In search of patterns in classical and modern Greek literature

Author: Dia Mary L. Philippides
The passage below (Euripides’s Medea 476-513), the first of the play’s three major confrontations between Medea, the wronged wife, and Jason, the husband who had betrayed her trust (the full confrontation actually runs ll. 446-626), is an illustration of an extraordinary incidence of metrical variation in the dialogue meter (the iambic trimeter) of ancient Greek tragedy:

εςωσά σ’, ώς ἵσασιν Ἐλλήνων ὅσοι
taúτων συνεισέβησαν Ἀργῷον σκάφος,
πεμφθέντα ταύρον πυρπνόων ἐπιστάτην
ζεύγλαισι και σπερόντα ἑανάσιμων γύνην·
δράκοντα θ’, δ’ πάγχρυσον ἀμπέχων δέρας
σπείρας ἐσωξε πολυπλόκοις ἁυπνος ὄν,
κτείνασ’ ἀνέσχον σοι φαός σωτήριον.
αὕτη δὲ πατέρα καὶ δόμους προδοῦσ’ ἐμοὺς
tὴν Πηλιώτιν εἰς Ἰαλκὸν ἴκιμήν
σῶν σοι, πρόδυμοι μάλλων ἡ σφοτέρα·
Πελίαν τ’ ἀπέκτειν’, ὡσπερ ἀλγιστὸν θανεῖν,
παιδῶν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, πάντα δ’ ἐξείλων δόμων.
καὶ ταῦθ’ ὑφ’ ἡμῶν, ὸ κάκιοτ’ ἀνδρῶν, παθὼν
προδώκας ἡμᾶς, καὶνά δ’ ἐκτήσω λέχη,
pαιδῶν γεγώτων· εἰ γὰρ ἡσθ’ ἀπαίς ἐτι,
συγγνωστὸν ἴν σοι τοῦδ’ ἐρασθῆναι λέχους.
ὅρκων δὲ φροῦδῃ πίστις, οὐδ’ ἔχω μαθεῖν
εἰ θεοὺς νομίζεις τοὺς τότ’ οὐκ ἄρχειν ἐτι,
ἢ καὶνά κείσθαι θέσμι’ ἀνθρώποις τὰ νῦν,
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As already noticed by Carlo Prato in the early 1970s, this passage presents an exceptionally high concentration of the metrical phenomenon called "resolution," where in the regular 12-syllable pattern of the iambic line of verse two short syllables are substituted for a single long syllable, thus creating a line of thirteen syllables (or more, if the line of verse contains, as it may, more than a single resolution). In the passage above, the (nine) words containing resolutions have been rendered in italics.

The significance of resolutions for the poetry of Euripides had been noted much earlier. Among others, the Polish classical scholar Zielinski stated near the beginning of the 20th century (1925) that this metrical variation sufficed to separate the plays of Euripides into chronological categories. His theory was subsequently expanded by Ceadel (1941) to include the corollary that Euripidean plays of uncertain date might be dated through interpolation with plays of defined date, based on their total count of resolutions, since that count seems to increase rather steadily with time over the production of Euripides. A sophisticated demonstration of the theory was given by Martin Cropp and Gordon Fick in their recent study of the fragmentary tragedies of Euripides (1985), in which, on the
basis of statistical analysis, they assigned dates to a good number of the 50 fragmentary tragedies included in their analysis. (By contrast, Euripides' predecessors, Aeschylus and Sophocles, show a relative avoidance of resolutions in their works.)

Metrical variation and other phenomena of style (such as the length of sentences or the preference for [or avoidance of] certain "function" words) have often been used to re-examine, and where possible confirm, the uncertain authorship of works and/or their relative dating. What was new about the Euripidean studies of the '70s is the fact that they linked their observations on metrical phenomena with an (internal) analysis of the dramatic content of the plays. From a study of the dialogue meter of three early and three late plays of Euripides (Philippides 1981) it may be hypothesized that the poet used either exceptionally high concentrations or an avoidance of resolutions (beyond what might be expected by chance) to underscore the dramatic content of certain types of scenes—high concentrations accompany passages of heightened emotional intensity, and passages with exceptionally low concentrations may be found in accounts of events that occur offstage (such as in messenger speeches) and occasionally in passages where a speaker is putting on a calm front, trying to hide his actual intentions and lull his interlocutor into a false sense of security.

Stylistic analysis on the iambic trimeter of Euripides has been facilitated by early studies of scholars such as Joseph Descroix; the latter's monograph (1931) offers scansion for the dialogue meter of all 33 tragedies. In a survey of this broader area one should point out the monograph of Seth Schein, on the trimeter in Aeschylus and Sophocles (1979), the link between meter, style and vocabulary in the trimeter of the three Greek tragedians by Carlo Prato et al. (1975), and the important work on prosody by Devine and Stephens (1981 and 1994). We can hope that the Perseus Project will expand to include the metrical scansion of the trimeter lines of the Greek texts.

Here in today's story we take flight from Euripides, through a series of fortunate coincidences, and find ourselves poised at the end of the 1970s in a course taught at Harvard, under the auspices of the then new George Seferis Chair of Modern Greek Studies, by its incumbent George Savidis, on the topic of Cretan Renaissance Literature. Towards the end of the four centuries-long Venetian
occupation of Crete (1211-1669), the cultural cross-fertilization of
the two cultures had a marked result. "Cretan Renaissance" literature has its peak in the late 16th to early 17th century (the traditional dates are 1570-1669), partly coinciding with the latter years of El Greco (1541-1614). This important period of Greek literature was little known to the Western world until the appearance in 1991 of the seminal volume of essays edited by David Holton, entitled Literature and Society in Renaissance Crete. The major literary works of the period encompass plays—religious drama, comedy, tragedy and pastoral are the types represented. The arguably most significant contemporary work is the long romance, Erotókritos.

From the presentation of the material in Prof. Savidis' course, to one of his auditors, still relatively unfamiliar with the period of the Cretan Renaissance, it soon became apparent that the Cretan dramas resemble in their form the tragedies of 5th-century Athens, in that they are expressed mainly in "stichic verse," that is poetic lines of fixed length;¹² in this case the 15-syllable line in iambic rhythm that is characteristic of late medieval Greek verse and the folksong, arranged here in rhyming couplets (with "feminine" rhyme, i.e. final stress on the penultimate syllable of the line of verse). One of the shorter works of the period is the religious drama The Sacrifice of Abraham, which retells, in ca. 1,100 verses, the story of God's message to Abraham that he must sacrifice his son, and the carrying out of that command (the μαντάτο). We shall leave aside the important Renaissance characteristics of the play, and also issues pertaining to its relationship to its Western (Italian) prototype which has been identified (about these topics much is found in the works of especially Wim Bakker and also Arnold van Gemert).¹³ The reader of this religious drama can become mesmerized by the—alas, anonymous!—poet's fine attention to language and form. The first four lines of the play (Θυσία 1-4) follow:

Εὕπν', Ἀβραάμ, ξύπν', Ἀβραάμ, γείρου κι ἀπάνω στάσου,
μαντάτο ἀπὸ τοῦς οὐρανοὺς σοῦ φέρνου κι ἀφουκράσου.
Εὕπνησε, δόξε τοῦ Θεοῦ ίσω και μπιστεμένε,
και να κοιμᾶσαι ἀμέριμνα ἐδὰ καιρὸς δὲν ἦναι.

In order better to appreciate the play's language and poetic style, the auditor in Prof. Savidis' course prepared for the Sacrifice
of Abraham a number of printed word-tables, including a keyword-in-context concordance and several other word-tables, including word-frequency, a reverse index and a rhyming table. The book was published in Athens (Philippides 1986). Figure 1\textsuperscript{15} gives a sample taken from the concordance: the locations of the name Σάρρα in the text, chosen in honor of our conference host. A keyword-in-context concordance lists all the words in the exact form(s) in which they occur in the text, placing them in the center of the page in alphabetical order; each line in the table refers to a citation in the text, identified by the number of its line at the right. Words with more than one citation in the text are arranged in the alphabetical order of the context to their right. This arrangement brings to light similar phraseology—which in the case of this word is (unfortunately) not to be seen! The word-frequency table (see Fig. 2) summarizes the fact that the name Σάρρα occurs twenty-two times in the text—twenty as Σάρρα and two as Σάρρας, in the genitive case. Fig. 3 presents a section of the rhyming table with the words from the play’s nine couplets that rhyme in ARA. Here Σάρρα is included five times, always in an odd, or first, line of a couplet.

The concordance to the *Sacrifice of Abraham*, which was based on the edition prepared by Eleni Tsantsanoglou (1971),\textsuperscript{16} was the first to be printed in Greek for a work of modern Greek literature.\textsuperscript{17} It was prepared in the best classical tradition: designed and printed by Stephen V.F. Waite (now of the Packard Humanities Institute in California, then living in New Hampshire in the vicinity of Dartmouth College, and in charge of the APA’s collection of Latin electronic texts), and based on the programs developed and used by David Packard in his landmark four-volume concordance to the Roman historian Livy (1968). Two other concordances for modern Greek literature were to follow separately: the first (published in seven volumes!), to the complete (prose) works of the 19th-century General Makrygiannes (Kyriazidis et al. 1992) and the second, a concordance to a version of the early modern Greek epic (or “narrative poem”\textsuperscript{19}) of *Digenes Akrites* (Beaton et al. 1995). Both these concordances use a slightly different arrangement than that of the *Sacrifice of Abraham* (and Livy et al.).\textsuperscript{20}

It could be claimed that the major use of the concordance to the *Sacrifice of Abraham* to date has been to serve as a stepping stone for the subsequent new critical edition of the play by Wim Bakker.
and Arnold van Gemert that appeared ten years later (1996). Both of the critical editors have admitted their debt to the concordance (which facilitated their checking up on forms appearing with inconsistent spelling in the text, e.g. γηρατεύα (“old age”), with η and γερατεύα, with epsilon; the inclusion or omission of apostrophes; their review of meter, etc.)—in fact the copy of the concordance which I had sent to their Institute’s library in Amsterdam fell apart due to heavy use and had to be replaced!—but, as one can anticipate, the publication of their new critical edition generates a problem for the longevity, or usefulness, of the existing concordance. The editors sent to me a copy of their book adding a personal inscription in which they begged my forgiveness for their publication, tout court. Obviously, the current text of their edition of the play no longer matches the text on which the concordance and other word-tables are based. The problem of keeping up with new editions is one regularly faced, I expect, also by the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae and Perseus, on a scale far larger than that of a single play. The amount of philological (and technical) work involved in the making of a concordance and other such word-tables is extensive. Thus I was, and still am, seeking a method of presenting, in clear tabular form, the differences in the new edition from the old, so as to supplement the existing set of word-tables rather than being forced to produce an entirely new one. When, a few years ago, I consulted one of the best authorities I could think of, Peter Robinson of Oxford, who has produced the program Collate for the automatic collation of texts (and the related CD-ROM to Chaucer’s Wife of Bath Prologue), he replied that I seemed to be wanting to collate concordances, something which has not yet been done automatically. The case rests there for the moment. The main joy is that from the many years of close collaboration over problematic issues of the text of the Cretan Sacrifice of Abraham, two of the collaborators gained, according to the inimitable expression of our colleague in Theater Studies at the University of Athens, Walter Puchner, a more lasting collegiality.

The tale now takes a different turn, breaking away from drama. The major literary work of the Cretan Renaissance, both because of its length (which is almost 10,000 verses, i.e. close to the extent of Homer’s Odyssey) and also because of its stature, is the romance Erotokritos. The Erotokritos tells (in five books, not twenty-four) the
story of the young princess of Athens, Aretousa, and the commoner Erotokritos, who fall in love and must go through several ordeals—she, brutal imprisonment by her father, and he, exile, wanderings, and then battle—these trials lasting close to five years, until Erotokritos returns to Athens (in disguise), having successfully defended the kingdom of Aretousa's father's, and claims her hand in marriage, which is granted to him by the grateful king.

Like the Sacrifice of Abraham the Erotokritos is also based on a Western prototype. An important edition of the romance was produced by Stephanos Xanthoudidis in 1915; the most recent critical edition is that of Stylianos Alexiou, with a publication date of 1980, and several reprints (including corrections) since that time. As soon as the Alexiou edition appeared, its text was entered into the computer. At the Cretological Conference in 1986, David Holton and Dia Philippides decided to work together, and in 1996 the 3-volume set of their concordance to the Erotokritos was published by Hermes Publications in Athens. Much of the related work presented in the present paper is an outcome of that collaboration, and should be taken as the result of joint effort.

Along with the plot, the characters and the language, one of the most interesting features of the romance is its form, as it has been called a “daring mixture of genres” (St. Alexiou 1980: 66). The Poet-narrator controls the development of the plot through his (mostly third-person) narration and allows the characters of the story to speak in direct discourse (or as we term it, dialogue). The name of the Poet-narrator (in the form of Ποιητής = Poet) appears—just as the names of all the speaking characters—at the change of interlocutor, in the left margin of the text of the edition (in the original sources as well). The five books contain differing proportions of narrative and dialogue—Book B (that in certain ways resembles Homer's Rhapsody B with the catalogue of ships), where the competitors for the joust are individually presented and compete, has the greatest proportion of narrative verses. Book Γ, where many developments in the love plot of the story take place, has the highest proportion of dialogue. The Poet-narrator intervenes almost everywhere between the speeches of the characters, except when once or twice he lets the dramatic excitement silence him.
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The keyword-in-context concordance helps us recognize the word-forms and the phrases the poet has used, and especially those he returns to and uses more than once. Through the arrangement of the concordance repeating phrases may be seen—I hesitate to call them "formulas," though Greek scholars mostly refer to "λογοτυποί." 28 (Also, this is not an oral composition; rather the romance is expressed in a written, sophisticated literary language.) Repeated phrases in the Erotokritos usually range in length from half a line of verse to a whole verse, or even slightly more. In Fig. 4 all the poem's (eight) references to "Crete" (Κρήτη) are given (ό Κρητικός, "the Cretan," occurs more frequently29). The alphabetical arrangement of the citations of a word by following context makes obvious the repeated phrase της/την Κρήτης το λιοντάρι (the lion of Crete), which refers, twice in Book B and once (in retrospect) in Book Γ, to the great Cretan jouster Χαρίδημος, who would have been the likeliest to win the crown in the joust, if Erotokritos, through luck (and the poet's help), had not succeeded in receiving the prize from Aretousa's hands.

Fig. 5 assists us in noticing the four-fold repetition of the phrase ἦτρεμα (-ε) (ω)σάν καλάμι (I/(s)he trembled like a reed), the repetition of the full verse (near the bottom of the figure) ἦτρεμεν ὁλο τὸ κορμὶ κ' ἡ δύναμι το/τη ἐχάθη in lines Γ977 and Γ1147 (with a difference only in the final pronoun), and the slightly more permuted repetition in the first and third lines of the excerpt: ἦτρεμ' (-ε) αὐτή/ἐκείνη στη μιά μερά κ' ἐκεῖνος εἰς τὴν ἄλλη (Β537 and Γ585).30

The concordance aims at facilitating the study of narrative vs. dialogue and the identity of the person speaking at each time. Thus, to the book and line number given at the left is added, for each keyword, the name of its speaker.31 (Other concordances lack this information; however, it is useful.) With the speaker identification we can easily distinguish what words may be characteristic of narrative or dialogue, and examine whether and how characters echo one another. We can begin to seek for linguistic idiosyncracies that particular characters may exhibit, as has been done for Achilles and others in the Homeric epics.32 For instance, Aretousa, who is commonly agreed to be the kernel of the romance (Sherrard 1978: 119-120)—does her speech show idiorrhythmic characteristics?

Having the two concordances available, for the Sacrifice of Abraham and the Erotokritos, means that we may review the
hypothesis of the common authorship of the two texts. As far back as 1915, Xanthoudidis proposed in his edition of the Erotokritos that the Sacrifice of Abraham be attributed to the author of the romance.33 (This is not going back as far as the start of the Homeric question, but still the issue is respectably dated!) The sizeable number of similar verses that occur in both works made the hypothesis take hold, and it gained ground when it was confirmed in 1960 by the great scholar of modern Greek literature Linos Politis.34 At Fig. 6 we see one of the lines of verse that coincides in the two works: μά 'ναν (μά ἔνα) κερίν ἀφτούμενον(ν) ἐκράτουν κ’ (κι) ἡσβησε μου (“as if I was holding a candle that went out”), used by Sarah in her μουρόλοι over Isach and by Erotokritos as he laments having to leave his love behind, as he goes into exile.

The latest review of the status of the question of common authorship is to be found in chapter IX of the introduction to the Bakker-van Gemert critical edition of the Sacrifice of Abraham (1996: 116-27). Issues of language and metrics (e.g., the use of particular words, personal pronouns; the presence or absence of hiatus) as well as the religious outlook of the two works are used as arguments. We still cannot be sure either way, although we know that the authors of that time were good readers (or listeners) of one another, that they could have borrowed unconsciously, and certainly considered it “comme il faut” to borrow from another’s work.

It could be of interest to note here that both the Erotokritos and the Sacrifice of Abraham are non-typical in their overall form. The Erotokritos presents itself in five books in the proper form of a Renaissance drama,35 whereas the Sacrifice of Abraham ignores some of the aspects that it should have as a drama of its time: the play has no prologue and no choral interludes, and the division into five acts has been obscured in the tradition of the text.36

Beyond the search for repeated phrases, and beyond the re-examination of the hypothesis of common authorship, the concordance can be instrumental in a number of ways: in bringing to light inconsistencies in forms, so as to suggest critical emendations to this text and others of its period; to contribute information towards a grammar of the language of the period, which is still lacking; in the study of the poem’s metrics (which is only beginning—though Natalia Deliyannaki’s doctoral dissertation [1995] offers much promise; the same author earlier published a study on
enjambement in the poem [Deliyannaki 1991]—one thinks back to the considerable secondary literature on the same phenomenon in Homer}; to examine connections of the Erotokritos with earlier Greek texts and also with subsequent authors who are known to have been influenced by Kornaros (for instance, Solomos and Seferis).

In addition to the three volumes of the concordance a fourth volume will soon be appearing in the set of word-tables to the Erotokritos. As was done earlier for the Sacrifice of Abraham, now for the romance other tables, such as of word-frequency and the rhyme, have been prepared. The frequency has been counted both for the actual word-forms as they appear in the text and for the dictionary headings (lemmata) under which they may be placed. Looking at lists of the most frequent lemmata in the Sacrifice of Abraham and in the Erotokritos (see Fig. 7) one notes similarities and differences: the lemma of the article ὃ is the most frequent and καὶ follows immediately upon it. The romance has a more paratactic structure, whereas the drama includes more subordinate clauses (see the relatively higher status of ύ). The third person pronoun ἄντως is more frequent in the romance; the first and second person pronouns ἐγὼ and ἐσώ in the drama. Most of the distinctions between the two works could be linked to their difference in genre.

As just mentioned, metrical studies in the Erotokritos have barely begun. One need recall that the poetry is created through means other than those of ancient Greek literature: ancient poetry results from a regular alternation of long and short syllables; by the time of the Erotokritos, the meter is based on an alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables (i.e. it is “dynamic”). An important related aspect is the rhyme that links successive pairs of verses together into a couplet. In the area of rhyme two results obtained so far are worthy of mention:

(a) In Fig. 8 the most frequent words in the rhyme of each of the romance's five parts have been identified. Many of these words are represented fairly evenly in each part (see the words underlined in the figure), which observation may be used to support the internal coherence of the poem and the relatively simultaneous composition of the five parts—which has occasionally been questioned, especially with regard to the joust in Book B, yet other kinds of recent research, based on the analysis of characters and themes
(b) An analysis of the parts of speech to which the rhyming words belong, in the Erotokritos, the Sacrifice of Abraham and a third work contemporary to them, the tragedy Erohile, shows the Sacrifice of Abraham exhibiting behavior similar to that of the other play and a marked difference between the two plays on the one hand and the romance on the other. Yet no one has ever proposed that the Sacrifice of Abraham be attributed to the Cretan poet George Chortatsis, the known author of the Erohile. This analysis seems to be pointing to a linking of the rhyme with literary genre.

The rhyming table comes with the name of the speaker attached to each couplet. Thus it will be possible to examine whether specific speakers tend to favor certain rhymes—we have some preliminary results for Aretousa. The rhymes of Cretan Renaissance literature have also been studied by Walter Puchner (1991) and Tasoula Markomihelaki (1993)—they working exclusively with the Cretan dramas. Now we'll be able to add in the study of the rhyme of the romance in connection with their dramatic findings.

Another element of the poem's form that has been studied, at least initially, also points us in the direction of acknowledging the effect of literary genre: the number of syllables per line of verse is always fixed at fifteen, but the number of words encompassed in each line varies—in the Erotokritos from three to fifteen! Charts and graphs published elsewhere (cf. Philippides 1998:384-385) juxtapose the Erotokritos and the Sacrifice of Abraham in this respect. The two works' profile differs: the romance shows a preference for (on average) lines of verse with fewer, longer words (the top frequency type contains eight words), whereas the drama shows a preference for nine-word lines, with more, and hence shorter words on average, that may give the impression of quicker interaction in the dialogue. A parallel analysis, examining separately the narrative parts and the dialogue parts of the Erotokritos, shows its result also in the study just mentioned. Separate charts and graphs for the narrative parts and the dialogue parts of the Erotokritos taken separately (Philippides 1998:386) show that the narrative portions alone of the Erotokritos resemble the overall spectrum of the romance, whereas its dialogue parts, when considered alone, resemble the spectrum of the Sacrifice of Abraham.
Another feature of the form of *Erotokritos* which it is important to study is the juncture of narrative and dialogue. In the text, speeches tend to begin and end (tidily) at the start and end of rhyming couplets (the exchange of dialogue between speakers is done exclusively in this way in the *Sacrifice of Abraham*). In the romance, however, there are cases where a single line of verse has an internal change of speaker (usually a transition between the Poet-narrator and a speaker) or where a couplet is not entirely expressed by a single speaker. There are 185 of these “divided” lines and 48 such “divided” couplets in the *Erotokritos*—a relatively small proportion given the total length of the work (9,982 verses or 4,991 couplets). Most of so-called divided lines begin simply with the Poet-narrator stating either Λέγει (he/she says) or Δέχεται combined with a pronoun of the person addressed (e.g. Λέγει τού or Δέχεται τη [he/she says to him or her], or in the reverse order: Τη λέγει . . .). Immediately thereafter in the line begin the actual words of the character speaking.45 These divided lines usually come at the end of longer narrative speech introductions. The introductions to speech have been extensively studied for the Homeric epics.46 It would be interesting to study them fully in the *Erotokritos*, and I hope that a narratologist will be undertaking the challenge. At present I have been reviewing the small subset mentioned, that of the “divided” lines and couplets at the juncture of narrative and dialogue. There the approaches of Homeric scholarship, which one had hoped would have been helpful, did not serve the Renaissance context. Fortunately, a theoretical approach has just been located, in the work of Panagiotis Agapitos (1991) on narrative structures in the Byzantine vernacular romance.47 In order to describe the similar phenomena which he witnessed in the earlier romances, he has developed the needed terminology: within his description of the “speech frame” that surrounds direct discourse, he identifies a type of speech-introducing technique that he calls the “delayed speech-introducing formula.”48 This term may be used precisely to classify the few verses of the type given below:

| Γ'159 | “Νένα μου, λέγει ή 'Αρετή, φρόνιμα δασκαλεύγεις, |
| Γ'171 | “Παιδί μου, λέγει ή νένα της, σφάνουσι τὰ λογιάξεις, |
| Γ'299 | “Νένα μου, λέγει ή 'Αρετή, ἤντα 'ν τὰ δασκαλεύγεις; |
| Ε'613 | “Νένα, τη Λέγει ή 'Αρετή, τὸ γίνηκεν ἐγίνη |
| Ε'1133 | “Αμε πέ, λέγει ή 'Αρετή, γλήγορα τοῦ κυροῦ μου |
These verses, where the speaker begins abruptly, and after his/her first few words the narrational introduction λέγει plus the name of the speaker is interjected, are found only in restricted locations of the poem, mainly linked to the speech of characters who are closely connected emotionally.49

At this break in our own narrative, I should like to mention—briefly—the forthcoming CD-ROM,50 now under final review before circulation, based on the material from the book with the word-tables of the Erotokritos. Besides the fact that it will be much lighter to carry around and less expensive than the four-volume set of the book with the word-tables, the three main characteristics of the CD-ROM are: (a) the fact that it will include the text of the romance in St. Alexiou’s edition, corrected according to the inconsistencies we have pointed out to the editor;51 (b) the ca. 500,000 bi-directional links that have been added to connect all the words in many of the word-tables to the text, so that the reader may move relatively quickly from table to text and back again, in order to check any idea he may have; (c) the fact that it has been prepared using Netscape technology,52 which theoretically means that, as soon as the publisher recoups some of the costs of production, it could be rather easily transferred to the Web. Given the fact that, until now, the Greek fonts and keyboard layouts on computers within Greece are generally incompatible with those used by philologists of Greek abroad, it seemed best to include the fonts used in the text and tables on the CD-ROM itself, so that it should play on most computers without requiring the readers first to purchase new fonts.

It should be crystal-clear by now that, in the 1980s and the 1990s, modern Greek has firmly entrenched itself in the world of computers and the humanities. On the one hand it had to deal with the complexities of the Greek alphabet and diacritical marks that differentiated it from the regular sorting order of the Latin alphabet that is familiar to computers; on the other hand it has gained good benefit from the lessons learned and the routes previously opened and travelled by researchers of ancient Greek. In this spectrum, though, it is interesting to note that making a concordance in the fully-stressed Greek alphabet is not a simple mechanical process: the keyword-in-context concordances to Homer’s Odyssey
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and *Iliad* came out only this past decade, respectively in 1994 and 1998. The job is laborious, as anyone who has made a concordance (especially for a text in any period of Greek) can testify. In Cretan Renaissance Greek, at least judging from the experience of the concordances to the *Sacrifice of Abraham* and the *Erotokritos*, even if one does not have to fully identify each word as to its morphology (that could be a different project), just disambiguating the “homograph” forms means identifying the syntax of approximately ¼ of all the forms in the text, i.e. close to 25,000 words (the total number of word-occurrences in the text is 84,568). Such projects can be completed only with a large investment of time, and with the collaboration of specialists from many separate areas: philologists, experts in computing (who know about the combination of computers and literary texts); if conclusions are to be sought re authorship, dating or style, then a statistician should also be included in the team.

Approximately a decade ago, the pioneers of the computer analysis of texts, especially those trying to answer questions of authorship and dating based on style, went through self-examination, and started to doubt their previous approaches. As a result, the use of statistics has become much more sophisticated. In Modern Greek we have not yet entered that race, but we are aware that a recent study of Shakespeare relied on the consensus of 55 tests (Elliott-Valenza 1996). It will obviously not be easy for us to solve the question of the common authorship of the *Erotokritos* and the *Sacrifice of Abraham*. First we need to collect general information from the literary texts of the period so as to know better the literary standard from which either work may be deviating (one need recall that we still lack a grammar of the period). We then have to think of many tests.

But even if such a project does not prove conclusively, for instance in our case, whether the poet of the *Erotokritos* did or did not compose the *Sacrifice of Abraham*, we are building step by step a corpus, or databank, that may be relied upon by scholars long into the future. We need the time, the coordination, and the funds with which to continue this development.

Such an approach to texts is a precise science, very analytical, but aiming at an overall view of the text from a different angle than linear reading. We follow this approach in order to learn more about the history of the literary language, and in the case of the
Erotokritos to understand why George Seferis calls this “the most perfectly organized language in the history of medieval and modern Greek literature.” In the past, it has been stated that “the demotic songs and the Erotokritos will be honoured equally with the Homeric poems, because assuredly these, and only these, constitute the . . . true link of modern Hellenism, joining us to the golden chain of our forebears”—from our point of view, the poem’s relative length, and its stature (and subsequent influence), might allow this claim. The approach to texts, common to the study of Plato, Aristotle, and St. Paul (frequently with the aim of establishing the authorship of works), brings early modern Greek literature into line with ancient Greek literary studies but also with those based upon other medieval and Renaissance texts of the West, where parallel issues (of how best to prepare and print critical editions) are being addressed.

While relying partly on methods that have yielded fruit in the study of ancient Greek texts, we need to look more closely at Italian metrics, theories of decorum and style too, since the basis for the Greek Renaissance texts comes from Italian literature and society. This approach might well be included within Comparative Literature. From the side of modern Greek literature, we are opening a dialogue with other disciplines—even if it’s not really a cross-over, it’s still a meeting or an opening of the minds and a sharing of experience.

Καὶ κάθε λόγο διαμετρά πῶς πάγει πῶς ταιριάζει (Erot. Γ646) (“and he measures out every word, to see how it fits in”)—these words are used by the Poet-narrator to describe Erotokritos’ examination of the first words of love he has just heard from Aretousa, but they could be self-referential to the poet’s own review of his words, and certainly they could reflect what we are now doing in retrospect as we revisit his text. Like the analysis of music, the point is not to take the work apart, but to learn how better to appreciate the several parts that make up the beauty of its whole.
Notes

*This paper is delivered for publication with sincere thanks to our hosts at the Contours of Hellenism conference, Prof. Sarah Morris, Prof. Speros Vryonis, and Dr. Stelios Vasilakis, for their invitation and warm hospitality, as well as to Prof. Ann Bergren of the Classics Dept. at UCLA, for her guidance in metrical footsteps some years ago.

1The text is taken from the Loeb edition of the play (Way 1935:320-22), cf. Philippides 1982:23, Fig. 4, wherein the Greek text is given accompanied by its English translation.


3A resolution is seen in the first two syllables of ἀπολύς in Medea 255, cf. Philippides 1982:17, Fig. 1:

4Zielinski's categories are entitled "severe," "semi-severe," and "free." The free group might be subdivided into middle and freer.

5See especially their Conclusions, p. 69.

6Well-known studies in the field of Classical Greek Studies refer to works of Plato and Aristotle and, in a slightly later period, to works attributed to St. Paul. See summaries (and bibliography) in Hockey 1980 (especially 136-140) and Oakman 1984:143-46.

7Sylvia Brown presented similar theories based on the choral meters of Euripides's plays, in her doctoral dissertation (1972) and in an article (1974). To the studies on the trimeter in Euripides should be added Marianina Olcott's study (1974) of the dialogue meter of two Sophoclean plays. The investigation of the interaction of meter and dramatic content in the trimeter of Euripides is currently continuing in the work of Nancy Laan (Ph.D. candidate in Classics at the University of Amsterdam), centering on elision; cf. Laan 1995.

8A monograph, based on my doctoral dissertation. The article Philippides 1982 gives a summary of the general approach used, and of the particular results achieved in the study of Euripides's Medea.

9The linking of exceptionally high, or low, concentrations of resolutions to particular type of scenes persists in the three late plays as well as in the three early plays examined, even though the total counts of the resolutions contained in each play increase over time.

10Here, and in the case of all classical references in this paper, indicative (not comprehensive) sources are mentioned.

11Currently available in either of its versions: Perseus 2.0 (1996) or on the Internet.

12For a major presentation of Greek stichic verse in antiquity see van Raalte 1986.


14The book includes a bilingual compendium of remarks on style.

15All the numbered figures for this paper will be printed at its end.

16This is the edition from which lines will be quoted in this paper, and on which all the play's word-tables are based.
Foibos Ghikopoulos had previously printed, on computer paper and in ASCII, a concordance to Greek folksongs from Italy (1984).

The concordance, Kyriazidis et al. 1992, expands the work of the same team's pioneering word-index published a few years earlier: Kyriazidis et al. 1983.

David Holton briefly discusses (1991b:208) the nature of Digenis Akritis, "the best known narrative poem of early Modern Greek literature": "Even though it is often characterized as an epic, . . . it too contains many features of romance."

In the concordances to Makrygiannis and Digenis Akritis the multiple occurrences of a repeated word are listed in their order of appearance in the text.

Their new critical edition was subsequently published as a χρησιμική έκδοσις: Bakker-van Gemert 1998.

Robinson-Blake 1996.


Out of the many reprints of the critical edition of 1980 (in 1986 and 1994), and of the Alexiou "small" edition of 1985, the editor counselled us to use his edition of 1992 (the third improved reprint of the 1985 edition), claiming that it includes the most up-to-date text. (The Alexiou edition of 1992 has been reprinted [reprints published by Hestia Publications, in 1995 and subsequent years]; the editor claims that no changes have been introduced to the text.)


The earliest surviving sources for the romance are two: British Library Harleianus ms. 5644 of 1710 and the first Venetian edition dated 1713—the copy of the Gennadius Library in Athens is easiest to access; it lacks two folios; the only other (complete) surviving copy of that edition known to us is in the Biblioteca Civica of Verona; of the latter a photostatic reprint edition has been published recently: Stevanoni 1995.

Gregory Sifakis, unable to travel to the conference, is sorely missed. His attention to the terminology and the analysis is significant. On λογοτυποι see, for instance, St. Alexiou 1993.

Specifically, forms of the word Κρητικός appear 44 times in the text.

As the duality in the spelling of the verb form indicates, we have not intervened in the editor's use of elision, which needs reviewing.


E.g., Friedrich and Redfield 1978.

Xanthoulidis 1973 [1915]:CXVIII-CXX.

See Politis 1960:360.
36See Bakker-van Gemert 1996:41.
37See Higbie 1990.
41A factor which we might assume is used “unconsciously” by the poet, a distinction that is important to statisticians.
42The text studied is based on the 1988 edition by St. Alexiou-M. Aposkiti; the interludes on their 1992 edition.
47I am grateful to Panagiotis Agapitos for a discussion in the spring of 2000, during which he clarified to me the sources of his theoretical framework.
48Agapitos 1991:66 “... a variation of the speech-introducing formula, in which the verb of speaking is placed after the initial words of the actual speech, thus delaying the exact signalling of the discursive section and obscuring the juncture.”
49As seen here, this rare pattern occurs only in emotional interchanges between Aretousa and her nurse, Frosyni (Nena). Other disrupted patterns in the narrative occur, but also rarely. For instance, on only a few occasions in the poem does the Poet-Narrator allow two speakers to follow immediately upon one another without an intervening comment on his part (Areti and Frosyni in Book A967-68 and A974-75; the two opposing combatants, Aristos and Erotokritos, in Book A1776-77).
50Philippides-Holton in press.
51This is an important point: in the future the text and the tables will be fully coordinated, both in subsequent printings of St. Alexiou’s edition of the text and on our CD-ROM.
52The program relies on an off-line Netscape browser.
53Tebben 1994 and 1998. A previous full concordance to the Homeric epics, prepared by Richard Janko, has been on display in a locked case, at the University of Cambridge, as a rare book (only one or very few copies had been printed).
54Cf. Perseus with its full indexing of all words in the Greek texts. For his doctoral dissertation in Sweden Vasilis Sabatakakis is reported to have completed the morphological analysis of the Erotokritos.

55With respect to modern Greek we also suffer from the fact that makers of computers within Greece and those outside Greece, as has already been suggested, have employed distinct, mutually incompatible ways of storing Greek characters on the machine. It is hard for authors within Greece and those abroad to exchange computer files with one another. One should also point out the fact that the multi-volume dictionary of medieval Greek (Kriaras 1969-) still only reaches the letter π.

56See the retrospectives of Milic and Potter (both 1991); also, Clayman 1992, and Olsen 1993.

57However many tests we may perform, based on criteria of style, a single new discovery in the archives of Venice might best solve the issue.

58Our choice of an early time period shares a certain positive characteristic with studies of ancient Greek literature. Both avoid the caveat of the lesson in David Lodge’s Small World, where the practically maddened computer researcher (Robin Dempsey, a professor of English) causes the writer whose style he fully analyzes (Ronald Frobisher) to go into writer’s block: “I’ve never been able to write fiction since,” he exclaims (Lodge 1985:185). It seems best perhaps to limit one’s analysis, at least at present, to authors who are no longer in our midst!


60An early quote from the editor of Cretan texts K.N. Sathas (1868:603), cited in English translation by Margaret Alexiou (1991:242).

61In earlier times reference would be made simply to the “typical 15-syllable iambic line in rhyming couplets” of the Cretan Renaissance texts, whereas now it has become clear, as with the stichic hexameter and trimeter texts of ancient Greek, that study of the versification and the language may allow for individual characterization and juxtaposition of authors and particular works, as well as a link of meter with content within the texts. Thus, our study of the rhyme, meter and language of the Cretan Erotokritos and its contemporary dramas may lead to further appreciation of the distinctions between various authors and works, or between narrative and dialogue form, as have done for the Homeric hexameter—and its relatively contemporary texts—the recent studies of Janko (1982) and Kelly (1990).
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### Figures

1. From the concordance to the *Sacrifice of Abraham* (Philippides 1986:94)

| Διάβασε από τή καρδιά σου/ και διάβασε πάσα | Σάρρα, ήμε κάμε προσευκή, δέση στο Θεό μας/ | 162 |
| — | Δέση στο Θεό μας/ | 501 |
| τήν ὅρα τού σκολείου ἐγὼ 'Θεία τζυνήσει// | Σάρρα, γέλασε, κι απέ μακρά δέ γνωρίσει | 1045 |
| ή Σάρρα και τρομάξει.// κι ως δες τή | Σάρρα/ και κάμε πάλι ταραχή και σκότιση | 271 |
| ας πιεινα, πρίγιο σηκινεί ώς λγομένη | Σάρρα/ και λυπήσου με κι αυτά τά λόγια πάψει, | 471 |
| Θε δ να σφαει με τού κυρού τή χερά.// δ ο | Σάρρα, και τρομάξει.// κι ως δες τή Σάρρα, | 1044 |
| Θελεις φωνάζει/ γλυκα φωνή, μή φοβηθείς ή | Σάρρα κειταιται άκομη λγομένη.// Τάμαρ, θυρώ τη | 290 |
| τού/ ή δουλεία ας γένει/ εδά πού ή | Σάρρα, κι ο Θεός πάλι τήν έγνοιαν έξει/ | 479 |
| νά το κρατά το να το φιλώ στο στόμα.// φήγανε, | Σάρρα, μή διδεις πλα σκηνώ και πάθη | 367 |
| νά θυμόμαστο πάντοτε το σημερνο μαντάτο.// | Σάρρα/ μηδέν τήν κάμεις να γενει ανάγκη/ | 41 |
| ή εσώ φότο 'δεκέθι σ' έμένα κε είς τή | Σάρρα/ ήν κάμεις, όντα σού γρικά, νά τής κολλά | 699 |
| μήν έμπεις σ' έτοιν πόλεμο με τήν κερά τή | Σάρρα μου θυγατέρα/ είναι καιρός παρηγορίας, | 343 |
| δέν είν' καιρός για κλάμημα, | Σάρρα, νά το βαστάξεις// όσον το δες να σηκινθεί, | 457 |
| ν' αφουκράσει// γαιτά δέν είναι βολετο, | Σάρρα ξελιγώθηκε κι έξει νά με μπερδέσει// | 306 |
| κι ήσερε μαντάτο πού μ' άρασεί/ ή | Σάρρα, παρακάλω ασ/ κι άγαμα, μήςένε από δώ | 447 |
| σώσα, μήν κλαίγεις, μή γρινάς, | Σάρρα/ πέ μου το και μηδέ δελιάς, κι άς πάγε | 149 |
| μολόγηση μου το κι έμε, όμη γάτας τή | Σάρρα πλα δέν ήτενα νά γαστρωθεί κοπέλα/ | 43 |
| τήν κάμεις να γενει ανάγκη και κατάρα.// | Σάρρα/ πού τήν ήράνσα/ ο καμής και τού παιδιού | 1075 |
| ή πός είναι μπορεί τό τάσημο νά λυσάει// | Σάρρα, πού 'τον άκαρπο και γρά κατά τή φύση/ | 673 |
| ή ζοτήσει το παίδι σου// και, πρίγιο | Σάρρα σηκινθεί και δεί τό μισεμ σου/ σπουδάζει έσο, | 237 |
| τήρα και χολή ή ϰήθη σου γειμάτη// | Σάρρα τάχ' απόθανε κι ήρας νά πείς μαντάτο/ | 1067 |
| πόνος γυνής με πολεμοίν ομδά/ τή | Σάρρας θλίψη, δάκρυα με μάνουν εις τήν "Αδη/ | 328 |
| στρατεύετε νά πάτε νά τους βρείτε// τού | Σάρρας στέκε νά χαθει μυγή και τό κορμ εξ/ | 1057 |
| ο Θεός τό θέλει/ ήμε καί νά 'ν' ή στράτα | σας γάλα, δροσές και μέλι// ήμε πού νά σε λυπηθεί | 404 |

2. From the word-frequency table of the *Sacrifice of Abraham* (ibid: 144-45)

| — | σάν, βλ. ώσαν | 22 | Σάρρα (ή) |
| 12 | σάρκα (ή) | 20 | Σάρρα |
| 7 | σάρκα | 2 | Σάρρας |
| 1 | σάρκαν | 4 | σβήνω |
| 4 | σάρκας | 1 | ήσβήνει |
| 1 | σαρκικός | 1 | σβήσει |
| 1 | σαρκική | 2 | σβήσεις |

3. From the rhyme-table of the *Sacrifice of Abraham* (ibid: 185)

**ANA**

| Μάνα | Κάνα | 832 | Σάρρα | κατάρα | 42 |
|———|———|———|———|———|———|
| κατάρα | άνταρα | 68 | Σάρρα | τρομάρα | 150 |
| λακτάρα | άνταρα | 760 | Σάρρα | τρομάρα | 700 |
| λακτάρα | τρομάρα | 172 | ΑΣΛ | κατάρα | 1142 |
| Σάρρα | άνταρα | 272 | κατάρας σας συντροφιά σας | 556 |
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4. From the concordance to the *Erotopêritos* (Philippides-Holton 1996, vol. Γ: C600)

51u3y9ili9du3991"Ano)nuttoth
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49191(19,1321133d13X13 AD11)
5411911A91513037111690013A9131
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5. Ibid, vol. B: C386

6. From the concordances to the *Sacrifice of Abraham* and the *Erotopêritos*

6. From the concordances to the *Sacrifice of Abraham* and the *Erotopêritos*

0908  ἀλάσει, καὶ σαν ἄντας κραταῖς
1145 [οὐδὲ καπνίσματα μποροῦν οὐδὲ
0415 νὰ μ’ ἀφήσεις; ἐπά 'ν τ’ ἄφτομον
0408 μὴ ἐδα το ποτέ μου, μά αν τα]

(a) Sacrifice of Abraham

A0756 ΠΟΙ κ’ ἐπονεῖ/ σαν τὸ
E0923 ΡΠΩ ἀγάλα ἐχάνετο σαν τὸ
Γ1102 ΡΟΙ κ’ οὐδὰς φυσήςς τὸ
B2391 ΠΟΙ κα οὐδὲ ψυγάρι οὐδὲ
B0757 ΠΟΙ κα αὖτος στὴν κεφαλὴν ἕνα
E0414 ΠΟΙ τῶν ἀματιῶν του ἡ λάμψη/ B2177 ΠΟΙ οἱ τρεῖς τοις σ’ μιὰ μερά,
Γ1396 ΡΠΩ δὲ σ’ ἐδα ποτέ μου, μὰ ἕνα
Δ1763 ΠΟΙ λαβάσθαι/ σα νὰ χεν εἶναι

κερή, τέτοιας λογίας διαβαίνει, στὸν κάμπτο

(b) Erotopêritos
7. The most frequent lemmata in the two works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacrifice of Abraham</th>
<th>Erotokritos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1148 Ο ήδραρ</td>
<td>10230 Ο ήδραρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690 καί σύνδρ</td>
<td>7400 καί σύνδρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584 νά σύνδρ</td>
<td>4838 αυτός άντρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545 εγώ άντρ</td>
<td>3524 νά σύνδρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373 αυτός άντρ</td>
<td>2551 εις πρόθυ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367 άσω άντρ</td>
<td>1536 εγώ άντρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243 εις πρόθυ</td>
<td>1286 δεν έπιρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184 είμαι</td>
<td>1189 είμαι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The most frequent rhyming words in the five books of the Erotokritos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erot. A (2210 vv.)</th>
<th>Erot. B (2454 vv.)</th>
<th>Erot. Γ (1756 vv.)</th>
<th>Erot. Δ (2020 vv.)</th>
<th>Erot. Ε (1542 vv.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Αρετούσσα 25</td>
<td>έγινη 40</td>
<td>έγινη 20</td>
<td>μεγάλης 22</td>
<td>έγινη 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεγάλη 25</td>
<td>μεγάλη 39</td>
<td>μεγάλη 15</td>
<td>έγινη 21</td>
<td>έχει 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έξει 24</td>
<td>κοντάρι 29</td>
<td>έκείνη 14</td>
<td>άλλο 14</td>
<td>έκείνη 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έγινη 19</td>
<td>έχει 23</td>
<td>γυρεύγει 13</td>
<td>έχει 14</td>
<td>έκρατει 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παλάτι 19</td>
<td>χέρα 23</td>
<td>κείνη 13</td>
<td>ήμέρα 14</td>
<td>παλάτι 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>áφηνει 16</td>
<td>έκείνη 22</td>
<td>Φροσύνη 12</td>
<td>έκείνη 12</td>
<td>δόση 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έκρατει 16</td>
<td>ήμέρα 22</td>
<td>μιλήση 12</td>
<td>κάνει 12</td>
<td>μιλήση 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>