, though, remains the same: Armida's love games present an antithesis between tender and unfriendly acts (cari vezzi e liete paci). Ζυγώματα could correspond to placide e tranquille repulse.329

6.4. Summary

The examination of variant readings results in the same picture we found in the comparison of the common errors and the stage directions: the Birmingham and the Athens manuscripts have very close similarities in comparison to the group consisting of the other witnesses, although they are not completely identical. The group of G, K and M presents a more complicated picture, as sometimes K and rarely M may agree with B (and/or A, for the passages where A has survived), while more frequently, K and M agree with each other against G, A and B.

7. The relation of the witnesses with the Italian models

The main model of Erofili, as Bursian showed, is Orbecche by Giambattista Giraldi.330 He provided a scene by scene comparison of the two plays and pointed out the most

---

329 For this passage see also Alexiou & Aposkiti 1992: 43, 109.
330 Bursian 1870.
important similarities in structure and phrasing and the most important structural differences. *Erofili* is a very free adaptation, as some structural elements have been omitted (for example the two children from Orbecche’s and Oronte’s marriage), others have been adapted (e.g. instead of the Ghost of Selina, the King’s murdered wife, we see his murdered brother) and others have been transposed in different places (e.g. Orbecche’s prophetic dream is placed at an earlier stage of the action in *Erofili*).\(^{31}\) Verbal similarities, which sometimes extend to a word-for-word translation, appear occasionally.\(^{32}\)

The fact that the verbal parallels are so few makes it unsafe to use *Orbecche* as a guide for editing *Erofili*. Firstly, the problem is most of all practical: in very few cases do verbal similarities occur in passages where different variants have survived in different witnesses. Secondly, these few cases do not help us distinguish a specific witness which bears a closer relation to *Orbecche* than others, not only because they are so few that it is not safe to base an argument on them, but also because the similarities do not appear only in a single witness or a group of witnesses. But most importantly, a methodological question arises: how safe is it to consider more authentic the variants which may be more faithful to the “model”, if the relation between the two works is not very close and is not based on verbal similarities?\(^{33}\)

Since there is no evidence that a specific witness is closely linked to *Orbecche*, it is not safe to assume that every time a variant is closer to *Orbecche* it should be the authentic one. Moreover, since we know that Chortatsis was not actually translating his model, or even closely following its plot, we cannot be sure that he actually

---

\(^{31}\) The structural, aesthetic, stylistic and ideological similarities and differences between the two plays have been discussed extensively by scholars. See Embiricos 1956; Bancroft-Marcus 1978: 121-30; Alexiou & Apostoliti 1988: 27-35; Spadaro 1971; Spathis 2001; Cappellaro 2005; Chatzinikolaou 2007.

\(^{32}\) The most detailed presentation of structural and phrasing parallels is given by Bursian 1870. Bancroft-Marcus 1978: 121-30; Spadaro 1971; Luciani 1996.

intended to stay close to his model: perhaps the closest version could be the older one, and the poet later revised it changing the phrasing slightly, either because he did not want an accurate translation, or because he was not satisfied with the aesthetic result. Of course Orbecche, as well as the other models, can be useful in clarifying corrupt passages and helping to choose between variants when the interpretation of a passage is not easy without the help of its model.

The analysis which follows will deal first with Erofili and Orbecche, secondly with other models of Erofili and finally with the Interludes and Gerusalemme Liberata.

7.1. Erofili and Orbecche

In order to understand the complexity of the relationship between Erofili and its main model and the implication it has for the textual problems of the play, first some passages will be presented where Orbecche is accurately translated in a witness or a group of witnesses, and secondly a selection of passages will be discussed, where the close relation between the tragedy and its model cannot offer any help to the evaluation of witnesses for various reasons.

7.1.1. Passages which can be interpreted with the help of Orbecche

- Erof. III 365-8 and Orb. I.i. 113-117

Empiete dunque di furor sí grave
Quest'empia corte, ove Sulmon soggiorna,
Ch'alstro non vi si veggie che dolore
E strazzi e pianto e morti e da ogni canto
La scelerata corte a sangue piova

The corresponding passage of Erofili, l. III 367 has survived in 3 different versions:

Κ' ἐσὺ ἐκ τὸν Ἅδη, Πλούτωνα, πέψε φωτιὰ μεγάλη,
σὰ μοῦ 'ταξες, κι ἂς κάψουσι σὲ μιὰ μερὰ κ' εἰς ἄλλη (G ἅψουσι)
μάνητες, πρίκες, βάσανα, κλάηματα καὶ θανάτοι
κ' ἔρημο ὥς μείνει σήμερο τὸ παλάτι! (G γένη)

334 Orbecche is quoted from Ariani 1977.
The most faithful translation is the version of AGM which follows exactly the sequence *furor, dolore, strazi, pianti, morti*. It could be argued that καημοί in B is a synonym of βάσανα, but πολέμοι και θανάτοι looks completely out of context. This hemistich appears in the previous Act (II 223), and seems to have acquired a formulaic character as it is also used in *Rodolinos* III 473 and *Stathis* Prol. 7, so the origin of this variant is easy to explain.

- *Erof.* III 244-7 and Orb. I.ii. 1-6

Uscita i' son da le tartaree rive
Onde si son partite or le tre Dee
Che de' dannati ne gli oscuri regni
Prendono grave et immortal supplicio;
E (come insin là giù la fama suona)
Venute sono a la divina luce

Ἀπὸ τὸν Ἅδη τὸ σκληρὸ καὶ τὸ σκοτεινιασμένο (Β araghgniasmeno)
μὲ θέλημα τοῦ Πλούτωνα τὴν ὥρα βγαίνω
στὸ φῶς τοῦ ἡμέρας τὸ λαμπρὸ, καὶ τοῦ καθάριου κόσμου
τὰ κάλλη ἄκομη δὲν μπορεῖ νὰ δεῖ καλὰ τὸ φῶς μου.

AB To fos ci meras

The appearance of the Ghost of Selina has some similarities with the appearance of the Ghost of the dead brother of the King, although their structural function is completely different.

The couplet 245-6 of *Erofili* in the GKM version (βγαίνω | στὸ φῶς τοῦ ἡμέρας) corresponds to v. 6 of *Orbecche*, *venute sono a la divina luce*. The version of AB has no enjambment and the verb νὰ δεῖ is complemented by both φῶς τοῦ ἡμέρας and τὰ κάλλη τοῦ κόσμου as objects. GKM moreover is a *lectio difficilior* because of the more complicated syntax. Here the model can be a guide to choosing between variants with the help of other factors. A less obvious similarity could be observed between
σκοτεινωσμένο and regni oscuri, a phrase used frequently by Giraldi for the Underworld.

- *Erof. III 59-60 - Orb. II.iii.19-20*

Oimè che sarà questo? *Sarà forse* Giunto novo dolore al nostro affanno?

'Οimelinea k' ίντα τού γροικώ; Τάχα καινούργια πάλι κακομοιρία ν' ἀπόσωσε νὰ σμίξει μὲ τὴν ἄλλη;

A Oimeña ch' ida tu gricó chiamiá logiaso pagli cacomirian epossosse na smixi me tin agli

The translation of *Sarà forse* / giunto novo dolore al nostro affanno? is τάχα καινούργια πάλι κακομοιρία ν' ἀπόσωσε, from BGKM.

- *Erof. IV 610-4 – Orb. III.iii.1-5*

Mallecche, in questa età canuta sciocco,
Si pensa con sue favole e sue cianze,
*Il cervello intorniato avermi in guise, Ch'io non debba mostrare al traditore Di che importanzia questa ingiuria sia?*

Τὰ γερατειὰ ἐλολάνασι, θαρρῶ, μὰ τὴν ἄληθεια, τὸ σύμβουλο καὶ κάθεται καὶ λέγει παραμύθια, λογιάζοντας πὼς μετ' αὐτὰ τὸ νοῦ μου νὰ σκοτίσω, τέτοιο μεγάλο φταίσιμον ἁγδίκιωτο ν' ἀφήσω τὸ νοῦ μου νὰ σκοτίσει... ν' ἀφήσει GKM

Although the expression ὁ νοῦς μου ν' ἀφήσει ἁγδίκιωτο is not improbable, the version of AB, which is closest to the model, is preferable because it is clearer that it refers to the King. The variant of GKM occurred probably because of a misunderstanding of the syntax.

- *Erof. V 173 – Orb. IV.i.159-61*

A queste voci
*Vidi pianger le mura e i duri sassi E tremar de l'orror tutta la torre*

Only G offers an accurate translation of *tremar*. Σκιστεῖ, on the other hand, is not completely improbable, and is reminiscent of the image of the torn veil of the Temple from the Biblical narrations.


This is one of the passages where the structural and verbal similarities between the two works are very prominent. The couplet ὁ φόβος πὼς τοι βασιλιοὺς φυλάσσει λογαρίζω... corresponds to ma io tengo ... che ’l timore / sia colonna de’ regni. This
couplet appears twice in G, once after V 244 (=G1) and one after V 250 (=G2), with slight textual problems:

G1 Τὸ φόβο πὼς τζὴ Βασιλιοὺς φυλάσσει, λογαργιάζω, καὶ δίχωστοι τῇ Βασιλιᾷ τίβοτας δὲ χρειάζω
G2 Ὁ φόβος πὼς τζὴ Βασιλιοὺς φυλάσσει, λογαργιάζου, καὶ δίχωστοι τῇ Βασιλιᾷ τίβοτας τὴν κράξου

The version of B is closer to G2, without the corruptions, but the couplet is placed after V 244 as in G1:

B O fouos pos ci Vasiglius filasi logariaso
chie dhighostu ti Vasiglia tiuetas dhe di craso

K and M omit the passage completely. The position of the couplet after V 244 would be more faithful to the structure of Orbecche, because these passages present many verbal similarities. It also well connected with the previous line as it clarifies what is the different opinion that the King holds on this matter (ἀλλιᾶς λογῆς στὸ λογισμό μου κρίνω). Alexiou and Aposkiti have followed G2. In this position the couplet is not irrelevant, because it summarizes what has been previously said, before Filogonos moves on to say that he is very happy to have restored his honour.

The repetition of the couplet in G probably occurred from an early draft where the couplet was deleted from its initial position and inserted some lines before or after and a later scribe kept both of them, or it was added later in the margin with unclear signe-de-renvoi. The shorter version of the passage from K and M is also an indication that is has undergone some revision and the extant witnesses drew from different drafts, none of which was the final, or from the same early draft which was heavily marked with additions or deletions so that confusion arose.  

B is closer to Orbecche also in V 257-8:

Oh, se permesso avessi, che Malecche
M’avesse con sue fole a veder dato

336 See also Bancroft-Marcus 1978: 109-10 for further suggestions on revisions in this passage.
Che l' perdonare i recevuti oltraggi,
Via piú d' ogn'altra cosa, a un re conviene,
Quanto scemato avrei de la mia Gloria!

Ma posson ighaste lolos tora ma tin aglithia
agnisos chie tu simulu t' agnosta paramithia
Simeron igha afucrasti chiagdhichioti na fisso
mian edropin ossan afti chie tetio crima pglisso

GΚΜ
Μὰ πόσον εἶχα 'σταί λολός, ἂν ἦθελα γροικήσει
toú σύμβουλου μου τῇ βουλή, νά ἰθελα συμπαθήσει
toú πίβουλον Πανάρετου, κι ἀγδίκωτη ν’ ἀφίσω
tίν ἐντροπή ποὺ μοῦ ’καμε καί τέτοιο κρίμα πλήσο

In this case the versions which seem to be the oldest ones are not the closest to the model (although the sense is the same). Bancroft-Marcus interprets these divergences as a later revision by the poet who resorted to his model when trying to improve his work.337 Judging from the fact that the passage has survived in two quite different versions in the two groups of witnesses, and that it also belongs to the Fifth Act, which, as we mentioned previously, presents the highest number of extended differences among the witnesses and probably signs of revision as well, the idea that both variants originate from Chortatsis indeed seems very plausible.

7.1.2. Passages where the model cannot solve textual problems

Although it is possible in some cases to find close similarities between Orbecche and a witness or a group of witnesses, the relations between the model and the witnesses are more complicated, as the similarity between two passages does not necessarily mean that the model can always solve the textual problems of Erofili. The following examples will show that the way in which Chortatsis has adapted his

model does not permit us to find always word-for-word correspondences between two passages and therefore choose between variants with the help of Orbecche.

- *Erofili* III - *Orbecche* II.iii. 1-3

  Difficil è ne l’onde acerbe e crude  
  Quando l’irato mar poggia e rinforza,  
  Tener dritto il temone

This image is expanded in *Erofili* in four couplets, with A and B offering an extra couplet which seems a spurious addition:  

| Oden astrafti chie uroda chie anemichies fissussi  |
| chisto gialo ta chimata ta thimomena spussi    |
| Chie to carau i abothusi se mia mera chis agli |
| ci fuscomegnis thalasas me taraghi megagli    |
| [Chiastrapes chie i urodes chie to perisso ghiogni|
| canu chie dhe bora crati o naftis to timogni] |
| Totes gnoisete o calos naftlers mono totes     |
| timude i categhamegni chie adhinati podhotes (quoted from B) |

Since this imagery is only inspired by *Orbecche* without following its structure or phrasing, the model cannot be of any help.

- *Erofili* V 31-4 - Orb. IV.i. 45-8

  Cosa dirò, se tanto spirto avere  
  Potrò, che non s’agghiacci entro le vene,  
  Pel grave orrore, il sangue, che dapoi  
  Tutte vi pentirete averla udita (IV.i. 45-8)

  Ἀν ἔναι καὶ μιλώντας το δὲν φρύξει ἢ ἄναπνια μου  
  γῆ ἃ δὲ χαθεῖ τὸ πνέμα μου, γῆ ἃ δὲ σκισεῖ ἢ καρδιά μου,  
  πράμα πρικὺ σᾶς θέλω πεῖ, πολλὰ νὰ λυπηθῆτε,  
  κι όγιάντα νὰ τὸ δηγηθῶ στὸ ἀστερο νὰ μοῦ πεῖτε.  
  Β δὲν φρύξει ἢ ἐμιλιά μου

The messenger’s announcement of Panaretos’s torture is one of the passages most closely related to the model, however the phrase φρύξει ἢ ἄναπνια / ἐμιλιά is an

---

338 See above, section 3.3.1 for an analysis of the passage.
addition by Chortatsis, so it is not possible to choose one variant with the help of
the relevant passage from Orbecche.

- *Erof. V 41-2– Orb. IV.i. 59-61*

Giace nel fondo di quest’alta torre,
In parte sí solinga e sí riposte,
Che non vi guinge mai raggio di sole

Στὴν πλιὰ βαθύτερα μερὰ τοῦ Παλατιοῦ τὸν πάτο,
Στοῦ πύργου τοῦ ’ψηλοῦ ἐτουνοῦ τὸ βάθος ἀπὸ κάτω (G)
   B 1 stunu tu Pirgu tu psilu
   B2 stu Pirgu tu psilotatu
   K Στοῦ πύργου κείνου τοῦ ψηλοῦ
   M στοῦ πύργου τὸν ψηλότανε

The version of B2 is the most remote from the model because the demonstrative
pronoun is missing. It should be pointed out, however, that absolute superlative
adjectives like ψηλότατος are a distinctive characteristic of Chortatsis’s style,339 so
this variant should not be underestimated. B1, G and K give three different versions
which are a faithful translation of quest’alta torre, so Orbecche cannot be helpful at
this passage. M could be either a corruption of the superlative ψηλότατου or ψηλοῦ
τουνοῦ. We cannot exclude the possibility that all these variants are different
efforts by the unsatisfied poet to translate the original, B2 being probably the last
attempt which, although less faithful, seemed more satisfying.

- *Orb. V.ii. 60-1 - Erofili II*

Ed ecco venne
Una Aquila dal ciel, turbata in vista
Erofili’s dream is also a faithful rendition of its model. The ferocity of the falcon is
expressed in two versions: γεῖς λούπης θυμωμένος / μανισμένος B. Both participles
translate turbata and both of them appear in Chortatsis’s works (μανισμένος: Panoria
I 363, IV 53, Katsourbos II 66; θυμωμένος: Panoria III 102, 404, Katsourbos III 430).

7.2. The relations of Erofili with other sources

It is easier to spot some more striking verbal similarities between Erofili and other plays which have inspired specific passages, because in these cases the models are followed more closely, sometimes to a point of accurate translation.

Erofili’s dream in the Second Act, which corresponds to Orbecche’s dream in the Fifth Act (Scene ii), is preceded by a large passage where Erofili talks about the fears that torment her (II 111-136). This passage is an adaptation from Il Re Torrismondo (I 25-50): a part of it is almost a faithful translation but new details have been added.\footnote{See Manousakas 1959 for a detailed comparison.} It can help us clarify some problematic readings from the witnesses of Erofili:\footnote{For this passage see also section 4.1 of the present chapter.}

\[
e\textit{ senza lui solinga}
\]
\[
gir per via lunga e tenebrosa errando; (38-9)
\]

\textit{Senza lui} corresponds to μόνια μου from AB or δίχως του from KM, while σήμερο from G is the weakest version.

New images have also been added: the frightening forests with wild animals (II 123-4) and the image of the shipwreck and the drowning (II 133-6). The sequence of the last two images (the Ghost and the shipwreck) appears in two versions: in BGKM the shipwreck is placed after II 128 (that is, between two images which derive from \textit{Il Re Torrismondo}, the bleeding walls and the Ghost) and in A it is placed after the appearance of the Ghost (II 132; Xanthoudidis and Alexiou have followed A, so the line numbering in the modern editions represents this version). This ambiguity could have occurred from an early draft of the poet where the couplets 133-6 were written in the margin or without clear indications of where they should be placed, and the confusion passed on to the later manuscripts.\footnote{Bancroft-Marcus 1978: 105.} It is not safe to imagine that
the sequence corresponding to the model (i.e. without the interruption from the “additional” couplet) is the original and the other is a misplacing: the whole adaptation of the passage shows that Chortatsis could take liberties when working with a specific literary work and would not necessarily follow it closely.

Another passage closely inspired by a specific model is I 569-76, based on Orlando Furioso XLV 1.2.4:343

Quanto più su l’instabil ruota vedi
di Fortuna ire in alto il miser uomo,
tanto più tosto hai da vedergli i piedi
ove ora ha il capo, e far cadendo il tomo.
There exist two different versions of the passage where the only difference is the person of the verbs (2nd or 3rd singular: θωρεῖς –γδέχεσαι – στοχάζεσαι in B / θωρεῖ -
γδέχεται –στοχάζεται in AGKM). The version of B with the 2nd person is the closest to the original. The other version could be either a misunderstanding of the word division in θωρεῖ στὰ ὑψη πῶς καθίζει, which led to the adaptation of the whole passage, or a revision which would be less faithful to the model but a bit more grammatically connected with the previous lines (πρίχου δεῖ κιανεῖς τὸ τέλος νὰ παινέσει).

Some verbal similarities can be found between the choric odes of Erofili and their models. The First Choric Ode is inspired by the Third Choric Ode of Sofonisba. The text has survived in very corrupt condition in all the witnesses and the model can help to interpret some passages or confirm the value of corrections made by previous scholars (e.g. τόσά ’ν τά βρόχια τά δικά σου / γλυκιά – si dolci lacciuol).344
Apart from that, there are no variants which can be considered as equivalent and for which the model could provide guidance, with the exception of βερτόνια

343 The similarity was pointed out by Spadaro 1975. The passage has been discussed in section 6.2.1 of the present chapter.
χρυσωμένα / ἀκονισμένα Μ. Χρυσωμένα is a translation of *dorati strali*. Alexiou and Aposkiti however have preferred the version of Μ, without stating their reasons, although they mention that the other version agrees with the model.\(^{345}\) The golden arrows frequently accompany depictions of Eros and Chortatsis used this motif in *Panoria* with the same expression: οἱ σαίτες μου τούτες οἱ χρυσωμένες (V 5).

The Fourth Choric Ode is also inspired by the Second Choric Ode from *Sofonisba*, as Sathas had first remarked.\(^{346}\) The first tercets follow the first lines from the model quite faithfully and there are no divergences among the witnesses. Only IV 712 is μὲ τὴ θωριά σου in Β instead of μὲ τὴ φωτιά σου in all the others. *Sofonisba* writes *santa luce*, so φωτιά is a better translation for *light*. Moreover, θωριά appears in IV 717 so the version of Β could be inspired by that. The rest of the Ode elaborates freely on the imagery of the model (as far as the different context permits), but there are no striking verbal similarities which could help to relate a specific witness to it.

### 7.3. The Interludes and Gerusalemme Liberata

The relation of the Interludes with their model is much closer than that between *Erofili* and *Orbecche* and many more verbal similarities can be found.

- i 14 στὸ θάνατο γιὰ λόγου μας ἐδωκε τὸ παιδί του  GKM ] ἤπεψε ΑΒ
  The Italian has *il figlio diede* (IV.11. 2-3),\(^{347}\) which agrees with GKM.

- i 20 τώρα ξαναθυμίζοντας σ’ ὅλους μας καινουργιώνω GKM ] φανερώνω ΑΒ
  καινουργιώνω is the most suitable variant, not only because it agrees with the model, but mostly because it fits the sense better.

---


\(^{346}\) Sathas 1879: ξη΄-ξθ΄. See also Makris 1998 for a discussion of other possible sources and Paschalis 2011 for a broader comparison between the choric odes of *Erofili* and their models in their respective contexts.

\(^{347}\) Text quoted from Petrocchi 1966.
The model refers to poisoned waters which will intoxicate the soul:

*Ma dentro ai freddi suoi cristalli asconde*

*Di tosco estran malvagità secreta;*

*Chè un picciol sorso di sue lucide onde*

*Inebria l'alma tosto, e la fa lieta* (XIV.73. 3-6)

Φαρμακεμένα could be a more accurate translation of tosco, but this could lead to the misunderstanding that the water is poisonous. For that reason μαγεμένα is better.  
Perhaps the first version was a faithful translation and afterwards the poet changed it to a more apt expression.

The relevant passage from GL (XV 44) refers to Rinaldo’s idleness (*fra cibi, ed ozio, e scherzi, e fole*). Εὐκαιριὰ could be a translation for ozio. However, ἕξορια is mentioned elsewhere referring to Rinaldo’s seclusion and his absence from the battle (*lontano esilio*), so this version should not be considered as inferior.

The closest to GL is πλυθεῖτε in BKM: *ma pria la polve in queste acque deporre / vi piaccia* (XV. 64) and Papatriandafyllou-Theodoridi supports this variant. Alexiou and Aposkiti have preferred πιεῖτε because it is connected with the advice not to drink from the fountain, but consider both variants authentic.

The version of GKM is a translation of *me d’un tesor dotata, e di me stessa, / in moglie avrà, se in guiderdon mi chiede* (XVII 48). Moreover, ἂν εἶναι καὶ γδικιώσει με repeats the previous lines (*ἄλληι τὴν κεφαλή του χάρισμα κομμένη νὰ μοῦ δώσει*).
• iii 16 κ’ εἰς τὰ χέρια σου δεμένους ἦπεψά τοι AB ἓδωκά τοι KM ἔφερά τοι G

All three verbs are translations of GL XVII 45, e da me furo / in magnifico dono a te mandati. The closest to mandati is ἦπεψα of A and B.

• iii 20 κ’ ἐκείνους νὰ γλυτώσει GKM κι αὐτούς νὰ λεφτερώσει AB

Closer to the model is AB: in libertà gli mise (XVII 45). Alexiou and Aposkiti prefer GKM but consider this an improvement made by the poet himself.351

• iv 1-2 Μικρός, καθώς τὸ βλέπετε, στρατιῶτες μου ἀντρωμένοι
tὴ χώρα νὰ κερδέσομε κόπος μᾶς ἀπομένει ΑΒΚΜ ἀνιμένει G.

The two verbs are not synonyms, but the sense remains more or less the same: “little struggle remains for us” or “little struggle awaits us”. The closest to GL would be ἀπομένει: Fatto è il sommo de’ fatti, e poco avanza / dell’opera, e nulla del timor rimane.

Κόπος μᾶς ἀνιμένει reminds us of κ’ ἡ μάχη σ’ ἀνιμένει from ii 117.

• Interl. II 123-5 and G.L. XVI 25

Teneri sdegni, e placide e tranquille
Repulse, e cari vezzi, e liete paci,
Sorrisi, parolette, e dolci stille
Di pianto, e sospir tronchi, e molli bacj;

Γλυκὰ παραπονέματα καὶ τακτικὰ περίσσα
Κ χύλα
ζυγώματα, κι ώριότατες μαλιές κι ἀγάπες ἵσα,
Β λόγια κι ώριότατες θωριές, μάχες κι ἀγάπες
Α λόγια, γλυκότατας θωριές, μάχες κι ἀγάπες
Κ συγνώματα
Μ συγόνοντα
μεσοβγαλμένοι στεναγμοὶ, δάκρυα γλυκοχυμένα,
Γ ἄναστεναιμοὶ Γ πικροχυμένα
λόγια καὶ γέλια καὶ φιλιὰ καὶ γείλα ζαχαροζυμωμένα

The closest version to GL is the one offered by GKM.352 The version of A and B is grammatically and syntactically correct, with no logical problems, but the sense is

352 See also Alexiou & Aposkiti 1992: 43 for a word by word comparison.
quite different. In GKM, as in GL, the emphasis is placed on the tricks which combine expressions of love and tension. In A and B the tension is diminished, as \( \zetaυγόματα \) (repulse in GL) is replaced by \( \lambdaλ\gammaια \) and \( \thetaωριές \).

The comparison of the Interludes with Gerusalemme Liberata shows that most frequently GKM are closer to the Italian. However, as we mentioned previously, A and B are closer to GL in the names and titles of some heroes (Gofredos and Ubaldos, Adrastos and Tisafernos, Solimas the King of Jerusalem). Moreover, the version closer to the model is not always the most accurate, because of the different context in which the passages are adapted. That could mean that the poet first translated the Italian but later made improvements.

8. Conclusions

The first question that should be answered after the comparison of all the witnesses is whether any of them has a direct dependence on another. The examination of their shared or individual lacunas and errors shows that there are no signs of direct dependence among any of the witnesses:

- B could not have been the exemplar of any of the other witnesses, because of the absence of the First Choric Ode and the shorter version of Scene V.
- Since G is the most extended witness, none of the other manuscripts could have been its exemplar.
- The condition of the text in K and M does not allow us to suppose that any of the other witnesses would have derived from it.
- M could not have been copied from G, not only because M is shorter; even if we could suppose that these omissions happened accidentally and not because of a different tradition (as the same omissions in K suggest), G is missing three couplets from the Interludes which are found in all the other witnesses.
What remains to be answered is whether A could have been the exemplar of B or even K. The question if B could have been copied from A is not as simple to answer, because many pages containing crucial passages have been lost from A. The fact that B does not include passages found in A could be an indication, because otherwise we should suspect that Foskolos intentionally or accidentally left out some couplets and the First Choric Ode. In the case of the First Choric Ode a reasonable explanation could be that he was not satisfied with the condition of the text, and indeed the many corruptions in A could support this argument. However, A has also individual errors which are not found in B, so we cannot claim that B is directly dependent on A unless we suppose that Foskolos removed many of these errors. Finally, the couplet II 133-4 is placed in a different position in A. For the same reasons A could not have been the Carrer manuscript (if we supposed that this could have been a rare case when a printer’s copy survived).

For all these reasons, it is safe to affirm that none of the witnesses is directly dependent on another.

The common errors, the omission of small or large units of the text, the stage directions and other variant readings justify the classification of the witnesses in two groups (GKM and AB) one of which has two sub-branches (G and KM).

The group GKM is for various reasons more diverse than AB. The first reason is that if we have in mind the number of lines of each witness, the group should be divided into two subgroups: G on the one hand and KM on the other. This division, however, concerns mainly two parts of the text, Act IV Scene 6 and Act V. For the rest of the text, and if we consider other factors such as the common errors, the stage directions and the “indifferent” variants, the witnesses are quite close to each other. All three of them have common errors and also pairs of them have errors not found in the third (that is, there are common errors between G and M, G and K and
K and M), they have very similar stage directions, frequently different from those of A and B, and they have frequently different phrasing in comparison to A and B. Occasionally, however, K and less frequently M, present some affinities in phrasing with AB, so the distinction between the two groups is not completely clear-cut. Another reason that makes the group diverse is the different form of the witnesses (two editions and a manuscript) and their different origins. Many characteristics of the text they preserve are influenced by the conventions of printed editions and manuscripts, and most importantly, their linguistic character is completely different. K is an edition prepared by a non-Cretan with the clear intention to make a text understandable for a wide audience. G is an edition prepared by a Cretan, but its text is sometimes slightly influenced by the learned background of the editor, and finally M is copied in the Heptanese and although the Cretan dialectal characteristics are not consistently eliminated, the manuscript is linguistically less homogeneous than the Cretan witnesses. However, it is frequently easy to recognize which original Cretan form lies behind their linguistic alterations.

The degree of closeness of the witnesses A and B is not very easy to specify because A is missing the fifth Act, in which B presents the most differences from the other witnesses. But in the remainder of the text they are very close to each other and it is possible to treat them as representatives of the same branch of the tradition, at least for the part of the play that has survived in both of them. So the identity of the copyist of B (i.e. the playwright Foskolos) seems not to have played any role in the character of the text, as most of the changes derive from an ancestor.

A schematic representation of the relations of the witnesses could be depicted by the following diagram. It is not intended to be a proper stemma, as it does not aim to trace all the intermediate stages of the tradition, just to depict
visually the most plausible conclusions that can be drawn from the comparative analysis:

- $\varepsilon$ The original *Erofili*
- $x$ The common ancestor of all
  
  At some point the tradition is divided and significant changes in phrasing are introduced
  
  - $z$ Ancestor of G, K, M, the fullest version
  - $\psi$ Ancestor of K and M, without IV567-600, short version of V 295-324
  
  - $y$ Ancestor of A and B, shortest version of V 295-324
  - $G$ This branch has some kind of relation with K.

The interpretation of these relations, the evaluation of the different branches of the tradition and the way the editorial choices are affected by these relations will be analyzed in the next chapter.
Previous editors of *Erofili* and other scholars have already pointed out the merits or the problems of individual witnesses. From the time of the editions of Sathas and Xanthoudidis the low quality of the Kigalas edition and the Munich manuscript had been observed and they had accordingly been rejected as reliable or useful witnesses. The discovery of the Birmingham manuscript was greeted with enthusiasm as scholars realized that it could be an invaluable source for the methodology of the edition not only of *Erofili*, but of Cretan literature in general, since it was copied not just by a Cretan but also by a poet; it could therefore provide useful guidance on linguistic, metrical and stylistic issues. Indeed since then the study of the Latin-script manuscripts has shown that they are the most reliable witnesses in terms of language and style and for that reason they are used as guides for the edition of other Cretan texts as well.

The latest editors of *Erofili* and the Interludes believe that the Latin-script manuscripts are superior in all aspects because their copyists had a better sense of the language, metre and style in comparison not only to the Heptanesian copyists

---

353 Xanthoudidis 1928: μα’.  
and unskilled editors like Kigalas, but also to conscious and competent editors like Gradenigos.\textsuperscript{355} It is not clear from their phrasing if they mean that these manuscripts are better than the edition of Gradenigos in all respects, not only language and euphony; in the prologue to the most recent reprint of the edition of \textit{Erofili} the editors characterize the edition of Gradenigos as the best witness ("τη θεωρούμενη καλύτερη").\textsuperscript{356} In any case, their editorial policy is to study all the witnesses thoroughly and not to devalue any of them because of its generally lower quality (as with K and M in the case of \textit{Erofili}, the Heptanesian manuscript in the case of \textit{Erotokritos}).\textsuperscript{357} Although Sathas and Politis had remarked that Kigalas at least could be of some use for corrupted passages, the latest editors put this remark into practice and showed that indeed even the worst witnesses have sometimes preserved readings more convincing than those of the other witnesses.\textsuperscript{358}

The detailed comparison of the witnesses in the previous chapter has shown that in principle the observations of previous scholars are accurate: the two Latin-script manuscripts are very trustworthy in terms of language and versification and, together with the other Cretan witness, the edition of Gradenigos, they can be considered as the best witnesses of \textit{Erofili}, while in rare, but not negligible cases, the two “inferior” witnesses can give the solution to problematic passages.

What has not been answered clearly by the previous editors, however, is how the different branches of the tradition can be evaluated in comparison to each other and what consequences this evaluation would have for the editorial problems of \textit{Erofili}. Their evaluation is not an easy task because of complexity of their relations: it is not difficult to map out the affiliations between manuscripts or groups of

\textsuperscript{356} Alexiou & Aposkiti 2007: θ´.
\textsuperscript{357} Alexiou & Aposkiti 1992: 11.
manuscripts, but the interpretation of the way the text has been altered through the various stages of transmission is complicated by many factors:

- All the witnesses have some errors in common, but closer investigation of them is needed in order to find out if it is incontrovertible that they all originate from a common ancestor.
- Each group has its own textual problems so neither of them could be considered as superior.
- Apart from the obvious errors and the cases when it is quite safe to recognize what the original reading was and how it got altered in the other witnesses, many differences between the two groups cannot be interpreted as the kind of variation which is normal during the transmission of a text to many witnesses (e.g. simplification, contextual influence etc.); they seem to be more conscious alterations where it is not easy to distinguish between the original and the alteration. This has further implications if we take into account the relative chronology of the versions: we can assume that the longest version is the oldest, but we cannot say for sure that the shortest and probably newest version was created by a redactor (in which case the variants found there should be treated with suspicion) or by the poet during a revision (so the variants could represent his final intentions).

For all these reasons, the two groups should first be studied on their own merit, without preconceived ideas about their chronological sequence and their superiority. The analysis which follows will attempt to discuss the issue of the evaluation of the two branches of the tradition from various aspects: what is the significance of the common errors, how the omission of large units of the text can be interpreted and finally what are the linguistic, stylistic and metrical characteristics of each branch and how they can be evaluated.
1. The common errors: Indications of common ancestry?

The majority of the errors common to all the witnesses, or in all but one witness, cannot be safely attributed to a common ancestor; it is possible that some of them could have occurred independently. Such examples are:

- misinterpretation of the writing conventions: the omission of final –ν (III 122: ἄ(ν)πασι / ἄς πασι, IV 283: εἶχα(ν) κάμει / εἶχε κάμει), the ambiguous use of letters (i 16: ci / τοῆ / σ’ τοῆ), the misreading of letters or combinations of letters which look similar (II 300: alono / olono, I 204: i tossi / s’ tossi), the misunderstanding of the word division (V 183: τελειώνει, ναίσκε, 'νος κορμιοῦ τὰ πάθη / ναί, κ’ ἑνὸς κορμιοῦ / τέλειον εἶναι καὶ νοῦς κορμιοῦ)
- omission of short words (III 3: τό’ να <σ>τ’ ἄλλο, I 191: <’κ> τέτοια, ii 87 <ἀζ> λογάστε)
- misinterpretation of the syntactic structure (e.g. II 101-2 also helped by the similarity of agapis / agapes; V 108 thori / thoro; Prol. 117 fouate / fouaste).

If the errors were of this kind only, it would not be safe to say with certainty that a common ancestor was behind the extant witnesses of Erofili. But there are other examples of errors or corrupted passages which could not have occurred independently and most probably originate from a common ancestor. Small differences among the corrupt variants suggest that some of them might be results of attempts by copyists to restore a corrupt passage, or produced by different interpretations of an unintelligible exemplar. Such examples are:

- the serious textual problems of the First and Third Choric Odes (I 591-3, I 597-9, III 406-8).359
- Erofili’s dream in II 121-4, which presents various problems.360

---

359 These passages have been presented in detail in sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the previous chapter.
360 See also Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 226.
2. The longest version = the oldest version?

It is more credible to assume that the version represented by G, being the longest one, is also the oldest. The additional passage (IV 566-600) is a faithful rendering of the relevant passage from Orbecche and its style is compatible with Chortatsis’s style, so it cannot be an interpolation. The chronological sequence of the two shorter versions (as far as Act V is concerned) cannot be proven. The lines omitted in K and M on the one hand and in B on the other are different: K and M omit lines from Erofili’s part, while B from Nena’s. So the abridgements in the exemplar of B (and perhaps of A as well) were made on a version with the “full” text of the scene and the exemplar of the B version could not have been dependent on an archetype of the KM version. So, since these redactions occurred independently from each other, we cannot claim that the shorter of the two is also the later.

What is also not easy to ascertain is whether the abridgements were done by Chortatsis himself or by someone else (such as a director of a performance or a copyist). The passage IV 567-600 is almost a word-for-word translation of the relevant passage in Orbecche, and keeping in mind the otherwise free fashion in which Chortatsis works with his basic and secondary models, it would be more likely that he included this passage in the first version of Erofili and removed it later, not only because it made the Counsellor’s speech too long without adding any

361 See also Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 122.
362 See also Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 223.
arguments that had not been expressed before, but also because he wanted to be
more creative with his model. Moreover, Giraldi himself had predicted that some of
his readers might find that Malecche’s speech is unnecessarily long and stated so in
the afterword of his play, A chi legge, where he “excuses” himself for characteristics
of the play which his readers might find strange, innovative or annoying.\textsuperscript{363}
Chortatsis seems to have taken this point into account: most of Malecche’s
arguments are introduced in Erofili’s speech (Act IV, Scene 4), focusing on the clash
between daughter and father and emphasizing Erofili’s prudence. The removal of
this passage from the Counsellor’s speech could be a way not only to make his part
even shorter, but to emphasize Erofili’s personality and her strength of character,
leaving to her the main arguments in favour of Panaretos and their secret marriage.

On the contrary the other abridgement of the play in the Fifth Act does not
occur in a scene with a long monologue where one could more easily justify it. It
belongs in a quite emotional scene, where Erofili bids farewell to her Nurse, sure
that she is going to die. It is indeed their last encounter and since the audience
already knows that Panaretos is dead, dramatic irony is abundant. Moreover,
Erofili’s expression of fear is well connected with her dream in Act II. The nature of
the omissions in the two short versions of the scene is different. The couplets
omitted in K and M repeat Erofili’s fears of death:

\begin{quote}
Nένα καὶ Μάνα μου ἀκριβῆ, τάχα νὰ χωριστοῦμε;
sήμερα μιὰ τὴν ἄλλη μας τάχατες νὰ μὴ δοῦμε; (V 283-4)

Ἄλλο δὲν ἔχω νὰ σοῦ πῶ παρὰ νὰ σὲ φιλήσω,
νένα μου ἀγαπημένη μου, νὰ σ’ ἀποχαιρετήσω (V 303-4).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{363} Troppo lungo parrà forse Malecche, / Egli a sua volta lo si accorci, ch’io / Mai perciò non verrò
seco a tenzone (67-69).
The arrangement of the scene in B is quite different. The most emotional parts of Erofili’s speech, the ones which were also retained in KM, are preserved as well, and the couplet V 283-4 is also present, with an improvement in phrasing: πλιό μας νὰ μὴν ἰδούμε instead of τάχατες νὰ μὴ δούμε in G, which repeated τάχα from the previous line. What is missing is the greater part of Nena’s response, in which she promises that in the unlikely – in her opinion – event of Erofili’s death, she will not want to remain alive. Nena indeed expresses the wish to die when she sees Erofili dead; it is implied by the action of the Maids to prevent her from committing suicide (πιᾶστε τοι τὰ καημένα / χέρια νὰ μὴ σκοτώνεται, V 550-1) and she swears that she will kill herself when she arranges the burial of Panaretos (V 591-4). So there is no reason to suspect that the references to her death were removed because the poet did not want to imply that Nena would commit suicide, because this intention is mentioned again. Perhaps the point of the version of KM was to give a more prominent role to Nena, by reducing Erofili’s part, whereas in B the aim was the reverse. This passage could also have been shortened for practical reasons: the complete version of the scene requires that Erofili and Nena are walking together from Erofili’s room to meet the King and as they are approaching, the King eavesdrops on their conversation and makes comments; the person responsible for the version of B seems to have preferred to avoid parallel action, so the King remains inactive until the two women arrive at his room and see him.

These kinds of alteration to the text of the play could easily be attributed to a director or redactor of the play with a performance in mind; however, there are reasons to believe that the Fifth Act at least was not finalized by the poet, who worked on it at different periods and had different ideas. The issue of the possibility of a revision will be discussed thoroughly later.
As far as the Interludes are concerned, there are no cases of shortening of passages. The couplets missing from G, which are attested in *Gerusalemme Liberata* and seem to be necessary for the coherence of the passages where they belong, could not have been absent from an earlier version (supposedly represented by G) and added later in revisions. It is more reasonable to suppose that their absence from G is the result of a textual corruption independent of the other witnesses. So for the Interludes we cannot say that G represents an older version, distinct not only from A and B but also from K and M. What is striking in A and B, however, is that contrary to what happens in *Erofili* there are no simplifications but additions of details in the proper names and the origins of some secondary characters (Christian and Turkish warriors, King Soliman), which correspond to *Gerusalemme Liberata*. The addition of material with the help of the original model should make us consider the possibility that the poet himself revised the Interludes and added more details. If this is the case, some variants of A and B could be improvements introduced by the poet during a revision.

Since the transmission of *Erofili* and the Interludes has followed the same path and has the same origins, the possibility of improvements and additions in the Interludes by the playwright himself could throw light on the different versions of the tragedy; if the Interludes underwent revision, it is also possible that the older version of the tragedy was not the author’s final version.

3. Language

The issues which had puzzled editors of the other works of Chortatsis which have survived in linguistically more diverse witnesses are not present in *Erofili*, for which we have three Cretan witnesses in our disposal, which are consistent in their use of Cretan dialect. If Kriaras (in his edition of *Panoria*) and Politis (in the case of *Katsourbos*) were concerned about whether they should remove Heptanesian forms,
regularize the use of final -ν or impose uniformity in the use of the Cretan dialect, the editors of Εροφιλι did not face such issues because of the existence of three Cretan witnesses which gave an answer to problems of this kind. But apart from these general issues, linguistic differences in matters of detail do appear as well and sometimes it is possible to find specific kinds of linguistic variation between the two groups, as far as the linguistic idiosyncrasies of each witness permit us to draw conclusions.

The main linguistic difference between the two groups is the use of the East Cretan dialect in A and B. Apart from this, it could be argued that this group presents more dialectal characteristics than the other. A and B occasionally use the morphemes -ξω and -ξα for the formation of future and aorist, instead of-σω / -σα (ρωτήξω, ζητήξω, έστεγνώξα etc). Kigalas avoids them altogether, while G and M use them when not at the end of the verse, if their use might affect the rhyme. So G and M write ἀποκοτήσω (Ι 88), ἐστεγνῶσα (ΙΙΙ 13), ἀγγίσω (V 582), ζητήσει (ΙΙ 346 and IV 44), to rhyme with ρωτήσω, ἐδώσα, φιλήσω, χαρίσει, μιλήσει. A and B, on the contrary, have these pairs of “imperfect” rhymes: ἀποκοτήξω - ρωτήσω, ἐστεγνῶξα - ἐδώσα, φιλήσω - ἀγγίξω, ζητήξει - χαρίσει, μιλήσει - ζητήξει. None of the witnesses of Panoria presents this kind of rhyme and Katsourbas has it only once (Ι 311-12, ἀγγίξω - προικήσω). In Fortounatos as well, Foskolos uses the forms in -ξω quite frequently, but has only one imperfect rhyme (I 257-8, ρωτήξω - γροικήσω). A and B are also the only witnesses to use the consonant cluster -κτ- in verb endings (ρίκτω, δείκτω, βουηθηκτώ). These forms never appear in GKM, but appear

365 It is uncertain, however, if these rhymes where considered as imperfect at that time. Irregularities in rhyme can be found even in the most sophisticated works of the period, so perhaps the poets had in some cases different views about which rhymes were acceptable. See for example the imperfect rhymes of Erotokritos in Deliyannaki 1995: 102-5 and the few imperfect rhymes of Erophi in the rhyme-table of the play (Deliyannaki 1995-6).
occasionally in A and B (II 292, III 201, ii 77, II 121, ii122, III 58 etc). Δείχτω appears only once in one of the witnesses of Panoria (manuscript A) at III 298.

Some variation appears also in the use of older or newer words or forms of words. A and B use both the older πάσα and the newer κάθα, with the same frequency. The other witnesses on the other hand use πάσα almost exclusively, while κάθα appears sometimes in καθ’ ἕνα and καθ’ ὥρα. Κάθα / κάθε appears rarely in Panoria in comparison to πάσα, but when it does, it is attested in all the witnesses. Both πάσα and κάθα appear in Katsourbos. A and B also use the newer γδυμνός, instead of γυμνός. The more archaic form κάμνω is used in G alternately with κάνω; it is used occasionally in M and exclusively in K. On the other hand, A and B use the older relative pronoun τὸν /τὴν /τὸ more frequently than the other witnesses, and probably more frequently than the witnesses of other works of Chortatsis as well. The pronoun appears sometimes in all the witnesses of Erofili when there is no antecedent (e.g. Prol. 131, Φτωχοί, τ’ ἀρπάτε, φεύγουσι, τὰ σφίγγετε, πετοῦσι; IV 227, Τὰ δὲν κατέχει ἀφέντης μου, δὲ γνώθει ὁ δουλευτής του), but when there is an antecedent in GKM (ὁ)ποὺ is normally used instead: τὰ ἔχεις ἡ ξακουστὴ καὶ μπορεμένη χώρα AB ] ποὺ ἔχεις... (Prol. 46); κατὰ τὰ λόγια τὰ γροικῶ AB] κατὰ τὰ λόγια ποὺ γροικῶ GKM (I 394); μὰ τὴ χαρὰν τὴν ἥπαιρες Β ] μὰ τὴ χαρὰν ἀπὸ τοὺς γροικῶ GKM (IV 382); καθὼς τὰ λόγια τὰ γροικῶ ABM ] ποὺ γροικῶ GK III152. The same variation appears in Panoria: III 77 ὁ λογισμός τὸν ἔχεις D ] ἀπὸ τοὺς NA; ἐκείνο τὸ χρειάζεστε ND ] ἐκείνο ποὺ χρειάζεστε A IV 224; τὰ σημάδια τὰ γροικῶ DN ] ποὺ γροικῶ A IV 347. The pronoun appears only once in

See the Glossary in Kriaras 1975.
Katsourbos in this use (III 74, τὴν παιδωμή τὴν εἶχα). A and B also use τίς and τινάς instead of ποιός and κιανείς (I 43, IV 59, IV 350).

Apart from these variations which are frequently repeated, individual variants might also differ in terms of their dialectal or more learned registers. The more dialectal forms usually appear in AB:

- I 202 ἐξαναγιάγερνε Β ] ἐξαναγύριζε GKM
- I 220 ἐχωνε Β ] ἔκρυβε GKM
- II 154 τὸ ζιμιὸ ΑΒ ] ξαφνικά GKM
- IV 693 μᾶλλιος λογιάζω ΑΒ ] πιστεύω μάλιστα GKM
- V 106 ἐράξαν B ] ἐτρέξαν GKM
- V 154 ἀπόκεις B ] ὕστερα GKM
- V 660 πάμενε B ] πάγομεν GKM
- II 392 δύναμη ΑΒ ] μπόρεση GKM
- I 66 ἐδῶ BK ] δεπὰ GM
- I 71 ἐδῶ B ] ἐπὰ GM

The linguistic variation characteristic of the period, as well as the different dialectal origins of the witnesses of Erofili, make it difficult to evaluate the witnesses on linguistic grounds, as there is no way of knowing whether similar characteristics in two witnesses are necessarily an indication of common origin or simply a coincidence because of the common linguistic background of the scribe. Moreover, variation exists even within one witness, which shows that perhaps some features were not considered important by scribes, or even authors: this is supported by the linguistic variation in the autograph of Fortounatos, with respect to/as regards features which do not affect the versification, such as the use of σκιάς and κιάς or

---

367 It is unclear whether the use of the interrogative and indefinite pronoun τίς in texts of this period can be considered as an archaism; the nominative τίς could be considered as an archaism, but not other forms such as τινάς, τινός (Pidonia 1977: 197-9).
κάθα and πάσα. The other witnesses of the works of Chortatsis cannot be of much help in clarifying such issues. *Katsourbos* has survived only in a Heptanesian manuscript with many Cretan characteristics eliminated and *Panoria* has survived in three linguistically diverse manuscripts, so the absence of a particular dialectal characteristic from them cannot be considered as a safe indication that Chortatsis would not have used it. Finally, it would be dangerous to suppose that the most dialectal forms should always be regarded as the most original, since we do not know to what extent dialectal forms were used as a poetic idiom, or if the genre affected the linguistic register.

### 4. Style

In the majority of cases the variation we have noted between the two groups affects only a small part of the line; instances of rewriting of whole verses are very few. Thus, the two groups do not present great stylistic differences: the features which are considered as specific characteristics of Chortatsis’s style, such as the elaborate syntax, the complicated word order, the metrical variety, the frequent enjambments and the euphonic avoidance of hiatus, are present in both groups (although in the group GKM the most characteristic representative is G, as the linguistic alterations in M and K more often than not do have a significant impact on the style).\(^{368}\) This means that, although it is possible to evaluate individual variants for stylistic reasons, it is not possible to claim that one group can be considered superior to the other.

---

4.1. Syntax and word order

The variants with more complicated word order or elaborate syntax are not limited to one group of witnesses only, so in no case can we talk about a version where the style is simplified and thus less likely to be authentic. The following examples show some cases where the word order in GKM is less “natural” than in BA (i.e., word units which should normally be together are separated), or the structure is more sophisticated (preference for subordinating syntax):

- P 38: κέρδη σάν κάμουσι πολλά GM ] σάν κάμου κέρδητα πολλά B
- I 166: πιάνει στήν ἀνακάτωση συχνά τῷ νιώ ἢ ἀγάπη GM (τῶν νέων πολλά K) ] πιάνει στήν ἀνακάτωση τῷ νιῷ συχνά ἢ ἀγάπη B
- I 408: μὲ τὸ οπαθί μου ἐτέλειωνα μιάν ώρα τῇ ζωῇ μου GKM ] μιᾶν ώρα μὲ τὸ χέρι μου ἦπαιρνα τῇ ζωῇ μου AB
- II 41: σφάλμα ποτὲ δὲν ἔκαμα GKM ] σφάλμα δὲν ἔκαμα ποτὲ AB
- I 267 τόσα, ἀποῦ πλιὰ ἐπαιδεύγουμο, καὶ πλιότερη εἴχα μάχη GM ] τόσα πολλά ἐπαιδεύγουμο καὶ πλιότερη εἴχα μαχή BK
- I 136 γιὰ τὸ περίσσο πλοῦτος / καὶ κέρδος ποὺ μᾶς χάρισε G ] γιατὶ περίσσο πλοῦτος / καὶ κέρδος μᾶς ἔχαρισε ABKM
- IV 486-7 καὶ τόσα βασανίσασι τοῦτο τὸ δόλιο τόπο / ἁπὸ ὅπου κι ἄν περάσομε GKM ] κι ἀπ’ ὅπου κι ἄν περάσομε AB

Similar examples can be found in A and B:

- II 468: τύχη χαριτωμένη τῶν ἄθρωπω AB ] χαριτωμένη τύχη τῶν ἄθρωπω GKM
- III 18: καὶ κιανενὸς τὰ πάθη μου δὲν ἔδειξα AB ] δὲν ἔδειξα τὰ πάθη μου GKM
- V 410: καὶ μ’ ἐντα κύρη μοῦ ήσφαξες μαχαίρι τὴν καρδιά μου B ] μὲ τὶ μαχαίρι μοῦ ήσφαξες κύρη μου τὴν καρδιά μου GKM
- I 50: κ’ οἱ χριστιανοὶ τὰ πάσκουσι νὰ χάσου AB ] κ’ οἱ χριστιανοὶ νὰ χάσουσι τὰ πάσχου GKM
4.2. Versification

Since the majority of the variants usually concerns a small part of the line, the differences do not usually have an impact on the rhythmical patterns of the lines. The few cases where the rhythm of the line is affected and a deviation from the strict iambic scheme of the 15-syllable is observed, are not limited to one witness or one group, so again we cannot tell whether a specific branch of the tradition represents a version with greater rhythmical variety or frequent deviations from the traditional pattern. It should be noted, however, that it is not easy to define what would be a normal and what an unusual rhythmical pattern: the 15-syllable permits stresses on odd-numbered syllables, especially the first and the ninth, and even in other positions, under certain conditions. There is no comprehensive study of Chortatsis’s versification, only some comparative remarks for *Erofili, Thysia* and *Erotokritos*, based on samples from Alexiou & Aposkiti’s edition, so there is no reliable guide to his rhythmic preferences.

The most unusual rhythmical patterns which occur in the context of variation between the witnesses are one case with stress on the fifth syllable and one on the third:

- I 245: κ’ ἐλόγιασα χίλιες φορὲς νά ’βρω ἀφορμή νά μείνω GM ] πολλὲς φορὲς BK
- V 415 γιατί τόση ἐντροπῆ κ’ ἐσὺ μ’ ἐκαμες νά γνωρίσω B ] γιατί κ’ ἐσὺ τόση ἐντροπῆ G ] κ’ ἐσὺ τήν ἐντροπῆ KM

The first case is one of the examples where stress on the 5th syllable is acceptable, because it coincides with a syntactic pause and splits the hemistich in two equal

---

The second case is also justified because it is preceded by a stress, so the iambic character of the rhythm is not affected. Stress on the third or the fifth syllable appears in Chortatsis in lines where there is no difference between the witnesses or no suspicion of textual corruption (e.g. Ded. 71, Prol. 25, Prol. 55, Prol. 116).

The other cases where the rhythm is affected by the substitution of a word, change of the word order or the syntax relate to the stress on the ninth or rarely the first syllable, which are the most frequent “deviations” from the iambic pattern.

- II 245: μὰ σφάλλει ἀν εἶναι καὶ θωρεῖ πλῆσο καιρὸ νὰ τά ἵχω AGM ] πολὺ καιρὸ νὰ τά ἵχω B
- III 84 ...γλακᾶ στὸν ποταμὸ πλῆσα πεθυμισμένο G ] πολλὰ πεθυμισμένο ABKM
- ι 100 πάντα θαμμένο νὰ ὃ το B ] χάμαι θαμμένο νὰ ὃ το M ] θαμμένο πάντα νὰ ὃ το GK
- ι 374 δρόσος νὰ μὲ ποτίζει GM ] δροσὲς νὰ μὲ ποτίζει BK
- ι 437 σ’ τούτη τὴ χρεία νὰ ὃ σαι AB] στὴ χρειὰν ἐτούτη νὰ ὃ σαι GKM
- ι 552 τούτο τὸ πράμα παραμικρὸς GKM ] τὸ πράμα τούτο παραμικρὸς AB
- III 226 σ’ τούτο τὸν τρόπο πάντα B] σὲ τέτοιο τρόπο πάντα AGM
- ι 331 κ’ ἴντα πολλὰ τρομάσω B ] και πλιότερα τρομάσω GKM
- ι 35 μάχες ἐσηκωθήκασι B ] μαλλιὲς ἐσηκωθήκασι GKM

The above examples can show us that there is no witness or group of witnesses which shows a preference for stress on odd-numbered syllables, only individual variants which can appear in any of the witnesses. The choice between them on stylistic grounds is not easy; however, since it is observed that the Cretan

---

371 See Deliyannaki 1995: 30-33 on the permitted cases on stress on the 5th syllable.
373 Deliyannaki 1995: 29-33 and 213-4 (tables 2a and 2b).
poets, and especially Chortatsis, are creative with the “rules” of versification (e.g. abolition of the isometry between lines or hemistichs, tension between rhythm and meaning), we could suppose that the versions which offer rhythmical variety probably represent the poet’s preferences.

It has been observed that Chortatsis avoids hiatus not only at the caesura, where it is acceptable according to the rules of the 15-syllable verse, but also even between lines (both between the lines of a couplet and between couplets). The “exceptions” are actually stylistic devices, either because emphasis needs to be placed on a word or phrase, or because there is a strong syntactic pause. With this principle as a guide, it is sometimes easy to reject some variants which do not otherwise present problems, but in other cases, when the hiatus appears in the allowed positions or at a syntactic pause, it is not easy to reject a variant on metrical grounds only:

- I 496: λοιπὸ ἀνισῶς καὶ δὲν μπορεῖς νὰ τὴν ἀφήσεις πλιὸ σου ΒΜ ] ἀπειδῆ Α ] ἀνὲ καὶ G ἀν εἶναι καὶ K
- II 69 Κι ἐτοι ἀνισῶς καὶ πεθυμᾶς καὶ θέλεις τὴ ζωῆ μου ABKM ] ἀνὲ καὶ G
- IV 194 θώρειε ἀνὲ κ’ ἡ φύση G ] ἀνισῶς κ’ ἡ φύση ABKM

Gradenigos never uses ἀνισῶς when it is attested by other witnesses; in these cases, it is clear that ἀνὲ καὶ creates a hiatus which is avoided in the other witnesses.

- II 431 Ὡ Ἅδη καὶ τσῆ κόλασης τσῆ σκοτεινῆς GΜ ] Ὡ τ’ Ἀδη Β

The same expression appears in ii 61 as in B (ὡ τ’ Ἀδη καὶ τοῦ Κόλασης δύναμεις), where hiatus is avoided.

---

374 For the rhythmical innovations of the poets of the Cretan Renaissance, especially Kornaros and Chortatsis, see Garantoudis 2004 and Garantoudis 2006.
376 Alexiou and Aposkiti have edited as in GM.
In both cases the difference between the witnesses affects the beginning of a line which is preceded by a word ending in vowel. In the second case we can suppose that μοῦ was omitted at some point and accept GM as the authentic reading, but in the first case the two variants could not have resulted from a corruption of the same exemplar and thus we cannot reject the reading of B simply because it is a line starting with a vowel.

Two consecutive vowels in the case of an article and a substantive are not considered as hiatus, so it is not easy to reject this variant on this ground only. But the overall structure of B seems preferable because it corresponds to the previous line (μὲ τὶ μαχαίρι μ’ ἔσφαξες – μετ’ αὖτο ποὺ μοῦ βάρηκες σ’ ἔσφαξα).

This is one of the extremely rare cases when a variant from KM could possibly be authentic. If we choose this, we avoid the hiatus τροφῆ ἐγίνη, which is not justified by any rule. On the other hand, the structure in B and G is a chiasmus, and Chortatsis frequently uses such stylistic devices. Perhaps both versions are authentic and the poet was unsure which one he preferred stylistically, and so both variants remained during the transmission of the text.
This case again can be characterized as a hiatus only with a strict application of the rules, because the caesura is one of the places it is acceptable, even if Chortatsis uses it rarely.

- ii 93 ἀς πάμενε ἀπάνω τως AB ] πάγομεν KM πηαίνομεν G

In this case the hiatus in A and B cannot be justified for any reason.

4.3. Relation to similar passages by Chortatsis

Another way to evaluate some variants would be their repetition in other parts of the play or in other works by Chortatsis, especially if they are attested by all the witnesses. This criterion can be used as an indication that a variant may be authentic but not that it definitely is or is not authentic:

- Πρός τὸν ἐκλαμπρότατον καὶ ύψηλότατον B
eυγενέστατον καὶ ύψηλότατον K
eυγενέστατον καὶ έξοχώτατον G

Ded. 53 παρακαλὼ τὸ λοιπονίς τὴν ύψηλότητά σου BK ] έξοχότητά σου G

Only Panoria has survived with a Dedication, attested by one witness only, where Viaros is addressed as ἐκλαμπρότατος καὶ εὐγενέστατος. Ἐκ λαμπρότατος is also used by Foskolos in the Dedication of Fortounatos (πρὸς τὸν ἐκλαμπρότατον καὶ φωτερότατον).

- Ι2 τὴ δοξεμένη μου καρδιά (B only)] τὴν πληγωμένη μου καρδιά GKM

Π 118 δοξεμένη μου καρδιά B βαρεμένη μου καρδιά AGKM

All participles appear in Chortatsis in similar contexts: τὴ δόλια μου καρδιά τὴ δοξεμένη (Panoria ΙΙ 340); ἡ καρδιά νὰ γιάν' ἡ δοξεμένη (Panoria ΙΙ 374); τὴν καθεμένη μου καρδιά τὴν πληγωμένη (Panoria Ι 332); μιὰ καρδιὰ τοῦ πόθου πληγωμένη (Panoria V 225), τοῦ πόθου οἱ βαρεμένοι (Panoria ΙΙ 522).

- Ι 302 πόθου φωτιὰ βαστοῦσι B ] γρικοῦσι GKM
Both verbs are used by Chortatsis to express sentiments: τόση φωτιὰ στὰ σωθικὰ βαστῶ συναφομάς του (Panoria V 177); γροικῶ στὸ στῆθος μου καμίνιν ἄφτωμένο (Panoria I 3); μεγάλην ἀναγάλλιαση μέσα γροικὰ ἡ καρδιά μου (Katsourbos III 207).

I 507-8 καλότατα γνωρίζω... σ’ ἐσένα ἐλπίζω BGKM ] καλότατα κατέχω ... ἐσέναν ἔχω A

The rhyme κατέχω - ἔχω is one of the most frequent rhyme pairs in Chortatsis, but the rhyme γνωρίζω - ἐλπίζω is also attested (Katsourbos III 125-6, 427-8).

II 152 μανισμένος Β θυμωμένος AGKM

Both words appear in Panoria (μανισμένος: I 363, IV 53; θυμωμένος: III 102, 404), and in Katsourbos (μανισμένος II 66, θυμωμένος III 430). Περίσσα θυμωμένος appears in Erofili in IV 85.

μανισμένος AB ] μοιρολογάται GKM

Moirologouμαι appears only once in Erofili (V 546), so does paraponoμαι (V 465); paraponoμαι appears also in Panoria (I 30, II 392 etc).

I 408 μιὰν ὧρα μὲ τὸ χέρι μου ἡπαίρεινα τῇ ζωῇ μου AB ] μὲ τὸ σπαθὶ μου ἔτελειονα μιὰν ὧρα τῇ ζωῇ μου GKM

‘Ἡπαίρεινα τῇ ζωῇ μου is also found in Panoria (III 5), but in a passage where the context resembles the first hemistich of GKM: μὲ τὸ σπαθὶ του / ἐδῶ στῇ βρύσῃ σήμερο ἡπαίρειν τῇ ζωῇ του.

Passages with similar phrasing, as we have seen, can sometimes facilitate the choice between variants, but there is no indication that any of the families of the witnesses is closer to the poet’s diction.

4.4. Rare words

The use of rare words or expressions can also be a criterion for evaluating the witnesses: an uncommon expression is more likely to be substituted by a more
widely used one. If a rare word is attested by any of the other works by Chortatsis, it is also more likely to be authentic.

- I 129 τὰ ξύλα, τὸ νερό, ἀσβέστης καὶ τὸ χῶμα Β ] οἱ πέτρες καὶ τὸ χῶμα GKM.

'Ασβέστης is a word very infrequent in Cretan literature: according to the dictionary of Kriaras it appears only in these three witnesses of Erotokritos, and the other instances of the word are from earlier texts. From this aspect, it could be considered as the lectio difficilior. The context in which the word appears in Erotokritos is very similar: ἀσβέστη oὐδὲ χῶμα.

- Prol. 10 σκληροκάρδη ΒΚ ] σκυλοκάρδη GM

V 12 σκληροκάρδοι ΒΚΜ ] σκυλοκάρδοι G

V 105 σκληροκάρδοι ΒΚ ] σκυλοκάρδοι GM

V 223 σκληροκάρδη ΒΚΜ ] σκυλοκάρδη G

Σκυλοκάρδης is not found in any other text in Cretan literature and is attested only in the dictionary of Somavera in the form of σκυλόκαρδος, so it can be considered as lectio difficilior. Σκληροκάρδης is used in Panoria (V 189) and appears in other texts as well (Zinon, Prol. 124, Kritikos Polemos by Bounialis, 357.11 and 513, 6). The two words would present an optical similarity when written in the Latin alphabet: schilocardhis – scglirocardhis so a misunderstanding could have occurred independently in all the witnesses.

- II 361 τὰ κάλλη ΑΒ ] τὰ ἤθη GKM. Ἔθη is used by Chortatsis in Panoria with the meaning of the external appearance, but generally this use seems to be rare (attested once in Rodolinos). In view of this, it can be considered as the lectio difficilior.

- I 392 ἀναχασκίζω ΑΒΜ ] θὲ ν’ ἀρχινήσω GK .

Ἀναχασκίζω is lectio difficilior in comparison to ἀρχινήσω.

---

5. Conclusions

The conclusion from the examination of the relations and the evaluation of the witnesses of *Erofili* is that no specific witness or family of witnesses can be considered as superior, although individual variants can be preferred against the others for various reasons. That leaves the future editors of the play with a wide range of editorial possibilities which they can follow. The discussion of editorial issues will be the subject of the next chapter, which will deal with the previous editions of the play and the theoretical and practical problems future editors have to face.
Before discussing the practical and methodological problems of editing *Erofili*, which arise from the previous analysis, it is necessary to present the previous scholarly editions and discuss the way other editors (Xanthoudidis, Alexiou & Aposkiti and Bancroft-Marcus) have dealt with the complicated tradition of the play. This will be the subject of the first section of this part. The second section will deal with historical facts and theoretical considerations about the nature of the production and transmission of Cretan Literature, and dramatic works in particular, which should play an important role in any editorial decisions, and the third section will discuss the positive and negative aspects of various editorial approaches and will end with some suggestions.

1. Presentation of previous editions

1.1. Xanthoudidis

The edition of Xanthoudidis was the first scholarly edition of the play and was based on all the material available at the time. The editor follows the two witnesses he considers more trustworthy: principally the edition of Gradenigos and secondly the Athens manuscript. The Munich manuscript is used in a few cases to restore some
passages, and the edition of Kigalas is not taken into account at all. Uniformity is imposed on the use of the West Cretan dialect and learned forms of the printed edition, which are not considered to be genuine, are removed. The apparatus of the edition includes divergences from the edition of Sathas, even if they concern only slight linguistic differences (e.g. κιανεῖς / κανεῖς, χρουσός / χρυσός etc), and the rejected variants of the other witnesses.

Xanthoudidis died before the printing of the text was complete, so some inconsistencies found in the apparatus could be due to the fact that the edition needed further proofreading; sometimes interesting variants are ignored, while obvious errors are mentioned. For example in I 228 the variant μετὰ σοῦ of M and A (instead of μὲ σένα in GK) appears in the apparatus as a reading of M only; in II 136, the editor follows A (γὴ στὰ χαράκια πῶς κτυπῶ) but does not mention πῶς σκορπῶ of G, although he mentions ἀποσκορπῶ of K and M.

As far as the general condition of the text is concerned, the editor has cleansed the text of most of the corrupted passages. This is an important task, since Xanthoudidis was not aware of B, which could have solved some textual problems. Most of the emendations he introduced in the text were also presented in a previous publication, for example I 216, ἀπὸ λόγου τοῦ instead of ὀγιὰ λόγου τοῦ, III 122, στὸν Ἅδη ἂν πάσι instead of πάσι / ἀς πάσι, V 108 θωρῶ νὰ βγάλει instead of θωρεῖ νὰ βγάλει. Some of his emendations are confirmed by the testimony of B and K, of which he was not aware:

- I 190 τέτοια σκλαβία νὰ λυτρωθεῖ. The editor corrects the passage to 'κ τέτοια σκλαβία, a variant supported by K.

378 Xanthoudidis 1928: μά.
379 Xanthoudidis 1928: μή.
380 Xanthoudidis 1921.
381 See section 4 of Chapter 2 for these passages.
• III 89 μὰ πρίχου σώσει ὁ βασιλιὸς. Xanthoudidis corrects to σώσει, which is confirmed by B and K.

• IV 518 τὸ πῶς ποτὲ μὲ δύναμη νὰ πάρουν ἐμποροῦσα. The passage is corrected to δὲν μποροῦσα, which is supported by K.

An examination of the editor’s choices shows that he relies mainly on the edition of Gradenigos, while the Athens manuscript is used when there is an obvious problem in Gradenigos or if it preserves a variant which is supported by other witnesses. Some interesting variants from A are completely ignored: in I 443 the editor prefers the variant ἄδικη of GKM, instead of ἀντίδικη of A, although the adjective ἀντίδικος is used very frequently by Chortatsis, and he does not mention the variant of A in the apparatus; the same happens in II 114, where the reading στὸν Ἁδη μὲ βάνουσι, supported also by K and M, instead of στὸν Ἀδη μὲ βασανίζου of G, is not included in the apparatus. Of course it should be noted that Xanthoudidis’s mistrust of A is justified, given the incomplete state of the manuscript and the fact that the additional evidence from B, which usually agrees with A, was missing.

Not taking K into account at all was not the right approach, as the editor could have avoided a few corruptions; the same can be said about M: although its variants are mentioned in the apparatus, they are not taken into account in cases when they could offer a solution. For example in II 121, K is the only witness which writes πῶς σ’ μιὰ σκοτεινιασμένη (apart from B), a variant which could have been useful for Xanthoudidis. In II 101, the reading of M το’ ἀγάπης το’ ἀπρεπες could be used as a clue for emending the whole passage (το’ ἀγάπες το’ ἀπρεπες τοι συντροφιάζου).

Other deficiencies of this edition have already been mentioned by scholars. The editor’s preference for the Western dialect frequently distorts the rhyme (e.g. I 501-2, περίσσια - ἐχαρίσα, II 135, βουλήσω – πλήσιο, IV 97-8, παρηγορήσω –
περίσσιο). Xanthoudidis is not concerned with euphony, so many hiatuses which could be easily avoided with the use of final –n are found, and many final or initial vowels are elided in order to avoid synizesis. A few characteristic examples of hiatuses which could be easily avoided and of overuse of elision are the following:

- καὶ πάλ’ ἐκεῖ μποροῦμε (I 512)
- Πανάρετ’ ἄν ἦ-δυι σου (I 73)
- φόβ’ ἄκαροι ’n αὐτοίνοι (II 137)
- κι ώσαν ἐμένα ὁρίζε (III 283)
- ἐκεῖνο, ἅποι σοῦ φανῆ καὶ πρέπει στὸ παιδί σου (V 239)

Apart from these problems, the quality of this edition on the whole is generally good, especially if we consider the standards of the time and the fact that the editor did not have all the textual material in his disposal.

1.2. Alexiou and Aposkiti

Alexiou and Aposkiti present an eclectic text, using the testimony of all the witnesses, when they can be useful for the restoration of a passage. Their editorial principles are not very clear, though, as regards the way they evaluate the best witnesses: they characterize G as the editio optima and B as codex optimus, but they do not state clearly if they give priority to one of them. The only hint they give is that they base themselves on a critical comparison of the Xanthoudidis edition and the Birmingham manuscript. They use the stage directions of B, but they do not take into account the omission or addition of lines in B. Their editorial principles are more clearly presented in the edition of the Interludes, where they insist on the

---

382 Bancroft-Marcus 1980: 19; Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 15
383 Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 14; see also Alexiou 1971 for Xanthoudidis’s edition of Erotokritos, where similar characteristics are found.
importance of the eclectic use of witnesses, because it would be wrong to rely solely on G or the two Cretan manuscripts. These observations concern mainly semantic variants, because the editors clearly insist on the superiority of the Latin-script manuscripts as far as language and versification are concerned. The methodology of the editors concerning language and style is also not extensively discussed, but the methodological principles of Alexiou have been presented clearly in other publications about Cretan texts and in the much more detailed introduction to the edition of Erotokritos: standardization of the basic characteristics of the Cretan dialect in morphology and phonology, respect for the variation between Eastern and Western dialect when the rhyme is affected, great concern for the avoidance of hiatus with the restoration of final –ν.

This edition has been greeted positively by scholars as far as the final result is concerned, and no objections have been raised about the eclectic editing and the treatment of language and versification. However, it has been pointed out that the richness of the textual material of Erofili demands a more detailed presentation of the variant readings of the witnesses and perhaps a diplomatic edition of some of them (particularly the Birmingham manuscript because it was copied by Foskolos). The form of the edition and the replacement of the apparatus with a commentary have also puzzled critics; some of them are reluctant to characterize the edition as critical and describe it as «φιλολογική» (“philological”). The first editor has defended his practice of both eclectic editing and not providing a detailed apparatus, explaining that eclectic editing is the only rational approach to texts

---

with a rich and complicated tradition and that an apparatus is inadequate for displaying the variety of the tradition.\textsuperscript{391}

The merits and limitations of the approach of the editors will be discussed in detail in the following section. What should be pointed out at this point, is that the editors have set clear aims and have explained the rationale of their approach; so, irrespective of whether one agrees or disagrees with the methodology of the edition, the fact is that the result fulfils the editors’ main goal, which was to present a text free of corruptions and to enable the readers (not only scholars), to appreciate and enjoy the literary qualities of the play.

1.3. Bancroft-Marcus

Rosemary Bancroft-Marcus has published \textit{Erofili} together with the other plays by Chortatsis and \textit{Stathis}, in parallel with an English translation. The volume includes texts and translations only, accompanied by a brief preface. The introduction, which will include a discussion of the textual tradition, and the critical apparatus, will appear in a separate volume.

The editor has presented her editorial principles in previous papers.\textsuperscript{392} Her main point is that scholars should concentrate on rhythm, euphony and style. She considers synizesis and avoidance of hiatus most important factors. Moreover, emphasis is placed on guiding the reader on the rhythmical features of the text, with the use of an adapted form of the monotonic system, called phonotonic: accents are not used on syllables which are not stressed in the metrical context.\textsuperscript{393} This is an interesting proposal against the limitations of both monotonic and polytonic accentuation in texts of the period, but results in a very rigid and normalistic approach. Rhythmical uniformity is imposed and it is forgotten that the

\textsuperscript{392} Bancroft-Marcus 1980a; Bancroft-Marcus 1987.
\textsuperscript{393} Bancroft-Marcus 2013: xiv-xvii.
plays are meant to be performed and the rhythm can be affected by various factors, such as speed of utterance or intonation, and not only the metrical pattern. Since the metrical character of Chortatsis’s works is based on the interplay and tension between meaning and rhythm, an editor cannot claim that the readers can be guided on how the text should be read.

As far as the evaluation of variants is concerned, not much is said in the preface about that, but it is clear that an eclectic approach is used.394 The editor supports the idea of revisions by the poet during various stages of the composition of the play, so we must await the publication of the second volume in order to find out how this assumption is taken into account in the edition. What can be said for sure is that the editor is intervening not only in matters of language and versification, but also in other ways, such as the transposition of lines: the beginning of the First Act (I 1-4) is placed after I 6 and the second appearance of the Ghost of the dead King (V 645-648) is moved at the end of the play (after V 674). Without knowing the editorial principles which are followed, it is not possible to evaluate the choice of individual variants and other interventions, so we cannot say more about the edition until the appearance of the second volume.

2. Theoretical and methodological considerations
The state of our knowledge about Cretan literature does not allow us to have a full understanding of the mechanisms of the production, performance and written distribution of the plays, that would help us interpret the textual problems of the works which have survived. In the case of dramatic works especially, the situation gets more complicated because, if they were actually performed, the performances perhaps demanded some alterations which could have been introduced not only by the author, but also by other persons involved in the staging. So if we want to

394 Bancroft-Marcus 2013: xvii.
interpret the relations of the witnesses of *Erofili* and to decide which editorial method would be the most appropriate, we have to take into account a wide range of possibilities that would have affected the transmission of the play. The issues discussed below will be 1. The limitations of genealogical approaches, 2. The possibility of revision by the author, and 3. The specific textual problems of dramatic texts.

2.1. *The limitations of genealogical approaches*

The possibility of horizontal transmission has been one of the main arguments against stemmatics, because the most traditional approaches to this method did not take into account the possibility of “contamination”, or did not consider it as something normal. More recent presentations of the stemmatic method regarding classical texts have broadened their perspective, especially after Pasquali’s critique of Maas, and examine contamination as a normal occurrence.

In the case of *Erofili* the possibility of contamination could be supported by the fact that sometimes Kigalas’s edition and, more rarely, the Munich manuscript agree with the group AB, although they usually show more affiliations with G.

If we were to look at the extant witnesses of the play for evidence of contamination, we could find some indications in the Birmingham manuscript that Foskolos used multiple sources during the copying of the play. The manuscript contains some interlinear alterations in Foskolos’s hand, which not only correct obvious errors, but introduce new variants. It is possible that these variants

395 Cf. the introduction by Maas in *Textkritik*, where he states that his analysis presupposes that the scribes have not conflated exemplars (Maas 1958: 3) and his concluding remark that “no remedy has been found against contamination” (Maas 1975: 49).
396 Pasquali 1974.
398 See section 4.1 of Chapter one for details.
originated from a second manuscript, with which Foskolos collated his exemplar. Further evidence for the fact that Foskolos had access to a second manuscript of *Erofili* could be the fact that the Fourth Choric Ode seems to have been added later, as it does not fit in the space between the end of the Fourth Act and the beginning of the fifth, and is written in two columns. This indicates that it was copied later, probably from another source.\(^{399}\)

Moreover, since we have one high quality edition prepared by a skilful editor, it is not impossible that Gradenigos used more than one witness. This was the common practice of the Italian printers of the period and some Greek printers advertised it as an established practice for their editions as well, as did, for example, the publisher of *Erotokritos*.\(^{400}\) Gradenigos does not give any information about his sources and his editorial method. As we have seen, it is improbable that he used the previous edition in order to amend his own source, but whether he did in fact collate several manuscripts will remain a hypothesis which cannot be proven.

Another point, which was again raised by Pasquali against the stemmatic method, was that authorial variants might have survived in various witnesses.\(^{401}\) This will lead us to the next issue of the discussion, which is the possibility of revisions by the author.

---

\(^{399}\) See previously, section 4.1 of the first chapter.

\(^{400}\) «Δὲν ἠξεύρω, μὲ ὅσαις ἑπιμέλειαις καὶ κόπους, ὁποῦ ἔγιναν εἰς πολλὰ καὶ διάφορα χειρόγραφα τοῦ Ἐρωτοκρίτου, εἰς τὰ ὁποῖα ἀπὸ ἀμάθειαν τινῶν ἀντιγραφέων εὑρίσκονται ἀπειρὰ σφάλματα, ἀλλοίωσες, παραλλαγαῖς, καὶ διαφθοραῖς σχεδὸν ἀκατάληπτας, ἂν ἔτυχε νὰ εὔγῃ τὸ παρὸν ἀρκετὰ διορθωμένον». See Kaklamanis 2001: 129-138 about the practices of the editors of Greek texts of the period and Richardson 1994 about Italian editors in general.

\(^{401}\) Pasquali 1974: xix.
2.2. **Authorial variants**

It is not unknown for an author to work on his text for a long period of time without producing a final version, or to revise it after the initial composition. Then both the early and late versions could circulate in parallel, or the draft papers containing signs of revision could have survived and have been used as exemplars by copyists or printers. In this case we should take into account the possibility that copyists of manuscripts with parallel authoritative versions (with marginal or interlinear corrections and/or additions) could have become confused and copied both versions, or chosen indiscriminately between the old and new versions, resulting in “mixed” copies.

Modern editors of works of Cretan Literature accept the possibility that the textual diversity of works which have survived in more than one witness might be due to revisions by the poet himself, although the matter has not been discussed thoroughly and its editorial implications have not yet been taken into account. This possibility was also mentioned by Xanthoudidis about *Erotokritos* and accepted by Alexiou, but neither of them elaborated further on this matter and whether the witnesses of the text could be classified according to this possibility. Alexiou mentions in his edition some couplets which appear in only one of the witnesses and repeat something that was mentioned previously, and cannot be considered as interpolations on the grounds of their stylistic quality. They could be, according to him, alternative variants originating from the poet himself, which were introduced in the text in some witnesses, while in others only one of them was accepted.

---

402 See for example Pasquali 1974: 397-465 for ancient Greek and Latin and medieval Italian examples. See also Cherchi 1995: 447-451 for examples from Italian literature contemporary to Chortatsis.
403 Xanthoudidis 1915: 420.
404 Alexiou 1980: ν´.
405 Alexiou 1980: ν´.
Alexiou and Aposkiti recognize the possibility that some changes might stem from the poet himself. They mention this especially for the abridgements in the 4th and 5th Acts, which could be attributed to the poet himself or to someone who prepared the text for a performance. They also mention that some variants could originate from alternative versions by the poet, which were introduced in some branches of the tradition but not in others. However, they do not elaborate further on this matter, and it does not affect the methodology of their edition. Rarely in the commentary are these kinds of variants mentioned. The Introduction to the edition of the Interludes, in which the chapters about the witnesses and the editorial method are more extensive, makes a more detailed mention of this matter, this time in the main text and not in a footnote, as in the edition of Erofili. They point out that it is not always easy to distinguish between some variants and determine which was the first and which was the final one, and they suggest that a safer criterion would be to choose the more euphonic or the one which is supported by similar passages.

2.2.1. Revision in Chortatsis’s plays

The subject of revisions in works by Chortatsis has been discussed in detail only by Bancroft-Marcus, who suggests that Chortatsis’s plays should not be considered as works completed in a specific time frame, but as works which evolved over a period of time, being revised or rearranged for different performances. She has suggested various phases of reworking of the plays with the help of passages which can be interpreted as cryptic references to contemporary events. She has also identified some passages in Panoria and Erofili where the textual divergences among

---

406Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988: 19
their witnesses can be interpreted as revisions by the poet. Additionally, she has interpreted the two Prologues of *Panoria* as two genuine pieces written for different performances, based on a usual practice of 16th- and 17th-century playwrights. She believes that the Prologue of Joy and the Dedication to Viaros were written when the poet completed a revised version of the play, now represented by manuscript D, which presents a higher artistic quality.

The idea of a revision has been also suggested by Kaklamanis with regard to *Katsourbos*: Kaklamanis dates the first version of the comedy in the years 1581-2, based on the reference to Baldassare Rangone, the head of the Venetian army in Crete, who died in 1581, on the assumption that a comedy refers to current events, and it would be unlikely to refer many years after his death to a Venetian officer whose stay in Crete was limited and his achievements minimal. The reference to Michael the Brave, which was used as an argument to date the comedy to the time of his conflict against the Turks (1595-1601), could, according to Kaklamanis, have been added in a subsequent reworking of the play by the poet. Of course in the case of *Katsourbos* it is not easy to discuss the possibility of revisions because the play has survived in one manuscript only, with the exception of some comic scenes which were used as Interludes for *Panoria* and the *Tragedia tou Agiou Dimitriou*.

The autograph of *Fortounatos* can give us an idea of what an autograph with revisions by the author could look like. The text is complete and is neatly copied, so it cannot be an early stage draft, but it is not a finalized work either: the play contains alterations written between the lines or additional couplets written in the

---

412 Politis 1964: ηγ.κ.’.
414 See Politis 1964: οε’ for the Interludes of *Panoria* and Panagiotakis & Puchner 2000: 9-10 and 274-312 for *Tragedia*. See also Markomichelaki 1999-2000 for a comparison of the three versions of these scenes.
margin, and the first 10 lines of the First Act are deleted and written again between the lines with many differences. Moreover, a space is left blank for the name of a character which was not decided at the time Foskolos was writing the manuscript.\footnote{For a detailed description see Vincent 1974: 74.} Since this manuscript has survived in such a condition, it is not impossible to assume that something similar could have happened with the plays of Chortatsis.

2.2.2. The possibility of revisions in Erofili

When discussing the relations among the witnesses we mentioned some examples where we can suppose that the textual divergences could be signs of authorial revisions.

First of all, the abridgements of the Fourth and the Fifth Act (IV 567-600 and V 285-318). The omission of these passages is deliberate, as it does not create any gaps in the sense, and it is very possible that Chortatsis himself was responsible.

The passage V 244-56 seems to have undergone different stages of reworking, as its condition in various witnesses indicates. The couplet V 251-2 appears twice in G, after V 244 and after V 250. In B it is placed after V 244, while in K and M the two couplets 253-6 are missing completely.\footnote{See sections 3.1 and 3.2 of Chapter Two and section 2 of Chapter Three for more details.} This could mean that two possible positions of the couplet were given in authorial drafts and later copyists either copied both of them, as in the case of the ancestor of G, or chose one version (the ancestor of B).\footnote{See also Bancroft-Marcus 1978: 109, where this passage is discussed among other indications for authorial revisions.}

The last scenes of the play, with the confused speech attributions and the two choruses, as well as the final stage direction in G (that the King is carried away), which contradicts the previous dialogue (that he should be left there to be eaten by
the dogs), could be considered as an example of parts of the play which had not been given a final version by the poet. The confusing and contradictory stage directions and speech attributions could be the result of draft manuscripts or manuscripts with many corrections which were not understood by copyists.

Another example of textual divergences which could be attributed to the author appears in the Third Interlude, where in G, K and M three anonymous Turkish soldiers (στρατηγοί Τούρκοι) take part in the action, while in A and B there are only two, Adrastos and Tisafernos, following Gerusalemme Liberata more closely.

An indication of the existence of manuscripts with interlinear or marginal alterations which could be authorial are passages which look as if two different variants were merged:

1. I 69-70
   δὲν ἔν' καθὼς θωρῶ κιανεὶς καὶ νὰ μηδὲ τὸ ξάζει Β1 (second hemistich deleted)
   δὲν ἔν' καθὼς θωρῶ κιανεὶς ἴσα του νὰ τὸ ξάζει Β2 (written over the deleted passage, by Foskolos’s hand)
   δὲν εἶν' τιμή καθὼς θωρῶ καὶ νὰ μηδὲ τὴν ξάζει G

   Version B1 is a combination of the first half of B2 and the second half of G, which does not make sense.

2. III 78
   μονάχας νὰ σὲ δοὺσι / τὰ μάτια μου τοῆ ταπεινῆς, νὰ παρηγορηθοῦσι BA
   μονάχας νὰ σὲ δοὺσι / τὰ μάτια μου, τα πάθη μου νὰ παραλαφφωθοῦσι KM
   μονάχας νὰ σὲ δοὺσι / τα μάτια μου τοῆ ταπεινῆς, νὰ παραλαφφωθοῦσι G

   The version of G is a sentence which combines the verb of KM with subject of BA.

---

418 The scedne is presented in detail in section 5.1.3 of Chapter Two.
419 See previously, section 2 of Chapter Three.
Finally, another feature of the tradition which could be indication of authorial variants is the appearance of sets of words with similar meaning or use which are interchanged in the witnesses with no specific pattern:

- γνωρίσω / γνωρισμένος – γροικήσω / γροικημένος
  I 136 γροικήσεις BKG - γνωρίσεις M
  II 23 γροικημένο BKG - γνωρισμένο M
  II 392 ἐγροικῆσα B - ἐγνωρίσα A KGM
  IV 275 γνωρίσεις BAK - γροικήσεις G
  V 166 ἐγροικῆσα BKG - ἐγνωρίσαν M
  V 345 γνωρίσει B – γροικήσει GKM
  V 490 γνωρίσω B – γροικήσω GKM

- σφάλμα – πράμα – κρίμα
  I 134 σφάλμα B – πράμα K
  I 434 σφάλμα AB – πράμα GKM
  I 461 ἀπόφασις ABK – ἀπόφασις GM
  II 167 σφάλμα AB – πράμα GKM
  II 261, IV 69 σφάλμα AB – κρίμα GKM
  IV 146 κρίμα BKGGM - σφάλμα Α
  IV 206 κρίμα ABGM - πράμα K

- ἀπόφαση- ἀπόκριση
  II 304 ἀπόφαση BG - ἀπόκρισις AKM
  II 406 ἀπόφαση AB - ἀπόκρισις GKM

- γεναμένο – καμωμένο
  I 432 καμωμένο ΑΒ – γεναμένο GKM
  IV 186 καμωμένα ABKGM2 - γεναμένα M1
The most interesting thing is that in some cases a word appears in place of another when it does not fit in the context:

- ἀπόφαση and ἀπόκριση in II 406 can both be used (στέκου γιὰ τὴν ἀπόφαση / ἀπόκριση τὴν ἑδική μου τῶρα), while in II 304 only ἀπόκριση is correct (μὰ πάγω τὴν ἀπόκριση ἄποι ἕπες νὰ τοῦ δώσω).
- IV 186 ἀνε καὶ πρέπει μου καλὰ τὰ μοῦ ὑει καμωμένα ΑΒΓΚΜ2 ] γεναμένα M1
- I 134 τὸ ἀνέ καὶ πρέπει μου καλὰ τὰ μοῦ ὑει καμωμένα ΑΒΓΚΜ2 ] γεναμένα M1
- IV 205-6 νὰ σκεπάξουσι .. ἀνέ καὶ πρέπει μου καλὰ τὰ μοῦ 'χει καμωμένα ΑΒΓΚΜ2 ] γεναμένα M1
- IV 267 μὲ δίχως κρίμα χει καμωμένα ΑΒΚ ] μὲ δίχως πόνο ΑΒΚ μὲ δίχως πόνο ΑΒΚ μὲ δίχως πόνο ΑΒΚ

The meaning of ἀφάλμα and πράγμα is quite different. They can both refer to acts or events, but πράγμα does not qualify it, while αφάλμα expresses a judgement (μ’ ἀπεὶς τὸ πράγμα ἐγίνηκε in GKM, I 434 and II 167, τὰ πράγματα τοῦ πόθου I 461 ΑΒΚ; however, τὸ ἀφάλμα βλέπω σὰ γενῆ in Panoria V 223). Κρίμα is a more severe characterization than ἀφάλμα.420

An explanation for this could be that in some early manuscripts these words were often substituted for each other, perhaps because Chortatsis was indecisive in his autographs, and later copyists knew that they could be used interchangeably in similar contexts, so they were sometimes confused and used one word instead of another, even in cases where the context would not permit their use.

The possible existence of authorial variants is closely related to the problem of the final intention; in the case of dramatic works this is complicated by the fact that the text of a play could also be influenced by other people involved in the staging. The particular editorial problems of dramatic works will be discussed in the next section.

---

420 The theme of “error” plays a significant part in the plot of Ερόφιλος as well as other works of Cretan Literature (Rodosthenous 2006: 96-116; 104-8 about Ερόφιλος). It seems that αφάλμα and φταίσιμο are used as characterizations of the protagonist’s acts, while Κρίμα has more moral connotations (Rodosthenous 2006: 104).
2.3. The editorial problems of dramatic works

The editing of dramatic texts, irrespective of the period from which a play comes, has to deal with the specific nature of the genre: a dramatic work is not only meant to be printed or copied and read, but it is also meant to be performed. Theatrical practice shows that a work is not usually complete, unless it has undergone some adaptation for the needs of the performance, if the author is collaborating with the director. There have been discussions about the issue of the final authorial intention related to the possibility that the author made alterations to the play because they were needed for the theatrical praxis and it has been pointed out that, if the author was involved in the staging and therefore authorized any kind of revisions, these should be considered as authoritative, since he made them himself, or at least accepted them. Of course, if we don’t know the exact nature of the involvement of the author in the staging, the limits between authoritative and non-authoritative alterations are obscure. The plays of Cretan literature are such a case, because no concrete historical evidence exists about any performance of them.

Any suppositions about the theatrical use of the Cretan plays remain hypotheses, because the available information about the theatrical activity in Crete is not adequate, as we saw in the Introduction. In any case, if we accept that some kinds of performances did take place, we do not know who organized them, if the playwrights were directly involved, or how many other persons were involved in the staging (patrons, directors, actors etc.) and would probably require copies of the play, or parts thereof, or might demand alterations of some kind. A performance would require a number of manuscripts, which would derive from an authoritative

---


422 See previously, pp. 1-2.
text if the playwright was involved in the staging. Additionally, judging by Papadopoulos Komninos’s information, *Erofili* continued to be performed many years after the death of the author, so it is possible that the organizers of these performances would intervene in the text and adapt it according to their own taste or the technical and financial resources at their disposal. The comedy *Stathis*, which has survived in three acts and not in five acts like the other contemporary Cretan plays, and also presents some gaps in the plot, is a revealing example of how a play could be altered for the needs of performances. 423

2.3.1 Performance-related adaptations in *Erofili*

In the case of *Erofili*, the existence of different sets of stage directions (especially in the Interludes where the differences between the groups AB and GKM can be seen more clearly) may be connected to different performances. As far as the main text is concerned, we do not have a thorough-going adaptation, but some characteristics of the transmission of *Erofili* could be indications of small-scale cuts for the needs of performances. The main examples, which have been discussed extensively previously, are the abridgements of Act IV 567-600 and Act V, 285-318. The first abridgement could serve only to avoid repetition and to shorten a long speech, while the second adaptations could serve practical needs (the problem of parallel actions) or highlight different parts of the scene (Nena’s or Erofili’s speech). 424

Also, the absence of some couplets which do not affect the sense (e.g. I 237-8 IV 281-2, V 495-6 and V 589-90) need not necessarily be an error of transcription, but a deliberate omission. A mark found in the manuscript of *Fortounatos* next to some couplets has been interpreted as a note that the specific couplets should be


424 See previously, section 2.2 of this chapter.
omitted, probably at a performance. If a similar mark was used in one of the lost witnesses of Erofili, this could explain why some couplets are omitted by some witnesses and not by others.

The different arrangement of the participants of the Third Interlude (three unnamed Turks or Adrastos and Tisafernos) could also be related to a different approach to the staging. Finally, the condition of the end of the tragedy, especially the confusing speech tags between the Maids and the Chorus, could reflect how different staging practices (e.g. the role of the Chorus) influenced the text.

The conclusion from all these considerations is that a prospective editor of Erofili should take many parameters into account, in addition to internal evidence from the text and Chortatsis’s style. The following section will conclude with some considerations about the most suitable editorial method(s) for the edition of the play.

3. Suggestions for future editions

As we have seen, the previous editors of Erofili have used the “traditional” eclectic approach, although they recognize some of its limitations and point out that other approaches might be useful or even necessary. Indeed, readers interested in Cretan literature now have at their disposal useful and serviceable editions of Erofili based on all the available textual material and with clearly defined aims and principles. But this is not enough, for a text like Erofili with such a rich and complex tradition. Moreover, we should always bear in mind that we cannot pursue the idea of one “definitive” edition which could solve all the editorial problems of a text, especially

---

of one like *Erofili*. As scholars in the field of Early Modern Greek (and in the field of editorial theory as well) have pointed out, there are no “definitive” editions, but only reliable and unreliable ones.\(^{426}\) There is a wide range of possibilities for editing a text: traditional critical editions (eclectic texts), conservative and less interventionist (editions with minimal interventions, respecting the autonomy of each witness as a historical document), and the more modern approaches that point out the instability of texts (“versioning”, genetic criticism) or the social aspects of the transmission of literary works.\(^{427}\) Different editorial approaches can offer different perspectives according to their aims and methodology and the audience they are addressed to, and the existence of one edition does not exclude the need for other approaches.\(^{428}\) For that reason, the aim of the present section is to address the issue of editing *Erofili* from a wide perspective and to raise questions, instead of providing clear-cut proposals.

1. **Author-oriented editions**

The first question an editor must answer, is whether it is possible to go one step beyond the material offered by the extant witnesses and to reconstruct a text as close as it can be to what he believes was the author’s intention. Since *Erofili* is the work of an eponymous author, whose other works are known and who seems to have been well-known and respected in his era, it is legitimate to look for what he *did* write instead of what has survived in the extant witnesses.\(^{429}\)


\(^{427}\) See Eggert 1991, Cohen & Jackson 1991, Bornstein 1993, Tanselle 1995 and Shillingsburg 1996: 18-30 on the various approaches to scholarly editing during the last 100 years and the multiplicity of approaches to editing.


At that point, the term “intention” and its implications for editing should be defined. It is a term that has been widely exploited in the theoretical discussion of the last decades, not only in the field of editing theory and practice. Already from the period of New Criticism the idea of the “intentional fallacy” was put forward, meaning that any knowledge about the author’s intentions is unnecessary to the reader’s interpretation. In more recent years, following the declarations about the “death of the author”, poststructuralist scholars claim that there is nothing outside the text and the reader is the sole constructor of meaning. In the field of editorial methodology, scholars who reject the relevance of intention to editing claim that we should abandon the idea of the genius of the author who creates the work, stop asking for his intentions, and focus on other aspects of literary production (for example the social conditions which might shape the creation of a text, the text as a collaborative product or the instability and indeterminacy of texts).⁴³⁰ On the other hand, other scholars still insist on the idea that an editor should try to reconstruct the author’s intentions, if the condition of a text permits it.⁴³¹ A practical definition of intentions (in relation to editing) is for such scholars “the intention of the author to have particular words and marks of punctuation and the intention that such a text carry a particular meaning”,⁴³² or “the intention to put down a particular sequence of words and punctuation”.⁴³³ This means for them that the editor should try to establish the author’s text, not that of the compositor.⁴³⁴

An edition aiming to reconstruct Chortatsis’s intention could be constructed following two different paths: either as an eclectic edition, using the material of all

---

⁴³³ Shillingsburg 1996: 33.
the witnesses, or on the basis of one witness only. Both methods have positive and negative aspects and neither of them would be completely satisfying, given the characteristics of the tradition of *Erofili*. An editor wishing to follow either of these methods (or an intermediate approach) should take these factors into consideration:

- The Latin-script manuscripts are considered to be the most faithful in terms of dialect and style, since they were copied in Crete, they do not have learned influences, for which printed editions are usually suspect, and they show greater respect to matters of euphony and style. They also preserve the text of *Erofili* and the Interludes in a very good condition, so they are very reliable witnesses in all aspects. But the fact that they might have priority in terms of establishing the language and style of the text does not mean that they should necessarily have priority in every other editorial matter.

- The text of the play in the edition of Gradenigos has also survived in a very good condition, so it cannot be neglected as inferior in comparison to the manuscripts. Moreover, and more importantly, it includes a substantial number of lines which are not found in the other witnesses, probably because the relevant scenes were shortened at a later stage.

- None of the three best witnesses (A, B and G) can stand without emendations from the others, as they all have minor textual problems. None of them can be considered as completely superior in comparison to the others. Moreover, there are indications that the play has survived in different stages of conscious alterations, probably related to performance, which might (or might not) be attributed to the playwright himself.

From many aspects a traditional eclectic edition like the one of Alexiou and Aposkiti is a practical solution. The complicated relations of the witnesses and the
possibility of horizontal transmission make it difficult to draw a clear line between the witnesses or versions. Moreover, since no edition could be based on one witness only, without emendations with the help of other witnesses and other kinds of editorial intervention, a mixed edition could present a text free of corruptions. On the other hand, such an edition would not give a clear image of the tradition. A critical apparatus cannot clearly present the possibility of different versions (especially for V 295-318). Moreover, an apparatus can give the impression that the variants included there are rejected, rather than that they might be authentic as well, originating from the author.\footnote{For theoretical considerations about composite editions and the apparatus criticus see Jeffreys 2002. See also Greetham 1993: 11-15 on the readers’ perception of spatial hierarchies in scholarly editions.} With such a method it is not easy to make clear to the readers that the divergences of the textual tradition might be the result of reworking by the author and not necessarily corruption. Apart from that, composite editions tend to create texts that never existed historically, and this has been a fixed point of criticism against eclectic editing in past decades.\footnote{See for example Eggert 1991: 62-5;} However, even now scholars still argue that traditional editorial methods can be used cautiously and can lead to readable and reliable texts.\footnote{Kristeller 1981; Eggert 1991: 70-1.} This can apply in the case of Erofili, where none of the witnesses can be said with certainty to best represent the authorial intentions.

The opposite approach to editing, i.e. single-text editions (best-text/Leithandschrift method) emerged in the field of medieval literature, where it was clear that the transmission of works did not permit the conflation of readings from various witnesses, which were usually creative adaptations and could be treated as autonomous works.\footnote{See briefly Speer 1995: 394-400 on the emergence and the principles of the best-text method.} It should be noted here that in the case of Erofili we
cannot talk about distinct and autonomous works in the case of each witness (or at least each family of witnesses), because *Erofili* is the work of an eponymous author and has not been freely adapted by copyists or editors. So, an edition based on a single witness can only be made on the assumption that the editor chooses a witness which, according to the evidence of all the textual material, best represents the authorial intentions. That way the editor would respect the tradition and avoid the production of a text which never existed historically. But still, such a method leaves many questions open. A single-text edition could be based on either Gradenigos or the Birmingham manuscript (with the help of the Athens manuscript), which are the best witnesses. None of them could stand without emendations with the help of the other witnesses, so editorial intervention would be inevitable. Moreover, it would be difficult to decide which witness best represents the authorial intentions; it cannot be said for sure that the older version represents the original intention and the later witnesses are corrupt texts, or that the latest version is the final intention and the older are previous versions or early drafts.\(^{439}\) It would be wrong to rely solely on G on the basis of its age and to discard B as a non-authentic redaction, as the differences of B could originate from the pen of Chortatsis. It would also be wrong to choose B as the final intention of the poet, since the later version does not necessarily mean that it was the sole final intention; as it is a dramatic work, there might be authorial adaptations of the play for different purposes. Apart from these practical issues, a more theoretical point against this approach is that such editions are restricted to a documentary character, focusing on the *text* of the witness instead of the *work* of the author.

Given all these complications, a multiple text approach seems an interesting solution. Such an edition need not necessarily present all five witnesses. It could

\(^{439}\) See also Tanselle 1976: 191-207; McLaverty 1984: 130-5 and 1991: 146-7 on the problems of tracing the final authorial intentions in texts with multiple authorial versions.
take the form of a synoptic presentation of the two families, based on the best
witnesses of each family (G and B), with the most interesting variants of the other
witnesses (K - M and A, respectively) in an apparatus. That way the editor would
avoid the strictly documentary approach which would focus on the text of the
witnesses instead of the work of Chortatsis, but would not ignore the history of the
transmission of the play.

2. Transmission-oriented editions

The presentation of multiple witnesses leads us to another perspective on editing
texts; the discussion has up to now focused on the restoration of the authorial
intentions, but this is not the only possible approach, as we have seen. The
transmission of Erofili has a very interesting background, as it is represents all the
possible ways in which a text could be disseminated during that period: Latin-script
manuscripts from Crete, Greek-script manuscripts from the Ionian Islands, and
Venetian editions. So each one of the witnesses can offer valuable information to
scholars about the copying and printing practices of the period, about the way
Cretan texts were perceived by Cretan and non-Cretan copyists and printers, the
aesthetic preferences of the audiences in which manuscripts and editions
circulated, and finally the texts which were available to readers at certain historical
points or in certain geographical regions. The cultural and linguistic background of
Foskolos, who was also a playwright, is closer to Chortatsis’s than that of the
unknown copyist of the Munich manuscript, but Heptanesian manuscripts of Cretan
texts were probably widely used after the fall of Crete and could have influenced the
development of Heptanesian theatre. The edition of Gradenigos was probably the
most influential version of Erofili as it was the basis of the later reprints, but the
edition of Kigalas had circulated 40 years before, so it was the first witness of the
play which reached a wide audience. The edition of Gradenigos is also an important
document in its own right, as a high quality Venetian edition of an Early Modern
Greek text, which clearly aims to respect the language of the author and to
represent in written form characteristics of the pronunciation of the Cretan dialect
(voicing of initial plosives, y-glide), while the edition of Kigalas is an important
document for the reception of a dialectal literary work by a scholar who aimed to
present it to a wide audience, being more interested in the standardization of the
text for non-Cretan readers than the aesthetic qualities of the play. These
interesting features of each witness cannot be adequately represented even in a
detailed bibliographical or codicological description or an extensive study, or in the
photographic material which usually accompanies a scholarly edition. The text
offered by each witness could stand in its own right as an important document
which would provide scholars with valuable information, and a synoptic edition of
all the witnesses could serve this purpose, although such a venture would have to
face some practical problems and would be limited to a strictly scholarly audience.

3. Digital editions

The practical problems of editing a text with a rich tradition can lead us to another
perspective of modern editorial methodology, i.e. the field of digital editions. The
evolution of technology and the widespread application of computer science in the
field of literary studies open wide perspectives for future editors. This way of
publishing a text could be very suitable for Erofili and other works with a rich
transmission history, as the reader can have access to all the material without the
restrictions of space and other problems encountered in traditional publications; an
electronic edition can include transcriptions of all the witnesses and a critical
dition of one or more versions. The reader can choose which witness or version he
wants to be displayed, or can read in parallel more than one text. Moreover, an electronic edition does not just present a traditional edition in electronic form. Hypertext can allow an edition to be enriched with various annotations, including a critical apparatus and an editorial commentary. It can be enriched with high quality photos of all the witnesses, so that the reader can study the witnesses on his own and understand more easily the material aspects of a text, or read a facsimile in parallel with a transcription. Finally, other tools, like concordances and rhyme tables, as well as non-textual material (sound or video files) could also be included in a digital edition.¹⁴⁰ A characteristic example is the project “Internet Shakespeare Editions”, where the plays are presented in various forms: old-spelling transcriptions, facsimiles, editions according to modern principles, and are accompanied by information about the author’s life, bibliographies and material related to performances.¹⁴¹

4. Readers

Our discussion till now has focused mainly on the aims of the editor, without addressing the issue of the recipient of an edition. Scholarly editions sometimes cannot be accessible to all reading audiences (a huge, synoptic edition, or an edition with a huge apparatus and many textual notes could seem unappealing to a general readership, or there might be more practical reasons, like the size or the cost of the book). Erofili, and other works of Cretan Literature, are not only meant to be addressed to scholars or students of literature and theatre. They can be of interest to a wider reading audience, and the dramatic texts can also be performed. For that

¹⁴¹ http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/. A similar project about other English Renaissance dramatic texts (“Digital Renaissance Editions) is under preparation (http://digitalrenaissance.uvic.ca/)
reason editions are also needed which will present a text free from corruptions, without gaps or other textual problems, with a consistent language and style which will respect and bring forward the poetic value of the work. Editions addressed to a non-scholarly audience are usually called “practical” and this term is frequently used in a derogatory sense, as it implies that the text does not derive from a scholarly edition or is not prepared according to scholarly principles.\textsuperscript{442} The terminology in Greek is more confusing, as a variety of characterizations is used for non-critical editions: “χρηστική έκδοση”, which is the equivalent of “practical edition”, usually refers to editions for a wide audience, while “φιλολογική έκδοση” (“philological edition”) means an edition with more accompanying material, including a brief apparatus, with the intention for it to be used for teaching at a higher level.\textsuperscript{443} Scholars’ reservations about practical editions are not unfounded: if a publication is not based on a scholarly edition, the readers face the possibility of reading a corrupt text, or having a distorted image of the work.\textsuperscript{444} So, a reliable practical edition should either be based on a scholarly one\textsuperscript{445} (as for example the practical edition of \textit{The Sacrifice of Abraham},\textsuperscript{446} prepared by the editors of the critical edition of the play, adapted to the needs of a wider audience), or be prepared following the principles of textual scholarship. It should also be taken into account that material related to the transmission history of a literary work need not be considered as unnecessary for the general audience; on the contrary, information about characteristics of the witnesses and variant readings can shed light on the interpretation of a work or its aesthetic appreciation, so editors should include

\textsuperscript{442} Bowers 1969 and Shillingsburg 2005.
\textsuperscript{443} See Bakker 2002 and Karaoglou 2002 for a discussion of these terms.
\textsuperscript{444} The issue is discussed extensively by Bowers 1969 and Shillingsburg 2005.
\textsuperscript{445} See also Bakker 2002: 112-3.
\textsuperscript{446} Bakker & van Gemert 1998.
relevant information even in practical editions.\footnote{Shillingsburg 2005.} The preparation of this kind of edition of \textit{Erofili} should not be considered as a task of minor importance in comparison to scholarly editions, as it can facilitate performances of the play and its dissemination to the reading public.\footnote{See also Lendari 2001: 131, on the challenges an edition for a wider audience can pose to scholars.}

5. Other editorial issues

Whichever editorial approach is chosen, the editor should make decisions not only about evaluating the variants, but on other important issues as well. Till now we have dealt mainly with semantic and structural variants and not with the equally important problem of language and versification. \textit{Erofili} has the privilege of being preserved in two manuscripts originating from Crete and an early printed edition prepared by a Cretan scholar. This is not the case with other works by Chortatsis. So the editors have three witnesses at their disposal which respect Cretan dialect (only G has some learned influence, mainly in phonology) and versification (with care for avoidance of hiatus and respect to the rhyme). With these witnesses as a guide, the editor does not have to face the problem of regularization of the use of final –n or many characteristics of the Cretan dialect, such as the articles and pronouns τοι / τι, the ending –εύω instead of -εύω, the forms κιανείς / κιαμιά instead of κανείς / καμιά, πρίκα instead of πίκρα etc.\footnote{Compare, on the contrary, the different approaches of two editors of \textit{Katsourbos}. Politis has preserved non-Cretan characteristics such as the variation τοι / της and avoids the generalization in the use of final –n, while Kaklamanis has imposed uniformity.} It should be noted that these characteristics prevail even in the Heptanesian manuscript, where they are only sporadically replaced with non-Cretan forms. On the other hand, a degree of linguistic variation is inevitable, as the differences among the witnesses are great and there is no

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Erofili} has the privilege of being preserved in two manuscripts originating from Crete and an early printed edition prepared by a Cretan scholar.
\item The editors have three witnesses at their disposal which respect Cretan dialect (only G has some learned influence, mainly in phonology) and versification (with care for avoidance of hiatus and respect to the rhyme).
\item With these witnesses as a guide, the editor does not have to face the problem of regularization of the use of final –n or many characteristics of the Cretan dialect, such as the articles and pronouns τοι / τι, the ending –εύω instead of -εύω, the forms κιανείς / κιαμιά instead of κανείς / καμιά, πρίκα instead of πίκρα etc.
\item It should be noted that these characteristics prevail even in the Heptanesian manuscript, where they are only sporadically replaced with non-Cretan forms.
\item On the other hand, a degree of linguistic variation is inevitable, as the differences among the witnesses are great and there is no
\end{itemize}
autograph by Chortatsis so as to enable us to be certain what his linguistic preferences would be: we cannot know, for example, if Chortatsis preferred to write χρουσός, ὀλπίζω, δικιμάζω, instead of χρυσός, ἐλπίζω, δοκιμάζω, or if he cared about uniformity in forms like σκιάς / κιάς, πάσα / κάθα, οὔδε / μηδέ, τίβετας / τίβετοι etc. In these cases variety is found even within each witness and the editors would have to respect the fact, either in the case of editing eclectically, or when editing one witness only. The analysis of the autograph of Fortounatos shows that even an author writing down his own work can have unstable preferences in some linguistic aspects,\textsuperscript{450} so the imposition of complete uniformity in all linguistic aspects cannot be justified historically. The preference for dialectal instead of non-dialectal forms, or for demotic instead of learned, cannot always be a safe criterion, as we should not judge the Cretan dialect in the period of Chortatsis based on our knowledge of modern Cretan dialect, and we should not forget the important factor of style, which might affect the choice of linguistic register: Erofili is a tragedy, a genre supposed to have a more elevated diction, so a playwright who is known to respect these generic conventions would perhaps preserve some archaic forms and avoid some dialect forms, in order to have a higher language register and style. Another important linguistic issue that has to be dealt with by editors is the difference between Eastern and Western Cretan dialect. Erofili has survived in witnesses originating both from Eastern and Western Crete, but Chortatsis, as a Rethymniot, would be assumed (or expected) to follow the Western dialect, and the edition of Gradenigos seems more trustworthy in this aspect.\textsuperscript{451} However, the editors of Cretan literature are in the difficult position of having limited knowledge about the spoken dialect of the time, which should not be confused with the Cretan dialect spoken today. Written literary sources of the period frequently originate

\textsuperscript{450} Vincent 1998.
\textsuperscript{451} See previously, section 2.4 of Chapter One.
from other areas (usually the Heptanese or Venice), and moreover generic conventions about language register and style should be taken into account, before any conclusions are reached, while non-literary sources, such as notarial documents, also have some stylistic conventions which might obscure the dialectal character of their language. In any case, if the interventions of an editor are clearly described in the introduction of the edition according to clearly formulated principles, the readers can have accurate information about the language of the witnesses and the extent of the editor’s intervention.

An issue which has not extensively concerned editors of Early Modern Greek texts is the authorial intentions about spelling and punctuation. Editors of Early Modern Greek texts have followed the path of standardization according to the rules of either ancient or modern Greek and the point of divergence is usually the degree of modernization, while the issue of monotonic or polytonic accentuation system has concerned some scholars. The study of the spelling and accentuation habits of the period is still a desideratum, as this issue is usually neglected even by editors, who usually tacitly normalize the punctuation according to modern standards without giving a description of their interventions in the introduction. In the case of Erofili and other works of Cretan literature it is not possible to talk about authorial spelling, as these works were most probably written in the Latin alphabet. Since minor differences among manuscripts written in the Latin alphabet are found, it is not possible to establish an edition in the Latin alphabet claiming that the author’s system is followed. However, the spelling and punctuation system of all the witnesses, manuscript and print, should be extensively described in the introduction of a scholarly edition, so that the readers can have an accurate image;

452 See Manolessou 2003 for the positive and negative aspects of both sources.
453 An indicative example is the latest edition of the Sacrifice of Abraham, where the editors describe in detail in which cases they have imposed uniformity and when they have opted for variation.
454 See Kechagioglou 1993: 82-88 and 96-98 for reviews of editorial practices
the addition of a few high quality photographs of the witnesses, or even a diplomatic transcription of a few selected passages, can also clarify the description.

The spelling practices of the witnesses could be followed in the capitalization of the first letter of some abstract nouns, as Τύχη, Μοίρα, Οὐρανός, Κόσμος, which are usually written with initial capital in most witnesses. The voicing of initial plosives of enclitic pronouns could also be indicated, following the practice of the Cretan witnesses, although, as Alexiou has observed, it should be made clear to readers that the nasal is lost in the Cretan dialect. Finally, the indentation of the second line of each couplet, which is attested in both manuscript and print sources, could be (re)introduced in modern editions as well.

Another issue which can concern future editors of Erofili is the relation of the play to the Interludes. An edition which aims to be faithful to the tradition and to the work as it was available to the reading audience of its time, could include the Interludes intercalated between the acts. This would facilitate modern readers to realize the contrast between the two genres and the function the Interludes were meant to have, and open wider perspectives to the interpretation of the play. On the other hand, as Alexiou and Aposkiti have observed, the insertion of the Interludes in an edition could create practical problems, as their autonomous character could not be easily realized and they could also be neglected by readers, who would care for the unfolding of the plot of the tragedy. Perhaps a more practical solution, which would not betray the tradition but would also showcase the poetic value of both plays, would be to follow the practice of Foskolos and

458 See Paschalis 2011a for the relation between the play and the Interludes.  
publish the Interludes in the same volume as *Erofili* but not intercalated between the acts.

4. Conclusion

The complicated tradition of *Erofili* presents many problems for prospective editors, but also gives many opportunities for trying various editorial approaches with different aims and perspectives. The most important quality of an edition should be clearly defined aims and editorial principles, which should be followed faithfully. Since no edition can claim to be definitive or to address all the editorial problems of a text, the most important task of the editor, after the close examination and evaluation of the textual material, is to set the editorial principles according which the text will be established, and to present in detail in the introduction the rationale behind the edition and all the editorial interventions which are made.
The findings of the study of the textual tradition of *Erofili* can be summarized as follows:

The witnesses of Cretan origin, that is the two Latin-script manuscripts and the edition of Gradenigos, have preserved the most reliable texts in terms of content, language and style. The other two witnesses, K and M, can be taken into account in only a few cases for the restoration of passages, but they can offer important information about the history of the transmission of *Erofili*.

Two distinct branches can be identified in the tradition of *Erofili*, one consisting of G, K and M and one of A and B. The first can be divided in two sub-branches, G and K-M respectively. The main difference of the two branches is that the second represents a shorter version and has significant divergences in phrasing, but without any alterations in the plot and the sequence of events. All these divergences could originate either from someone who adapted the play, possibly for the needs of a performance, or most probably from the pen of Chortatsis himself. The condition of the Fifth Act especially, where the most divergences can be found and where the last two scenes present some confusion in all the witnesses in the
speech attribution and the stage directions, can lead to the assumption that the playwright himself reworked the end of the play.

The close study of each witness individually shows that the edition of Gradenigos should be taken seriously into account as far as language and style are concerned, because the Cretan scholar was very careful to respect dialect and versification and also to preserve in written form the characteristics of Cretan pronunciation. The same applies to the Athens manuscript, whose importance has not been fully realized by scholars, probably because of its mutilated condition.

The witnesses of Erofili can provide scholars with valuable information about the editing of Cretan literary works in general. The two Latin-script manuscripts and the edition in Gradenigos to a lesser extent can be guides for the treatment of language and versification. The study of the witnesses has also thrown more light on the practices of disseminating texts during that period. The edition of Gradenigos shows that printed editions should not be underestimated in comparison to manuscripts. The corrections in the Birmingham manuscript are an indication for either the existence of manuscripts with authorial variant readings in the margins, or of the conflation of multiple sources by copyists. The edition of Kigalas, even if it is an unreliable witness, deserves study on its own merit as a special case in the transmission of a literary work. The witnesses of Erofili can be read not only as testimonies for the restoration of the author’s original, but also as instances in the history of the transmission of a work, as documents of copying or printing practices of the period, or as special adaptations with different aesthetic purposes. Only the Sacrifice of Abraham has been studied from this aspect, among the other works of mature period the Cretan Literature, and similar studies are needed, especially for Panoria and Erotokritos which have survived in more than one

460 Bakker 1978-9; Bakker et. al. 1990.
If the transmission of texts with multiple witnesses is studied thoroughly, the conditions of the production of manuscripts and printed editions will be better illuminated and the work of future editors will be facilitated.

*Erofili* is an interesting case which offers scholars the possibility to explore various editorial approaches in order to showcase the richness of the textual material. The advances of technology and the new digital tools should also be exploited, in order to enhance the reader’s experience of the play. There are obvious applications in secondary and higher education.

* *

The study of *Erofili* and of the literature of the period in general has to face some serious obstacles and drawbacks. First of all, few texts have survived, and the majority of them are preserved in one or at most two witnesses, so we do not have in our disposal much information about copying and printing habits of the period. We do not know what kind of manuscripts were used for dramatic performances; almost no autographs have survived; most of the works were printed years after the authors’ death, so we possess very few editions overseen by the authors; printers’ copies were usually destroyed, so we do not have much information about the practices of the printers and the editors of the period.

The preoccupation of scholars in the previous years with chronological and biographical issues has led to an absence of studies about literary subjects, which would facilitate the work of editors. Of course no study of style and versification can be accurate without being based on reliable editions and a thorough knowledge of

---

461 Transmission-oriented studies have appeared also for works of previous periods, as for example *Apokopos*, (Panagiotakis 1991, Vejleskov 2005) the *Theseid* (Kaklamanis 1997 and Kaklamanis 1998, Olsen 1994) and *Imberios and Margarona* (Yiavis 2006).

462 Achelis (*The Siege of Malta*) and Troilos (*King Rodolinos*) are two rare cases of Cretan poets who had arranged for their works to be printed.

463 See Kaklamanis 2001 for a detailed discussion of the printing practice of the period.
the characteristics of the transmission. The same can be said for our knowledge of
the language of the period. For all these reasons, the study of the witnesses
themselves, apart from scholarly editions, is indispensable. Modern technology
again can offer invaluable help: facsimiles of early editions and manuscripts can be
better and more easily accessible as electronic media than as printed editions; apart
from individual efforts, a collective project similar to “Early English Books Online”
would be a useful tool not only for editors, but for any scholar in the field of Early
Modern Greek studies as well. The same applies for concordances; luckily
concordances exist for Erotokritos and the Sacrifice of Abraham and similar projects
for the works of Chortatsis and other texts would make a vast amount of material
available for comparative study.

The history of the transmission of Cretan Literature is a field open for various
approaches, which need not necessarily aim to the production of a new edition. The
aim of this dissertation was to make a first step towards the thorough study of a
variety of aspects related to the textual tradition of Erofili and to point out some
questions which can apply to other texts of the period as well.


Philippides 1986 and Philippides & Holton 2000, respectively. See also Philippides 1993, 1999 and
2005.
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