

THREE CRETAN MANUSCRIPTS *

I. CODEX MARCIANUS XI. 19

As is well known, the codex XI. 19 (1394) of the library of S. Mark at Venice contains the greater part of extant Cretan drama. There has, however, been no satisfactory description of it, and with regard to that part of it containing the *Fortunatos* even as great a scholar as Xanthudides suffers from one notable misapprehension.

The manuscript, which was first dealt with by Mingarelli, in his catalogue of the Nanian collection¹, is an agglomeration of several separate works. The first part of it contains some religious writings: from folio 117r onwards, the contents are as follows:

- (I) 117r—145v *Zeno*
- (II) 147r—177v *Gyparis*
- (III) 178v—179v *Phallidos*
- (IV) 180r—207r *Stathis*
- (V) 210r—231r *Abraham's Sacrifice*
- (VI) 234r—241v *Apocalypse of the Virgin*
- (VII) 244r—336v *Dialogue of Man and Death*
- (VIII) 338bis (a single-leaf fragment)
- (IX) 342r—439v *Fortunatos*

The oldest of these, (with the exception of the fragment), is the *Fortunatos*. It was recognised from the beginning as being the autograph of Marcantonio Foscolo, from the number of alterations and of new lines inserted². But among the text there are notes in a quite different hand, that of Michele Foscolo, whose relationship to Marcantonio is not known. Labaste³

*) My thanks are due to Mr. M. I. Manoussakas for his ever-ready help and kindness in the preparation of this study.

¹) A. Mingarelli, *Graeci Codices Manuscripti apud Nanius Patricios Venetos Asservati*. Bononiae 1784. See no. 89.

²) M. A. Φώσκολος, *Φορτουνάτος* ed. Σ. Ξανθοουδίδης, Athens 1922. This edition notes all such emendations.

³) H. Labaste, *Une Comédie Crétoise Inédite*. BZ 13 (1904) p391.

is not right in thinking that he was the poet's nephew, but has been misled by the apparent signature Jo. Michele Foscolo on folio 360r. This is in fact not a signature, but the address of a different person, and this Gianmichele Foscolo is the nephew of Michele.

The notes in this hand are as follows;

344r A di 9 Giugno 1669 S. V. (old style) <H>a-
<n>o vegniuto i socorsi di candia per far cam-
pagnia.

347r The heading *vacuo et fallo* and some notes on criminal procedure.

348r *vacuo et fallo*

350v *vacuo et fallo* and legal notes

351r *vacuo et fallo*

354v - 355r Two attempts at a letter, completed on 392r.

360r Draft of a letter to his nephew, Gianmichele Foscolo, dated 2 June 1669.

372v Dated 15 May 1666, a poem of six lines in Greek written in Italian script. (See Appendix 1).

392r The letter of 354r in its final state. It is to an unnamed nobleman, and is apparently meant to accompany a copy of an ode on the victory of Giacomo Riva, the Venetian captain, which Foscolo has finally consented to have printed only from the agony of hearing it wrongly sung in the streets. Dated 2 June 1669, and signed Michel Foscolo. I can find no record of such a publication.

406v - 407r Draft of a dedication of an ode, presumably the same one, to a nobleman, descendant of Francesco Duodo, the hero of Lepanto.

Labaste, (and his opinion was followed by Xanthudides), saw in these various notes and letters that Marcantonio Foscolo was using for the script of *Fortunatos* some paper already partly used by someone else. The truth is exactly the opposite. In two cases Marcantonio turned over two pages at once. On the leaves thus left vacant, his successor Michele has been at pains to ensure that no interpolations in the comedy should be made, and has written *vacuo et fallo* - «blank, a mistake». All his other notes are written on the empty leaves between acts, or between the dedication and the prologue and Act I.

Michele's notes fall between 15 May 1666 and 9 June 1669.

The *Fortunatos*, therefore, must be dated not between June 1669 and the fall of Candia in the following September, but at some time during the siege before May 1666. The fact that Nicolas Demezo, to whom the play is dedicated, was born only in 1621, and came to prominence only as a member of the commission to welcome the Marquis de Ville in 1666, suggest that the end of this period is the most likely date.

The manuscript of the *Fortunatos* now passed into the hands of an unknown Cretan litterateur, presumably in the Ionian Islands, where so many of the refugees from Candia had gone. This person copied, in a small rather irregular Greek hand, Zeno, Gyparis, Phallidos, and Stathis. He also used the empty leaf between the first and second interludes of *Fortunatos* to write some fifty lines from the prologue of another comedy (Appendix 2). The heading of this page has been cut by the binders, and is unreadable except for the word, in Italian script, *Prologos*. The prologue is spoken by Aphrodite, who has come to earth to take revenge upon an uncomplaisant maiden. It has little poetic value, and is largely imitated (we might say plagiarised) from the second interlude of *Fortunatos*.

If we are to ask why the copying of a new play was apparently started on a single leaf, the answer may be found in the fact that prologues were interchangeable. For Gyparis we have extant two prologues⁴; and it is clear that the plot described in this piece, and breaking off at so convenient a point, could apply to very many of the comedies of the day. It could, for instance, apply to the *Pastor Fido* of Guarini, of which the Greek translation was published at Venice in 1658, and whose rather pedantic prologue by the river-god Alpheius may well seem unsuitable for common performance, and is in fact omitted in the only manuscript⁵. It is not inconceivable that this prologue should be considered as a good useful stock introduction to the *Pastor Fido*, and that this part of the codex was in fact a theatrical text meant to supplement the hitherto published Greek plays - *Pastor Fido*, *Erophile*, *King Rhodolinos*, and *Abraham's Sacrifice*. The only

⁴) Γύπαρης ed. E. Κουτάρης, Athens 1940. See pp. 145 - 151.

⁵) Cod. Marc. IX. 24 (1472).

known Cretan play missing from this collection is the *Katsourbos*, and when we remember that Buniales mentions this in the same passage (588. 10 ff) as three printed works, (*The Siege of Malta*, *Erophile*, and *King Rhodolinos*), we may easily postulate an entirely unknown edition of Chortatzes' comedy.

If this theory is correct, Phallidos may easily be seen as a dramatic recitation, of the sort which, until quite recent years, was put on as an extra turn by companies of touring players in England and America. The tone of the last dozen lines, where the broken rake calls upon the «lords» to hearken and take warning from him, instead of laughing as they see him in this pitiful condition, fits very well with this supposition⁶.

What seems quite certain is that Stathis and Zeno, at least, were copied from manuscripts written in Italian characters. The Italian letters *ci* represent both *τσι* and *σισι*, and many errors in both plays arise from a confusion of these two combinations, e. g. *ὁ προδότη τση, ὁ θάνατό τση*, for *ὁ προδότης τση, ὁ θάνατός τση* (Stathis Int. II 88); *εἰ τσ'* for *εἰς τσ'* (Zeno I. 98, IV. 12, 277, 307.)⁷. Other difficulties in the texts point to the same conclusion, e. g. *γβάντι* (*guanti*) for *γυάντι* (*guanti*) in Stathis III. 72; *ἐχάθησα* (*echathisa*) for *ἐγλάκησα* (*eglachisa*) in Stathis III. 429; *χρόνους* (*chronus*) for *θρόνους* (*thronus*) in Zeno III, 76; and *ποιοί* (*pii*) for *ποῦ* (*pu*) in Zeno IV. 268. Moreover, in Stathis, the copyist has failed to disentangle all of the pedant's mixture of Greek and Italian, and some of his Greek is left untouched, as in «*οπου den eghi teri*» (III. 128) for *ὁπὸν δὲν ἔχει ταῖρι*; «*chie italica na su tone sprimero*» (III. 295) for *καὶ ἰταλικά νὰ σοῦ τονὲ sprimero*, and elsewhere.

The collection, which was probably not yet bound together, now came into the possession of a certain Zaneto Avuri. He himself copied the *Apocalypse of the Virgin*, in a sprawling hand in Italian characters, and completed a copy of *Abraham's Sacrifice*, which had been started by someone else in a much neater Italic script, and left in the middle of

⁶) Σ. Ξανθοουδίδης, Ὁ Φαλλίδος (ΕΕΒΣ 4 (1927)). See pp. 102 - 3.

⁷) This error occurs often in the Cretan War, with presumably the same reason.

a page (line 631). He also procured a neat copy of the Dialogue of Man and Death, of which the last twelve pages were missing, and supplied the missing portion himself; the last leaf of the original is very worn, and the replacement is on quite different paper.

We know his name, and that of his sister Donna Chierazula (*Κυρατισούλα*) Avuri, from a draft of a legal document written on 178r, between Gyparis and Phallidos. He also supplied one missing folio of Fortunatos (357), and recopied, on the preceding page marked *vacuo et fallo*, twelve lines of Act I, Scene I, which had been made difficult to read by Foscolo's alterations.

Of this man we know nothing, but the name Avuri is that of a prominent Zacynthiote family, recorded since 1500, which graduated from bourgeois to noble rank in the year 1739. Members of the family in the period relevant to our manuscript are Petros, Protopsaltes of Zacynthos, who died in 1727, and Georgios, a notary active between 1708 and 1743. The word *κυράτσα* is also recorded from Zacynthos⁸.

More exact dating is therefore impossible. The first part of the manuscript, before it was bound with the section that interests us, belonged between 1713 and 1727 to Anastasios Koutouphas and the priest Petros Koutouphas.

Folio 338 bis is a very small leaf whose provenance is unknown. It is not included in the original numbering and was probably inserted at a later binding. It may be rather older than the other texts, perhaps early seventeenth or late sixteenth century. I am dealing with this fragment elsewhere, and hope to show that, though it purports to be a prophecy, it is in fact part of a Byzantine satirical song dating from the tenth century.

II. CODEx VINDOBONENSIS THEOLOGICUS GRAECUS 244

This manuscript was described by Sathas in a letter to Wagner, published in the introduction to *Carmina Graeca Medii Aevi* (Lipsiae 1874). Its importance in the study of medieval Greek poetry makes necessary some additional remarks.

⁸) Λ. Χ. Ζώης, Λεξικόν Φιλολογικόν καὶ Ἱστορικόν Ζακύνθου. Zacynthos 1901. S. vv. **Αβοήρης, Κυράτσα*.

The codex is written, with some very small exceptions, by one scribe, whose writing, though presenting an even and pleasant impression, is not well - formed except when an obvious and conscious effort is being made. Such efforts are made in the astrological Method of Chaloueth the Prophet (132 - 167), and at the beginnings of the essay On Faith, (44), and of S. Athanasius' Reply to a Lord of Antioch (47): but as the hand soon relapses within the same works to its more normal form, Sathas' statement that these were written by different people cannot be upheld. The size of the writing varies greatly between the different works, and blank leaves are left between most items. This leads us to suppose that the collection as we have it was not originally intended as a single codex, but as a uniform edition of the most popular works of poetry and prose of the day. One of these, the Flower of the Graces, was included in the list of contents and the first (Greek) numbering, but later dropped out, leaving a lacuna of thirty - two leaves between 259 and 260.

Until lately, no comment had been made on the dating of the codex apart from the obvious terminus given by its acquisition by Ogier de Busbecq, who was Ferdinand I's ambassador to the Sultan on two occasions between 1559 and 1565. It can, however, be dated much more closely. The earliest possible date is given by Manuel Sclavos' poem on the earthquake of Crete, which took place on May 29th., 1508: it is probable that this date may be advanced four years, for although the end of Apollonius of Tyre is spurious, there is a strong presumption that it was written in or after 1512⁹. And Acacios, whose episcopal signature is found on 83*v, was bishop of Naupactus and Arta from 1516 to 1520¹⁰.

The scribe we may identify from his signature at the end of Apollonius of Tyre (78v): Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον καὶ δημηγῶριος ὁ γράψας. Similar inscriptions, dated 1526 and 1547, are found on five liturgical manuscripts from Mount Athos¹¹. The

⁹) See A. N. Πολίτης, Παρατηρήσεις στὸν «Ἀπόκοπο» τοῦ Μπεργαδῆ (Προσφορὰ εἰς Στίλπωνα Π. Κυριακίδη, Salonica 1953) p. 550.

¹⁰) Π. Γ. Ζεφλέντης, Θεσσαλονικέων μητροπολίται ἀπὸ Θεωνᾶ τοῦ ἀπὸ ἡγουμένων μέχρι Ἰωάσαφ Ἀργυροπούλου (1520 - 1578). (BZ 12 (1903)) p. 131.

¹¹) S. P. Lambros, Catalogue of the Greek MSS on Mount Athos, Cambridge 1895. Vol. I, pp. 256, 311.

fact that this Demetrius was a monastic reinforces the connection with Acacios, and suggests that the bishop, known otherwise only as a «harsh and vengeful man» who handed Christian preachers over to the Turks, may also have been the litterateur who commissioned the collection¹³. So that while the possible range of dates is 1508 to 1520, the probable range covers only the last five years of this period. It may be noted also that Sclavos' poem, which claims to have 150 couplets, in fact contains 141. This suggests some degree of removal from its original form, and therefore from the year 1508.

The second hand present in the manuscript is important only for the love - poem scribbled on the empty pages 330 - 331, and published by Pernot¹³. Other notes in this hand include two recipes, some instructions on bloodletting, an economically interesting wagebill, and some lines malcopied from *Lybistros* and *Rhodamne*¹⁴. The identity of this scribe is probably hidden in the as yet unsolved cryptogram written twice on the last leaf: + σοσλός δραός θανατός.

III. CODEX BAROCCIANUS 216

This manuscript of the Barocci collection in the Bodleian library is a miscellany codex containing principally theological works. On folio 179r there is a short poem, a *LOVER'S COMPLAINT* (Appendix 3) with references to Canea. It is autograph, by a scribe who has contributed only two quaternions to the volume. These cannot be dated on internal grounds, but have a watermark which suggests the first years of the sixteenth century¹⁵.

The poem was first published by N. Politis¹⁶, but in a

¹³) For Acacios, see Σ. Βυζαντίου, *Δοκίμιον ιστορικῆς κινός περιλήψεως Ἐρτης καὶ Πρεβέζης*, Athens 1884. p. 102.

¹³) H. Pernot, *Chansons populaires grecques des XVe et XVIe siècles*. Paris 1931. pp. 88 - 98.

¹⁴) See H. Schreiner's articles in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, (39 (1939) pp. 15 - 36, 272 - 301; 42 (1942) pp. 233 - 254).

¹⁵) M. Briquet, *Les Filigranes*. Leipzig 1907. no. 696. The mark, a jewelled ring, is a Piedmontese design, and is quoted from Genoa in 1506.

¹⁶) Ν. Γ. Πολίτης, *Ἀνέκδοτον Κρητικὸν Ποίημα*. (Κρητικὸς Λαὸς I (1909) pp. 97 - 99).

short-lived and rare periodical, and from a very inaccurate copy. It is, as he says, of less than moderate value, but has a considerable interest as one of our rare autographs of Cretan poems (if indeed it is Cretan: ἠσπίτιν (14) and μὲν for μὴν (4) seem Cypriot).

Politis drew attention to a startling similarity with the Simaetha of Theocritus' second idyll, who complains of her lover

ὄς μοι δωδεκαταῖος ἀφ' ὧ τάλας οὐδέποθ' ἔκει¹⁷
οὐδ' ἔγνω, πότερον τεθνάκαμες ἢ ζοοὶ εἰμές. (4 - 5)

and says

βασεῦμαι, ποτὶ τὰν Τιμαγήτιο παλαίστραν
αὔριον, ὡς νιν ἴδω καὶ μέμφομαι οἷά με ποιεῖ. (9 - 10)

But he concludes that this is coincidence, and that the Cretan woman does not have recourse to charms and magic. Politis, however, was reading *ναῦρω* in line 15: the reading *να σύρω* suggests even more strongly that Theocritus, however unlikely it may seem, was in the poet's mind, and this may be even an attempt at adaptation of the whole idyll.

APPENDICES

1 Cod. Marc. XI. 19. Folio 372v.

*O mana venetia, pos ta pomegnis
chie isegnia dhe thoro na begnis
Ti criti polemune opu pethi su
chie afignis nati baru igioghurhi[
Codo dhe to categhis pri to mathis 5
pos gdheghicte aposena voithia nagh[*

(Ἦ μάνα Βενετιά, πῶς τ' ἀπομένεις,
καὶ εἰ; ἔγνωια δὲ θωρῶ νὰ μπαίνης;
Τῆ Κορήτη πολεμοῦνε ὀπὸν' ν' παιδί σου,
καὶ ἀφήνεις νὰ τὴν πάρου οἱ γι-δχοουρθοὶ σου;
Κοιτὸ δὲ τὸ κατέχεις πρὶ τὸ μάθης, 5
πὼς γδέχεται ἀπὸ σένα βοήθεια νά'χη;)

4. Cf. *δχοουθοὶ* (*ἔχθοροι*) in Cretan War 303.10.

¹⁷) This being the reading used by the poetaster, and not *ποδεικται*,

2 Cod. Marc. XI. 19. Folio 421v.

< Ἀφροδίτη >

Σήμερο ἐκατέβηκα ἄπὸν τῆς ὀρανοῦς ἀπάνω,
 στὸν τόπο ἐτοῦτο ὡς βλέπε<τε>, κ' ἤρθα ὀγιά να γιάνω
 ἕνα πὸν ἔς τόσα κίνδυνα βροίσκεται μπερδεμένος
 ὀγιά μνία κόρη ὀποῦ ἀγαπᾷ καὶ εἶναι ἀποθαμένος,
 καὶ ὀλημερονὶς τὰ πάθη του μὲ κλάματα δηγᾷται 5
 ἄποκατωθιὸ εἰς τὸ σπίτι τῆς, μὰ αὐτὴ δὲν τὸ<ν> λυπᾷται.
 Καὶ ἐγὼ, θωρῶντας ἀλιονιά σ' αὐτὴ τόσα μεγάλη,
 νὰ κατεβῶ ἐκ τοὺς ὀρανοῦς στὸ νοῦ μο<ν> εἶχα βάλει,
 γιὰ νὰ τὴν κάμω παρευθὺς σ' αὐτόνο νὰ συγκλίνη
 καὶ σκλάβα του παντοτεινὴ πάραυτας ν' ἀπομείνη, 10
 τὴν ὄρα νὰ μὴδὲ θωρῆ ἄποκεὶ γιὰ νὰ περάση
 νὰ τότε δῆ γιὰ νὰ χαρῆ, πολλὰ νὰ ἀναγαλλιάση.
 Καὶ ἄκετ ἀποῦ δὲν ἤθελε νὰ τὸν ἀνατρανίση,
 θὰ τὴνὲ κάμω ὄγι' αὐτὸ νὰ ἄχη περίσσα κρίση,
 καὶ μέσ' <ο>τὰ φυλλοκάρδια τῆς τόση φρωτιά μεγάλη 15
 θὲ νὰ τὴν κάμω νὰ γοικᾷ παρὰ γυναικα ἄλλη.
 Γιατὶ δὲν εἶναι τὸ πρεπὸ σκληρότη ἔτσι μεγάλη
 μέσα τῆς νὰ ἄχη καθεμνιά, μὰ λύπη νὰ ἄχη πάλι.
 Κάθα κοράσο εἶναι πρεπὸ τόσα νὰ μὴ συγκλίνη
 στὸν ἄ<ν>τρα ὀποῦ τὴν ἀγαπᾷ, μὰ νὰ ἄχη σπλαχνοσύνη. 20
 Καθὼς θωρεὶ πρέπει κι' αὐτὴ σ' ἕνα ὀποῦ γνωρίση
 τὸ πὼς γι' αὐτὴνε κρίνεται καὶ θὲ νὰ ξεψυχῆση,
 νὰ ἔχη λύπηση σ' αὐτὸ κι ὄσο μπορὰ βοηθήση
 σ' κείνο πὸν ἄτάσσειται ὀγι' αὐτὴ νὰ κακοθανατίση,
 μὰ νὰ συγκλίνη μετ' αὐτὸ, ταῖρι γιὰ νὰ γενοῦσι, 25
 τὰ βάσανα νὰ λυώσουσι κ' εἰσὲ χαρὲς νὰ ὀρθοῦσι.
 Γι' αὐτός λοιπὸ ἤρθα ὡς ἐδῶ καὶ βροίσκομαι ὀμπροστά σας,
 πὸν ἄλλη φορὰ δὲ μὲ ὄδασι τὰ μάτια τὰ δικὰ σας.
 Μὰ βλέπω πὼς πολλότατοι ποιά ἄμαι δὲ μὲ γνωρίζου,
 μὰ μὲ μεγάλους λογιμοὺς τὸ νοῦ νιως περγορίζου. 30
 Ἐγὼ ἄμαι ἐκείνη, ξέρετε, πὸν κάνω ὄλα καὶ ζοῦσι
 τὰ πράματα καὶ θρέφονται καὶ δὲν μπορὰ χαθοῦσι.
 Ἐγὼ τῆς ἄνθρώπους, τὰ πουλιά, τὰ δέντρο καὶ πᾶσ' ἄλλο

1. κάμω cod

18. μάχη καὶ ἀγάπη καὶ τὰ δυὸ deleted: μὰ λύπη νὰ ἄχη πάλι written above.

20. ηγαπα cod.

κάνω λοιπὸ καὶ σμίγουσι τὸ ἕνα μὲ τὸ ἄλλο.
 Ἐγὼ ἔμαι ἔτοιμα καὶ παίρνουνται ὅλα τως καὶ γεννοῦσι 35
 καὶ ὡσὰ θεὰ ὅπου βρῖσκομαι ὅλα μὲ προσκυνοῦσι.
 Καὶ ἀνισωστάς κ' ἤλειπα ἐγὼ, ἢ κτίση εἶχε χαλάσει,
 ἔπο ἀθρώπους, ζῶα, κ' ἐρπετὰ ὅλη ἤθελε ἐρημάσει.
 Μὰ μὲ τῆ θέλησή μου ἐμὲ βρῖσκεται στολισμένος
 μὲ τόσες δόξες κὶ ὁμορφιῆς ὁ κόσμος γεμισμένος. 40
 Καὶ ἀπὸν τὴν ὁμορφιά μου ἐμὲ παίρνου κὶ αὐτοὶ τὰ κάλλη,
 καὶ καθαιεὶ τὰ ρέγεται κ' ἔχει χαρὰ μεγάλη.
 Ἐγὼ ὄντας θὲ νὰ κατεβῶ, ὁ Οὐρανὸς τρομάσει
 καὶ μ' ἀστραπὲς καὶ μὲ βροντὲς τὸ <ν> κόσμον θὰ χαλάσῃ,
 γιὰτὶ, λογιάζει, τὸ θρονὶ τοῦ ὄρανου θ' ἀφήσω, 45
 νὰ ρθῶ στὸν κόσμον ἐτούτῳε κάτω νὰ κατοικήσω.
 Γι' αὐτὸς συγχύζεται πολλὰ, μὰ ὅσα στραφοῦ νὰ δοῦσι
 τὸ πρόσωπό μου τ' ὁμορφο, ὅλα καταχαλοῦσι,
 καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα τρέχουσι κὶ ὀπίσω μ' ἀκλουθοῦσι, 50
 κὶ ὡσὰ θεὰ τως ταπεινὰ ὅλα με προσκυνοῦσι
 Ἐγὼ ἔμαι τὸ λοιπὸ ἢ θεὰ πὸν τζ' ὁμορφιῆς δρίζω,
 κὶ ὅπου θελήσω δίδω τζι, κὶ ἄλλου πάλι κρατίζω.
 Ἡ γι' Ἀφροδίτῃ εἶμαι ἐγὼ, τοῦ Ζεῦ ἢ θυγατέρα,
 πὸν ὁ ἥλιος λάμπει μετὰ με, καὶ φέγγει τὴν ἡμέρα.
 Καὶ τ' ἄστρη ὅπου <ν> στὸν οὐρανὸ μαζὶ μὲ τῆ σελήνη 55
 μὲ τζι ὁμορφιῆς μου λάμπουσι καὶ φέγγουσι καὶ κείνη.
 Τὴν ἀφορμὴ ἐγροικῆσετε πὸν ἐδῶ εἶχε μὲ φέρει
 ἀπὸν τὰ ὕψη τ' ὄρανου σὲ τοῦτὰ σας τὰ μέρη.

Compare Fortunatos Inter. II. 100 - 118

. ἡ ὁμορφιά μου, 100
 ἢ ὁποῖα ἔχει τόση δύναμι, ὅπου ὄχι μόνο σέρνει
 τὰ πράματα τὰ ἐπίγειο, μὰ τὸ ἴδιους θεοὺς φέρνει
 κάτω στὴ γῆ ἀπὸν τοὶ ὄρανοῦς, καὶ κάνει τσι καὶ γνώθου
 τοὶ ἀγάπης τὰ γλυκίσματα καὶ τοὶ φωτιῆς τοῦ πόθου.
 Ἐτούτῃ μόνο εἶναι ἀφορμὴ κὶ ὅλα στὸν κόσμον ζοῦσι 105
 τὰ πράματα, καὶ στρέφονται καὶ δὲ μπορὰ χαθοῦσι.
 Τούτῃ τὰ χόρτα, τὰ πουλλιά, τὰ δέντρα καὶ τοὶ ἀθρώπους
 κάνει συχτιὰ καὶ σμίγουσι ἀλλήλως τως μὲ τρόπους

36. πάντα τως is written above ὅλα μὲ, and then deleted.

37. ειχε cod.

πολλῶ λογιῶ, καὶ ἀποδεκεῖ σπέρονονται καὶ γεννοῦσι
 σιτὸ κόσμο καὶ πληθαίνουσι καὶ πάντα τως κρατοῦσι, 110
 καὶ ἂν εἶχε λείπει, ἐπόμενεν ὁ κόσμος χαλασμένος,
 καὶ ἀπ' ὄλα τὰ ποιήματα γδυνμός καὶ σημασμένος·
 Μὰ μὲ τὸ μέσο ται ἐκεινής βρῖσκειται σιολισμένος
 μὲ ται ὁμορφιές, ὁποῦ θωρεῖς κ' εἶναι ὄλος γεμισμένος.
 Λοιπὸ ἂν ἐγὼ τὰ πράματα ὄλα τοῦ κόσμον ὀρίζω, 115
 καὶ ται ὁμορφιές ἀπὸ ἔχουσι μόνια μου τῶς χαρίζω,
 καὶ ἀποῦ τὴν ὁμορφιά μου ἐμὲ παίρνου καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ κάλλη,
 καὶ κάθα εἰς τὰ ὀρέγεται κ' ἔχει χαρὰ μεγάλη,

3 Cod. Barocc. 216. Folio 179r

Ἀλέμονον ἢ τάλαινα, πῶς ἄρξωμαι τοῦ λόγου,
 τῆς τύχης μου τῆς πονηροῦς τὸ πᾶν εἰπεῖν καθόλου;
 Τίς μου τὴν θλίψιν ἐξελεῖ, τίνος αὐτὸ θαρρέσω,
 καὶ τίς ἀκοῦσαι δύναται, καὶ τίνων μὲν ἀρέσω;
 Τὴν φλόγα, τὴν πολλὴν πυρὰν τὴν ἔχει ἡ καρδιά μου, 5
 τίς νὰ τὴν οβέση δυνηθῆ, καὶ νὰ ἴναι παρηγοριά μου;
 Τίς νὰ γιαιτρεύση τὴν πληγὴν τὴν ἔχω ἀπατός μου, (?)
 τὴν μῶδωκεν, ἀλίμονο, κ' ἔσφαξε τὰ ἐντός μου;
 Οὐδὲν ἤξεύρω ἢ καὶ ζῶ, ἢ ζωντανὴ δὲν εἶμαι,
 ἀπὸ τὸν πόνο τὸν πολλὸν δὲ ξεύρω πόθεν κεῖμαι. 10
 Πληγὴν μεγάλην μῶδωκεν νέος ὁποῦ ἠγάπων,
 ὁποῦ ἔχε πάντα μετ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ τοῦτον πάντως *...*
 Δώδεκα μέρες ἀριθμῶ ἀφοῦ κεῖνος οὐκ ἦλθεν
 εἰς τὸ ἡσπίτιν τὸ ἐμὸν καὶ φαίνεται καὶ ἀπῆλθεν.
 Πορεύσομαι λοιπὸν ἐγὼ ἐκεῖνο νὰ σύρω τώρα, 15
 νὰ ὀρθῆ σιτὸ σπίτι τὸ καλὸν εἰς τῶν Χανιῶν τὴν χώρα,
 καὶ νὰ δῶ τοῦτον νὰ μεμφθῶ καὶ νὰ κατηγορήσω
 εἰς ἃ μοι κάμνει ὁ ἄθλιος, καὶ νὰ τὸν ὀνειδίσω.

9. Οὐκ οἶδεν. u oi deleted.

11 - 12. ὁποῦ ἠγάπων...πάντως is written above τινὰς δ' οὐδ' α, ἄψε καὶ σφάζομαι λοιπὸν εἰς τῶν χανιῶν τὴν σοῦδα, of which only ἄψε καὶ σφάζομαι is deleted.

13. γίνονται deleted, and ἀριθμῶ written above. πληγῶδην δλη deleted and κεῖνος οὐκ ἦλθεν written above.

14. καρδιάν καὶ τὴν κεφάλην καὶ τὰ νεφρὰ deleted.

GARETH MORGAN