

violence and Nilsson discusses erotic tactility. Here my criticism concerns the contribution of Tirnanic, which has some weaknesses.

First, the author draws conclusions that are not supported by Byzantine evidence. For example, it is stated that fire was “one of the four elements that the Byzantines believed their world consisted of” (p.213). Instead of giving a reference to a Byzantine text in support of this statement, the author talks about Plato’s approach to the elements. Second, there are a number of instances where Tirnanic talks about an ancient author’s theory without giving any reference to the source. She states, for instance, that “for Aristotle touch is the most ‘imperfect’ of senses”. Yet the validity of this statement cannot be substantiated, since there is no reference to the Aristotelian work(s) where this is written. Third, Tirnanic’s analysis is based exclusively on English translations of sources, which are not always based on the editions she mentions. Furthermore, there are cases in which the names of the modern translators are not given. Finally, the author draws parallels that are not always relevant. For instance, she concludes her article by likening the healing saint to the Byzantine emperor “who causes corporal pain in the condemned in order to heal the [...] empire” (p.237).

In the last part of the volume, Webb explores the use of rhetoric to arouse the senses. Lieber is also interested in the interrelationship between rhetoric and senses, but her sources are Jewish. Plested investigates the spiritual senses in theological literature. All in all, one would have liked to see more interaction between the chapters, either in the same part or in different ones. There is also a certain amount of inconsistency in, for example, references to primary sources.

Despite some weaknesses, which are to be expected in a large interdisciplinary volume, the editors should be congratulated for their excellent work and for introducing Byzantinists to sensory studies.

Stavroula Constantinou  
University of Cyprus

S. Kaklamanis and A. Kalokairinos (eds.), *Χαρτογραφώντας τη δημόδη λογοτεχνία (12ος–17ος αι.): Πρακτικά του 7ου Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Neograeca Medii Aevi*. Heraklion: Etairia Kritikon Istorikon Meleton, 2017. Pp. xiv, 670.  
DOI:[10.1017/byz.2019.4](https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2019.4)

The conference series “Neograeca Medii Aevi” was born in Cologne in 1986, thanks to the initiative and guiding hand of Hans Eideneier. To judge from the number of participants and the range of countries then represented, there was a demand for a conference which focused on literary texts in vernacular (i.e. non-archaizing) Greek, dating from the 12th to the 17th centuries, as a distinct area of Greek studies. There was an obvious affinity with the lexicon of Emmanouil Kriaras, the first volume of which had appeared in 1968, and which covers a similar time-span and textual

corpus, stretching roughly from *Digenis Akritis* to Bounialis.<sup>1</sup> Subsequent conferences were held in Venice (1991), Vitoria (1994) and Nicosia (1997). In 1999 a smaller working group convened for a “συμποσίπουλον” in Hamburg, focusing on editorial theory and practice in relation to such texts. The series continued in Oxford (2000), Ioannina (2005) and Heraklion (2012). The proceedings of all the conferences have been published, those of the 7th being one of the most substantial in terms of page numbers and one of the richest in breadth and quality of the contributions; of the 46 papers, four are in Italian, two in English, one in French, and the remainder in Greek.

In his introduction Stefanos Kaklamanis offers a definition of the field, sets out the main axes of the conference, and discusses the “mapping” of textual production referred to in the title.<sup>2</sup> Which works belong to the cultural environment of Constantinople and its immediate surroundings? Which to the wider Hellenic periphery, in which Cyprus, Rhodes and Crete gradually develop their own cultural identities, particularly after 1453? This mapping, he suggests, should also take into account, among other factors, genre preferences, subject matter, aesthetics, and world-view. Kaklamanis effectively sets the scene, offering a number of theses for further discussion as this relatively new field establishes its intellectual territory. The papers included in the volume indicate, however, that at this stage: 1) the thematics of Neograeca Medii Aevi are somewhat broader than the original definition (and that is to be welcomed); 2) chronological limits appear to be negotiable; and 3) many questions relating to the language and style of the texts – most importantly, perhaps, the terminology used to describe the different registers – remain unresolved.

Issues of language in fact figure in a number of the contributions to this volume, though they tend to be ancillary to other matters rather than central topics discussed with the use of linguistic terminology and methodologies. A notable exception is the paper by Marina Detoraki, who discusses the *Λειμωνάριον* of Ioannes Moschos, a text written down in the early 7th century and often cited in histories of Greek (Browning, for example, states that it is “fairly representative of the spoken Greek of the sixth century”,<sup>3</sup> and it has even been claimed that it marks the beginning of Modern Greek). Detoraki reminds us that there is no reliable edition of the work, the *Patrologia Graeca* edition being full of misreadings and arbitrary amendments (as Philip Pattenden had shown<sup>4</sup>), while the best manuscript dates from the 12th century. Yet it is still used as linguistic “evidence” for the 6th/7th century by scholars who should know better (including a contribution in this volume). Potentially interesting work is being done on early grammars of Modern Greek: those of

1 E. Kriaras, *Λεξικό της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημόδου γραμματείας (1100–1669)*. Volume 21, now published by the Centre for the Greek Language under the direction of I. N. Kazazis, appeared in 2019, reaching the lemma *συνεορτάζω*.

2 A similar “mapping” of the contributors seems unfortunately to have been overlooked. No institutional affiliations or biographical data are given. Abstracts and keywords would also have been welcome additions.

3 R. Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek*. 2nd edition. Cambridge 1983, p. 35.

4 P. Pattenden, “The text of the *Pratum Spirituale*”, *Journal of Theological Studies* 26 (1975), 38–54.

Sofianos, Germano, Portius and Mitrofanis are discussed by M. Karabini-Giatrou, and that of Romanos Nikiforou by N. Liosis, but neither presentation offers much that is new. It is sad to see again the assertion that Sofianos entitled his work *Γραμματική της κοινής των Ελλήνων γλώσσης* when in fact this title was invented by Émile Legrand.

The majority of the papers relate to literary texts, as one would expect, but there is space here to mention only a few that make major contributions to the field. Elizabeth Jeffreys extends and elaborates her arguments, first aired in 2009, for a re-dating of the Palaeologan romances. She argues cogently that the *War of Troy* was produced between 1267 and 1281, as part of the ideological programme of the Frankish rulers of Morea, and then acted as a spur and model for *Livistros* and other romances, created shortly after in a Byzantine context.

Several new editions of texts are announced or promised. Cristiano Luciani proposes a new edition of the *Exploits of Merkourios Bouas*, which he presumably intends as an improvement on the recent work of Roberta Angiolillo<sup>5</sup> (as well as correcting Sathas's numerous errors), and he stresses the need for a detailed historical introduction, to include new biographical information about the author Tzane Koronaïos and his Greek-Albanian hero Bua. The Cretan poet Stefanos Sachlikis is in the spotlight, thanks to the invaluable *Nachlass* of Nikos Panagiotakis. In 2015 Giannis Mavromatis published a *χρηστική έκδοση* of all the poems, together with a long essay by Panagiotakis which serves as introduction.<sup>6</sup> In the present volume, Mavromatis and Arnold van Gemert discuss their forthcoming synoptic edition of all the manuscripts, drawing particular attention to the fact that, late in life, Sachlikis seems to have embarked on a revision of all his poems but failed to complete it. Sachlikis is also the subject of Tina Lendari's contribution, a subtle engagement with the sensory world as depicted in the poems, the presence of the city and society, and the sense of movement that invigorates Sachlikis's work. On texts of a very different kind, Francesca Paola Vuturo stresses the need for an edition of the prose texts of Nilos Nathanail Bertos, which survive in 20 manuscripts, while Stylianos Lampakis presents an exemplary re-edition of the so-called Cretan *Apocalypse of the Virgin*, preceded by an informative discussion of the sources and dating.

Cretan Renaissance literature and its cultural context is the subject of a clutch of papers, which I can mention only briefly. First, we are given a reasoned explanation for the lack of evidence to connect the Cretan academies with vernacular literature (M. Paschalis); traditional scholarly tools are employed to investigate which version of the *Pastor fido* served as the model for the Cretan *Πιστικός βοσκός* (E. Papadaki); while a new "correspondence" is proposed for the *Βοσκοπούλα*, namely a well-known *contrasto* by the 13th-century poet Cielo d'Alcamo (M. Pafiti). The plays of Chortatsis receive attention from a number of scholars, from a satisfying variety of perspectives:

5 R. Angiolillo, *Tzane Koroneos, Le Gesta di Mercurio Bua*. Alessandria 2013.

6 G. Mavromatis & N. M. Panagiotakis (eds.), *Στέφανος Σαχλίκης, Τα ποιήματα. Χρηστική έκδοση με βάση καὶ τὰ τρία χειρόγραφα*. Φιλολογική ἐπιμέλεια, πρόλογος, εἰσαγωγή καὶ γλωσσάριο. Athens 2015.

the structure and models of *Panoria* (Maria-Christiana Passou); the manuscript and printed witnesses of *Erofilii* (Eleni Lampaki); a challenging investigation of the meaning of “τραγωδία” for Chortatsis (G. Kallinis); and a close reading of passages alluding to the theme of fate in *Erofilii* and *Erotokritos* (Natalia Deliyannaki). On the latter work three papers stand out for their originality, capitalizing on previous scholarship in illuminating ways: the content and poetics of the “hidden” songs of Rotokritos which have to be “unearthed” from within the text (M. Pieris); the figure of the Lord of Patras in the joust (Tassoula Markomihelaki); and a thorough investigation of echoes of the Escorial *Digenis Akritis* in Kornaros’s romance (Marina Rodosthenous-Balafa).

Two contributions on unknown or neglected texts of the 17th century are particularly noteworthy. Previously, the Zakynthian Theodoros Montseleze was known only as the author of a play, *Ευγένια*, printed in 1646. The discovery of another text by him, a historical narrative in verse relating the exploits of Lazzaro Mocenigo during the Turco-Venetian war of 1645–69, is announced here by Eirini Gergatsouli. We await with interest the edition of the text and further historical and prosopographical information. The second neglected (but certainly not unknown) text is the *Τέχνη ρητορική* of Frangiskos Skoufos, published in Venice in 1681 but yet to be accorded a modern edition. In her presentation Gaia Zaccagni claims that the text exhibits an innovative use of language as well as elements of Cretan dialect. Alongside its interest as a didactic work, it clearly merits a detailed linguistic study.

These brief comments by no means cover the whole thematic range of the volume, which also extends into early printing, metrics, documents, satire, Latin-script manuscripts, folk song, and 19th-century scholarship. It concludes with a tribute to Michalis Lassithiotakis (1955–2012), who died just a few months before the conference and indeed was to be one of the speakers. Lassithiotakis contributed greatly to the study of vernacular Greek literature, from medieval to early modern, especially through his comparative studies with Italian and French works and his research on Greek responses to Petrarchism. A number of his articles are brought together in a substantial book that appeared in 2010.<sup>7</sup>

Most conference proceedings are a mixed bag, and this volume is no exception. However, the great majority of the contributions advance their subject in distinctive and challenging ways, and provide essential points of reference for future research. We can affirm that “Neograeca Medii Aevi” is established both as a concept and as a distinct field of study, but with the flexibility to benefit from connections, comparisons and contextualizations in relation to other fields, periods and disciplines.

David Holton  
Selwyn College, Cambridge

7 M. Lassithiotakis, *Littérature et culture de la Crète vénitienne*. Paris – Athens 2010.