

## Σύγκριση

Τόμ. 12 (2001)



### Οι γυναίκες μέσα στον Καθρέφτη: Ο φιλογύνης Δαπόντες (1713-1784) και η μισογυνική παράδοση του Μεσαίωνα

*Tassos A. Kaplanis*

doi: [10.12681/comparison.10809](https://doi.org/10.12681/comparison.10809)

Copyright © 2016, Τάσος Α. Καπλάνης



Άδεια χρήσης [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

#### Βιβλιογραφική αναφορά:

Kaplanis, T. A. (2017). Οι γυναίκες μέσα στον Καθρέφτη: Ο φιλογύνης Δαπόντες (1713-1784) και η μισογυνική παράδοση του Μεσαίωνα. *Σύγκριση*, 12, 48-70. <https://doi.org/10.12681/comparison.10809>

TASSOS A. KAPLANIS

Women in the looking-glass;  
the philogynous Dapontes (1713-1784)  
within the misogynous tradition  
of the Middle Ages

I have to admit from the very beginning that my presence here,<sup>1</sup> at a round table consisting of specialists in the Greek Enlightenment, makes me feel a bit uncomfortable; I specialize in late medieval / early modern Greek vernacular literature (12th-17th c.) and I claim no specialty in the field of the 18th century. What really brought me here is the fact that I am challenged as a researcher<sup>2</sup> by the works of the most important poetical figure in the century of the Greek Enlightenment, i.e. Kaisarios Dapontes, given that most of the problems concerning his works, their importance and value, but even the various biographical problems of the poet himself have not been yet sufficiently studied.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, Dapontes' *Καθρέπτης Γυναικών* (*Mirror of Women*)<sup>4</sup> stands as a unique example in the homonymous literary sub-genre of 'Specula feminarum' (or better 'dominarum'),<sup>5</sup> as far as Greek literature of the period 12th-18th century is concerned, the only one<sup>6</sup> in fact which meets the strict generic criteria established by Jónsson.<sup>7</sup> In my paper I will discuss the genre, tracing also briefly the history of misogynist writing, and I will conclude by considering Dapontes' unusual place in this tradition.

Konstantinos Dapontes was born in 1713 on the island of Skopelos.<sup>8</sup> He lived a rather eventful not to say adventurous life. He left Skopelos in 1730 and went to Constantinople and from there to the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia to serve as a secretary in the Courts of the Phanariot Princes. He was charged with conspiracy against the Sublime Porte and was imprisoned for twenty months in Constantinople (27.3.1747-27.11.1748). In 1751, after two years of marriage, both his wife and his newborn daughter died. He decided to become a monk. He took orders (26.10.1753) and, renamed Kaisarios, moved to Piperi, a deserted island near Skopelos, for three years and from there he went to another monastery in Skopelos for a few months. After that he moved to Mount Athos, to the Holy Monastery of Xeropotamou, and from there he was sent to Wallachia to collect funds for the monastery. His journey

lasted eight whole years (1757-1765). He returned to the Holy Mountain in September 1765. For the next thirteen years (1765-1778), we find him on Athos where he was mostly occupied with the writing of his own works and the copying of manuscripts. In September 1778 he went back to Skopelos where he stayed until 3.7.1784; during this period he managed to reopen the monastery of Panagia Evangelistria and to partly refurbish both the monastery and its chapels. After that he went back to Xeropotamou where he died a few months later (4.12.1784).

In 1748, Dapontes begins to write, in jail, his *Καθρέπτης Γυναικών*. I have reason to believe that the work was completed between 1751 (when his wife and daughter died) and 1753 (when he takes orders), or even some time after 1753 when he was already a monk.<sup>9</sup> It was published for the first time in 1766 in Leipzig with mistakes about which Dapontes complains on several occasions.<sup>10</sup> It is not certain that a second edition in Venice by Michael Glykes was ever released.<sup>11</sup> The book has never been critically edited in modern times.<sup>12</sup>

To paraphrase what the late G.P. Savvidis once wrote,<sup>13</sup> Dapontes, as his surname significantly shows (Italian, *da ponte*),<sup>14</sup> was a bridge-man: an imaginary bridge connecting East and West, tradition and modernism, the erudite spirit and the popular feeling. I suppose there is no need to argue here that although most elements of Dapontes' poetry continue the medieval tradition of Greek literature, he also represents, in an almost exemplary way, the spirit and the values of his time.<sup>15</sup> He stands as a representative example of the heraldic emblem of the Enlightenment as defined by Kant: 'Aude sapere'. But not only does he 'dare to know'; he also wants to transmit his knowledge to others. As Voutieridis observed, 'he writes about everything, just like Greeks of his time had begun to want to know about everything, as much as they could.'<sup>16</sup>

In 1766, when his *Καθρέπτης Γυναικών* is published, he has already been a monk for 13 years. Most of the stories used in the book emanate from the Holy Bible. He was aware of the rich tradition of the Greek Middle Ages to which he had access through the monastery's library. It would be reasonable to suppose that his *Mirror of Women*—especially if we put it in the context of its medieval predecessors—should be another misogynous text. But it is not at all like that.

One of the assumptions governing our perception of the medieval period is the dominating presence of anti-feminism. In fact, misogyny is practically synonymous with the Middle Ages, although anti-feminine criticism—or rather, prejudice—does not appear then for the first time. Its sources can be traced back to the dawn of Greek culture, in Hesiod's poetry (750 BC), for instance, or in the iambics of Semonides of

Amorgos (2nd half of the 7th c. BC). On the other hand, the discourse of misogyny leads back into ancient Judaic law and it would not be an exaggeration to say that, *grosso modo*, it constitutes something of a universal cultural constant and certainly a universal textual dominant. As R. Howard Bloch notes: “The discourse of misogyny runs like a vein [...] throughout medieval literature. Reaching back to the Old Testament and to ancient Greece and extending through classical Hellenic, Judaic and Roman traditions all the way to the fifteenth century, it dominates ecclesiastical writings, letters, sermons, theological tracts, and discussions and compilations of canon law; scientific works, as part of biological, gynecological, and medical knowledge; folklore and philosophy.”<sup>17</sup> Examples are also to be found in most of the kinds of secular literature of the Middle Ages, irrespective of whether written in Latin or Modern European languages. Bloch again provides us with a set of examples that could be easily expanded:<sup>18</sup> the satires of the High Middle Ages, all the works grouped under the rubric of ‘les genres du réalisme bourgeois’: the comic tale or fabliau (including Middle English and Italian versions), the animal fable, the comic theatre or farce; also debate poems involving the virtues and vices of women and even certain mixed or ‘unclassifiable’ types, among which Jean de Meun’s portion of the *Roman de la rose* occupies a primary position, etc. Flowing in such a stream of misogyny, Christine de Pisan complains in her *Cité des dames* in 1405: ‘I could scarcely find a moral work by any author which didn’t devote some chapter or paragraph to attacking the female sex.’<sup>19</sup>

The important thing that R. H. Bloch’s study, *Medieval Misogyny and the Invention of Western Romantic Love*, brought to light is that “even those types which historically have been considered to be the opposite of, or liberating from, the dark age of medieval anti-feminism —the courtly romance, lyric and lay— maintain a complicated relation to the hegemonic negative images of the feminine”.<sup>20</sup> In other words, he indicates that the two competing discourses on the feminine —the misogynist and the courtly— are the two different sides of the same coin and they serve the same end by different means: control over women by men, church, society. Of course the subject is a good deal more complicated, since it is ‘the product of a historical process, of material conditions and of a contingent set of circumstances and even personalities, belonging to a specific time and place’.<sup>21</sup>

Although his arguments provide an outstanding contribution to the History of Ideas and the History of European Literature I have an objection which is of a generic kind. Bloch mentions: ‘Like allegory itself, to which it is particularly attracted, anti-feminism is both a genre and a topos, [...] — a discourse visible across a broad spectrum of poetic

types.<sup>22</sup> As I had the opportunity to argue at the 1st European Congress of Modern Greek Studies which took place in Berlin (2-4 October 1998), anti-feminism or misogyny is not a literary genre.<sup>23</sup> I could accept the term 'topos', though I find it relatively restrictive for such a phenomenon; I would rather use this term for the exemplum of feminine garrulity for instance, or for the proverbial phrase 'Fumus et mulier et stillicidia / expellunt hominem de domo propria'<sup>24</sup> as it first occurs in Walter Mapes's *Golias* or '[...] droppying houses, and eek smoke, / and chidyng wyves make men to flee / out of hir owene houses [...]' as it appears in Geoffrey Chaucer's *Wife of Bath*<sup>25</sup> — to use a famous example.

The term 'discourse' is more appropriate, but rhetorically rather than generically descriptive. In order to use a genuine generic term I would turn to Genette, who discovered in his *Introduction à l'architexte* a 'point of blindness' in Aristotle's *Περὶ Ποιητικῆς*. Aristotle, talking about literary genres, mentions: 'διαφέρουσι δὲ ἀλλήλων τρισίν· ἢ γὰρ τῷ ἐν ἑτέροις μιμεῖσθαι ἢ τῷ ἕτερα ἢ τῷ ἑτέρως καὶ μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον.'<sup>26</sup> (= they differ in these three: they imitate either by different means or different things or in a different and not the same way.) Genette, re-reading Aristotle, argues that in order to find out a literary work's genre we need to know what is said, how it is said and by what means. Under this spectrum, he constructs his generic system on three kinds of criteria: thématiques (= ἕτερα), modales (= ἑτέρως), formelles (= ἐν ἑτέροις). I will not go into details; all I can say is that misogyny, according to a generic system of this kind, is a 'mode'<sup>27</sup> and not a genre.

As far as Greek vernacular literature is concerned, I have shown elsewhere<sup>28</sup> that the generic term that should be used to describe the 26 relevant texts suggested as such by specialists is 'καθρέφτες γυναικῶν' (= 'mirrors of women'), with reference of course to the popular medieval genre of *Specula*. The term —in German 'Weiberspiegel'— was first used, in the context of Greek literature, in 1905 by Karl Krumbacher in order to describe the late 15th-century Cretan poem *Συναξάριον τῶν ευγενικῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τιμιοτάτων ἀρχόντισσων* (*Register of Noble Women*)<sup>29</sup> —which in fact proved to be two poems: *Συναξάριον τῶν ευγενικῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τιμιοτάτων ἀρχόντισσων* (*Register of Noble Women*) and *Ἐπαινος τῶν γυναικῶν* (*Praise of Women*). It was in 1960 that Gareth Morgan, commenting on these two poems, first claimed that 'the element that is common to Sachlikis and these poems is misogyny. It is in the misogynous poems of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance that we must look for their sources'.<sup>30</sup> The main supporter of this theory in the 1990s was the late Professor N.M. Panagiotakis, who rejects in practice the term 'mirrors of women' and uses the term 'misogynous texts' to de-

scribe them generically.<sup>31</sup> My objection is not only that the latter is not a generic term, as I suggested earlier; it is also a more realistic one: not all the Greek texts suggested as belonging to the genre are misogynous, at least not to the same extent.

In fact, the relevant texts<sup>32</sup> must be seen in a wider spectrum extending from absolute absence of misogynous positions (that is the case of *Θανατικόν της Ρόδου*, *The Plague of Rhodes*, by Emmanuel Georgilas Limenitis, for instance) to severe and unfair condemnation of women (the case of *Register, Praise of Women* and the alphabetical poem *Αδάμ τον πρώτον άνθρωπον*, *Adam the First Man*). Apart from these three, the rest of the texts always include galleries of good women (with the minimum example of the Holy Virgin) or at least a response to the misogynous commonplaces.<sup>33</sup> There are even texts that surprisingly defend women such as the *Άνθος Χαρίτων* (Venice 1529; Greek version of *Fior di Virtù*) where the anonymous adaptor/translator writes: "I will try to seek some poems of those prudent men who said good things about them [i.e. about women] and after that some poems of those who said bad things and finally I will put these writings together and I will give a real solution and they should hold their tongue those who say bad things."<sup>34</sup> I suppose that such a position could not be easily considered misogynous.

The term 'mirrors of women' with reference to the medieval literary genre of *Specula* is much more flexible. It does not presume the existence of misogynous references nor does it exclude them. Of course Krumbacher, who was a great Byzantinologist, was aware of the wide dissemination of *Specula* in medieval European literature. In fact, the mirror-titled books became a literary fashion in the 14th-15th century; a fashion which survived into the 18th century at least. As Herbert Grabes showed in his book *The Mutable Glass. Mirror-imagery in titles and texts of the Middle Ages and English Renaissance*, "among the metaphorical book-titles of this period, mirror-titles clearly enjoy special status: they are by far the most frequent type of book-title in the Middle Ages after *Liber* and *Summa*."<sup>35</sup>

What Krumbacher was not aware of, because a more systematic study of the subject only started in the 1970s, is that the mirror metaphor in the literature of *Specula* is a very important element of the genre and much more complicated than one can assume. Grabes has studied the different mirror-conventions in literature and art including the multiplicity of mirrors, the qualities and deficiencies of the mirror, the image in the mirror, the mirror's influence on the beholder and so on.<sup>36</sup> And according to E.M. Jónsson, who in his study *Le Miroir* investigated the genesis of the genre of *Speculum* in the 12th century



(see note 7 above), the presence of the word mirror in the title of the book is the determining factor in classifying the book in the genre.

As far as Greek literature is concerned, almost none of the works that we classify in the genre meets this requirement, but for the sake of convention, it is best to retain this generic term. I said almost none; the only work that fulfils Jónsson's strict generic condition is Dapontes' *Καθρέπτῆς Γυναικῶν*.

Dapontes dedicates the book to Eleni Mavrokordatou, the wife of Gregorios Gikas the 3rd (1724-1777). He ends his dedication: "In the women of this book I saw your image as in a mirror; and by comparison I found it made in their image. Therefore it should be in between them and it should appear alongside them in order to remain for ever and ever praised next to them".<sup>37</sup> It is obvious from the beginning that the book will praise women instead of condemning them. And this is a real shift from the commonplaces of the genre.

As far as the mirror-imagery is concerned Dapontes claims no originality: "And just as we use the mirror for our external embellishment we should use this mirror for our internal embellishment. And just as the looking-glass is made of sand and mercury this one is made of stories and truth. [...] And just as the mirror is to be found in almost every house in order for people to look in it and to increase their beauty and to embellish their ugliness, also this one has to be found everywhere, so that people can read it, in order to correct their malice, to increase their virtue and to delight their hearts. [...]" (see Appendix II) But even when he appears to be very platitudinous he surprises us pleasantly with his witty comments: 'Women use mirrors the most —but men also embellish themselves' (see Appendix II) The charge of embellishment for women derives from John Chrysostom and it is one of the commonplaces that occur very often in anti-feminine criticism. Dapontes instead says that if this is to be considered a sin men are not devoid of it.

I could present to you an exhaustive list of similar examples. However, in view of the fact that the modern reader has very limited access to Dapontes' work (which practically means that my arguments cannot be tested) and since it is impossible to include an accessible edition of *Καθρέπτῆς Γυναικῶν* in this article, I feel obliged to restrict myself to a single and last example from Dapontes' prologue which can be found in Appendix II: "After the most merciful God created the sky and the earth and everything that exists on it he took some soil from the earth and created Adam and put him in Paradise. And then he wanted to create Eve in order to create a helper for him. So He created Eve and gave her to Adam as she was worthy of him because she was like him."

Afterwards he compares Eleni Mavrokordatou with Eve because she is worthy of her husband and a real helper to him. This is probably a unique comparison in Greek literature. He dares to regard Eve as a positive image, before the fall of man. You will probably realize how important this is if I remind you that other texts see in the biblical Eve the Devil himself. And I refer even to texts that have a rather philogynous position like *Άνθος Χαρίτων*; the anonymous adaptor /translator who earlier told us that ‘those who say bad things about women should hold their tongue’ clearly claims that Eve is the personification of bad women and that the Holy Virgin is the personification of good ones.<sup>38</sup>

Apart from this, the general impression that one has after reading Dapontes’ book is that, although he moralizes a lot, he dares to regard both men and women as human beings. They are both subject to their social roles but this does not indicate, by any means, an *a priori* depreciation of women. Dapontes’ standards apply for both men and women; therefore, a person can be praised or condemned according to his/her qualities or vices irrespective of whether that person is a man or a woman. We have long departed from the period where a woman would be held responsible for all evil just because of her sex...<sup>39</sup>

In comparison with the previous misogynous tradition, Dapontes could indisputably be considered a philogynist. But not only is he philogynous, he is also aware of it and he admits it: “Had there ever been another philogynist, / the way I see it, you became the greatest one. / But, have courage, don’t be afraid; this philogyny / is a virtuous work, because it is a narration.”<sup>40</sup> This passage is taken from another work of Dapontes dedicated to women, the *Φανάρι Γυναικών*. This work was most probably completed in 1776,<sup>41</sup> ten years after the Leipzig edition of *Καθρέπτης Γυναικών*, and it was never published — although Dapontes wished it to be.<sup>42</sup> Throughout the text, which includes one hundred and fifty three stories of women,<sup>43</sup> this time more secular ones, Kaisarios converses with his *alter ego*, Konstantinos. This practice, or ‘narrative technique’ if you prefer, which also occurs in *Καθρέπτης Γυναικών*,<sup>44</sup> is revealing of the conflict that Dapontes was experiencing for the biggest part of his life; two different worlds, two contradictory ideologies, two antagonistic potential ways of being are constantly fighting inside him: the secular and the ascetic. The passage mentioned above is not irrelevant; his strange remark ‘this philogyny is a virtuous work, because it is a narration’ can also be read as ‘there is another kind of philogyny, which is not a virtuous work, because it is... real life’, as I would be tempted to complete the sentence. This kind of ‘philogyny’ is also known to him; it is called ‘womanizing’ or, to put it in his own words, ‘thelymania’.<sup>45</sup> Dapontes’ weakness for women is well known;<sup>46</sup> how much



this contributed to the formation of his philogynous positions would be the subject of another, undoubtedly more psychoanalytical, approach.

Before concluding, I would like to say that, even though I had to restrict myself to a very few but hopefully significant examples, I believe that it has been made clear to the reader that the philogynous positions expressed in Dapontes' *Καθρέπτης Γυναικών* present a real shift from the misogynous commonplaces that are often quoted in other texts of the same genre. Of course, the book's objective is moral; therefore, one should expect to find in it the same conventional views of women's social identities, 'which [...] are confined to their sexual roles'.<sup>47</sup> 'Honorable' women are stereotyped in Dapontes' book too; "Gentleness, compassion, and maternal love are among the innate virtues of the female sex. [...] Women make children; hence they are responsible for the early upbringing of their offspring, including religious instruction and training in manners. Moreover, since women are confined to the home and given charge over domestic arrangements, they are also responsible for household management and maintenance and for overseeing the servants. Obedience and chastity make them first dutiful daughters, then loyal wives."<sup>48</sup> Dapontes may dare to compare Eleni Mavrokordatou with the biblical Eve, but the rest of his comparisons (see Appendix II) in general recycle these same old stereotypes of 'honorable' women.

However, every now and then, one finds more original and daring ideas that are far from reproducing the image of the confined housewife: "Wouldn't you leave, were it possible, the Principality with great pleasure and go with all possible dispatch like a thirsty doe to the Holy Sepulchre and to the Holy Mountain, to pay due honor to those Holy Lands and to give an account of (να ιστορήσεις) the royal monasteries and the hermitages and the heirlooms and holy relics that can be found there?". (see Appendix II) As we see, in this passage Dapontes relates women to two very interesting activities: the pilgrimage and the composition of literary 'proskynetaria' ('pilgrim books'). Inevitably one wonders whether all this is just a conventional hypothesis or whether he actually refers to common practices of his time. Of course, we know that noble and educated women from the Principalities, Constantinople, and elsewhere, were involved in social and literary activities in the same way as their counterparts in Western Europe (and especially in France) were: they would organize salons where the local intellectuals and members of the upper class would converse with foreign diplomats,<sup>49</sup> and they would translate books of literature, history, etc., from major European languages.<sup>50</sup> But did they actually make the crucial step from translation to original literary composition? That we do not know.

Even though this issue will have to remain open for the time being,

it brings me closer to an aspect that should have been important for my research; so far I have tried to localize Dapontes' position towards women, as expressed mainly in his *Καθρέπτης Γυναικών*, within its literary and, more particularly, generic context, and that is with regard to its past. But what about its present? Is the philogynous Dapontes an exception or does he actually share and reproduce the commonplaces of his own era? And what exactly are these commonplaces? What is the image of the Woman within the context of the literature of the Greek Enlightenment? A researcher who will try to give an answer to these questions will find in his way two insurmountable obstacles: the first and most important one is that a large number of texts of the Greek 18th century, which could be used for such a study, lack critical editions; in their present state, in old editions and dusty manuscripts, they remain to a large extent inaccessible; the second obstacle is the lack of relevant bibliography,<sup>51</sup> with most evident the lack of a monograph on women's position and representation in 18th-century Greek literature.<sup>52</sup> Therefore, given the present state of Greek Enlightenment studies, a researcher who attempted to place an 18th-century literary work in its contemporary context, would have two options: either to generalize and repeat the same threadbare views that can be found in almost every reference book, or to remain silent. I chose the latter as the more honest solution. Of course, a third option is valid: to get hold of the texts and start preparing their critical editions; but this was far beyond the purposes of either a paper presented at a conference or an article published in a scholarly journal. Undoubtedly, things have to improve and I am confident that they will: the lively interest in women's studies that exists nowadays worldwide allows me at least to be optimistic for the future.

## APPENDIX I: DATING

Dapontes' *Mirror of Women*, as we know, was published for the first, and probably last, time in 1766 in Leipzig. But when was it actually written? The text is a compilation of stories that emanate from the Holy Bible and it seems that they were not all written at the same time. We know that the first story of the book, the 'Sacrifice of Jephtha', was written during Dapontes' imprisonment in Constantinople and completed by its end (27.11.1748): "Ετελειώθη εν Χριστώ, Χριστού χρόνους χιλίους, / οκτώ και τεσσαράκοντα, επί επτακοσίους, / μήνα κατά Νοέμβριον, εν τη των Εισοδίων, / της παλαιάς μου φυλακής εξόδου των αιτίων." (see Savvidis 1993, 138<sup>567-571</sup> = Dapontes 1766, I, 98<sup>(11-14)</sup>)

However, the rest of the stories were written some time later and, in different parts of the book, we can find chronological data that can lead to a more specific later dating. For example, in the following passage, with reference to events that happened in July 1746 (see Savvidis 1995, 273<sup>7-10</sup> = Dapontes 1766, II, 290<sup>(19-22)</sup>): "Τριάντα ο Ιούλιος είχε και είχα πάγει / ημέρες δεκατέσσαρας εις το Μπαχτσέ Σεράγι. / Έτος από γεννήσεως Χριστού χρόνους χιλίους / και έξ και τεσσαράκοντα με τους επτακοσίους"), Dapontes comments: 'πράγματα οπού έγιναν προ χρόνων δύο-τριών / να τα ειπώ πως έγιναν προ χρόνων τρισχιλίων.' (see Savvidis 1995, 282<sup>221-222</sup> = Dapontes 1766, II, 296<sup>(21-22)</sup>)

Although this reference is still very vague, other excerpts from the book confirm that Dapontes continued writing not only after November 1748, but also after January 1751. More specifically, in one of his usual digressions, Dapontes decides to describe two dreams that he had: "Έτει από γεννήσεως Χριστού χρόνους χιλίους, / οκτώ και τεσσαράκοντα με τους επτακοσίους, / Κυριακή ξημέρωμα, ένδεκα Δεκεμβρίου" (see Dapontes 1766, II, 404<sup>(5-7)</sup>) he had his first dream, and the second one when he was "[...] εις το Πατριαρχειό χρόνους εις τους χιλίους, / και ένα και πενήκοντα με τους επτακοσίους, / Σάββατον ξημερώνοντας Ερμείου του αγίου, / απάνω εις τας δεκατρείς του Ιανουαρίου." (see Dapontes 1766, II, 404<sup>(25-28)</sup>)

This last date provides us with a secure, but rather 'high', *terminus post quem* for the completion of the work. However, I would like to note the following: in the book's last story, 'Ιστορία των τριών παιδων', Dapontes describes the vanity of human life and sings monasticism's praises, while at the same time he shows repentance for his previous dissolute life and states his decision to turn over a new leaf and to follow the path of God. (see Dapontes 1766, II, 428-429; especially 428<sup>(6-9)</sup>): "Χαριτωμένη μου εσύ, προς τον μονογενή σου, / εσύ γίνου μεσίτρια διά τον δουλευτήν σου. / Και τάζω σου ο ταπεινός, υπόσχεσιν σου κάνω, / από

της σήμερον κι εμπρός όσον που ν' αποθάνω, / να φυλαχθώ όσο μπορώ, για να μην αμαρτήσω / και τον Υιόν σου και Θεόν πάλιν τον παροργίσω” and a bit further down, 428<sup>[31-34]</sup>: “Και έτσι μ' εξαγόρασες [ο Lord], οπού 'μουν πουλημένος / ατός μου στον διάβολον και κατασκλαβωμένος. / Και μ' έβγαλες και μ' έκαμες ουχί σκλάβον δικόν Σου, / αλλ' αδελφόν, αλλά υιόν, αλλά ομόθρονόν Σου”) In addition he states his decision to become a monk: “έκαμα να παρατηθώ απόφασιν του κόσμου / ο νους μου πλέον έστερξεν, έκλιν' ο λογισμός μου” and further down, 443<sup>[32-36]</sup>: “Ως πότε να σασε βαστώ και να σας υπομένω; / Ως πότε με του λόγου σας να είμαι και να μένω; / Φύγε τον κόσμον, ταπεινέ, και σύρε να μονάσεις, / μήπως σαν άλλους περισσούς αύριο κι εσύ φωνάζεις: / Ω, πώς εμέ τον δύστηνον ηπάτησας, ω κόσμε;”. (see Dapontes 1766, II, 425<sup>[7-8]</sup>)

Furthermore, there is a passage that allows us, I believe, to take the present tense used in it as referring to both the time of the narration and the time of the composition of the work: “Νά τις τον έκαμε κακόν τον κόσμον και αχρείον, / τον κόσμον τον ευγενικόν, καθό κτήριον θείον. / Νά διατί τον φεύγομεν εγώ κι εσύ, Χαρίτων. / Αλλέως ποίος έφευγε παράδεισον χαρίτων;”. (see Dapontes 1766, II, 431<sup>[5-8]</sup>) If this is the case, then we can assume that the work's completion took place some time between October 1751 (when his wife died; see Kehagioglou 1986, 46) and July 1753 (when he left Constantinople to go to Piperi; see Kehagioglou 1986, 47), because this is the period during which Dapontes takes the decision to become a monk.

Within this broad period, I would consider the year 1753 as the most possible date for the work's completion, because, according to Dapontes' personal testimony, this is the year when he actually made up his mind: “Εις τους πενήντα δε και τρεις, ελθών στον εαυτόν μου, / στάθηκα κι εστοχάσθηκα τα πλήθη των κακών μου. / [I omit 4 lines] Και το του κόσμου μάταιον ιδών και λογαριάσας, / και τα του κόσμου πράγματα, καλά, κακά χορτάσας, / και κόσμον και εγκόσμια με δίκαιον μισήσας, / από τον κόσμον έφυγα, έρημον αγαπήσας.” (see Savvidis 1995, 69<sup>1-2, 7-10</sup>) He might have finished it some time before or after he took orders (26.10.1753) in Piperi, or probably during the first months of his 'lonely conduct' (μοναχική διαγωγή), when he composes the major part of the primary material that he later brings together and publishes in his books: “Και κάνω ολομόναχος κοντά δυόμισυ χρόνους, / πλην όχι με τους πρέποντας μοναχικής τούς πόνους, / ξηγώντας και συνθέτοντας λόγους και ιστορίας / και ύμνους και εγκώμια, και διά στιχουργίας, / ως εις τους τόμους φαίνονται, υπέρ τους δέκα όντας, / οπού, αν ίσως αγαπάς, θέλεις τους βρει ζητώντας. / [I omit 2 lines] Ζώντας κατά αλήθειαν με άκραν ησυχίαν, / εκείνο οπού ήθελα, και με αμεριμνίαν, / και

γράφοντας και σκάφτοντας· ζωή τη αληθεία, / ως λέγουν, χαρισάμενη, και μία βασιλεία.” (see Savvidis 1995, 70<sup>37-42, 45-46</sup> - 71<sup>47-48</sup>) This period lasts from, probably, April or May 1754 (“Έμεινα μήνας έξ-επτά αντάμα με τους άλλους, / ώς δέκα όντας αδελφούς, μικρούς τε και μεγάλους.” (see Savvidis 1995, 70<sup>31-32</sup>); hence, if we take into account the fact that he took orders on 26.10.1753, ‘six or seven months’ later is either April or May 1754) up to 6.11.1756, when, after a quarrel with his Father Superior, he is obliged to leave Piperi and move to Skopelos (“Εις τους πεντήκοντα και έξ, τη έκτη Νοεμβρίου, / εμπήκα εις την Σκόπελον, ελέει του Κυρίου”; see Savvidis 1995, 78<sup>279-280</sup>). Thus, November 1756 is the *terminus ante quem* I would accept for the composition of the text.

Of course, the dedication to Eleni Mavrokordatou (see Appendix II) that accompanies the 1766 Leipzig edition is dated 1.3.1763, and that could be the lowest *terminus ante quem* for the book. But I believe that only the dedication and, perhaps, the prologue were actually *written* in 1763, when he sent the book for publication; most probably, Dapontes did make a selection of the material that would be included in the edition, without composing anything new in addition. Given the literary style of Dapontes, which is well known from all his works, it is most unlikely that he added something in 1763 without any reference to more recent events; very unlikely, indeed, that he would leave the whole course of events from, say, 1753 up to 1763 without a single comment, without a single autobiographical ‘digression’.

Thus, to conclude, I believe that Dapontes’ *Καθρέπτης Γυναικών* was completed between 1753 and 1756, most probably in 1753 or 1754.

## APPENDIX II: DEDICATION AND PROLOGUE

<Αφιέρωσις>

Τη εκλαμπροτάτη και ευσεβεστάτη κυρία κυρία Ελένη Μαυροκορδάτου, επιφανεστάτη δόμνη του υψηλοτάτου αυθέντου πάσης Μολδοβλαχίας κυρίου κυρίου Γρηγορίου Ιωάννου, εν Χριστώ τω Θεώ ευ πράττειν.

Αφού εποίησεν ο πανάγαθος Θεός τον ουρανόν και την γην και πάντα τα εν αυτοίς, χουν λαβών από της γης / (f. 2v) έπλασε τον Αδάμ και έθετο αυτόν εν τω παραδείσῳ. Θέλοντας δέ να πλάσει και την Εύαν, είπε, ‘ποιήσωμεν αυτό βοηθόν κατ’ αυτόν’, και ούτως έπλασε και την Εύαν, και έδωκεν αυτήν τω Αδάμ, ως αξίαν αυτό, καθό ομοίαν αυτό. Και αφού δέ αξίωσεν ο ύψιστος Θεός και ανέβασε τον ευσεβέστατον αυθέντην εις τον πατρικόν αυτού θρόνον, από των πατρικών αυτόν κόλ-

πων λαβών και έβαλεν αυτόν εν τη θεοφρουρήτῳ αυθεντία της Μολδοβλαχίας, θέλοντας να δώσει αυτό και δόμναν ομοίαν αυτό, την υμετέραν έδωκεν εκλαμπρότητα, ως αξίαν και πρέπουσαν αυτό, ομοίῳ το όμοιον προσαρμόσας και τῷ αξίῳ το άξιον αποδούς, ως τη κεφαλή το διάδημα. Όθεν όν / (f. 3) τρόπον ευφράνθητε υμείς, ο νυμφίος επί τη νύμφη, ούτως ευφράνθη, αλλά και ευφρανθήσεται Κύριος εφ' υμίν. Ταύτην λοιπόν κάγῳ την θεοτερπή ο ανάξιος μιμηθείς ομοιότητα, ευσεβεστάτη δόμνα, προσφωνῶ τη ση εκλαμπρότητι την θεοφιλή ταύτην συλλογήν και κοινωφελή εκλογήν των ιστοριών των πλέον θεοφιλών γυναικών, οπού ο πάλαι χρόνος ως ρόδα ωραία εβλάστησε και ο νομικός παράδεισος ως κρίνα ευώδη εξήνθησεν, ως αξίαν τη ση ευσεβεία και πρέπουσαν, ομοίῳ το όμοιον εφαρμόσας κάγῳ, και το τίμιον απονέμων ως το χρυσίον τῷ διαδήματι. Διότι εις την εκλαμπρότητά σου και εις αυτάς μεγάλην αναμφιβόλως θεωρώ ομοιότητα και τας αυτάς αρε-/ (f. 3v) τάς επ' αληθείας και χάριτας. Εις την ευγενεστάτην σου ψυχήν είδα εκείνο οπού εις την ευγενεστάτην θυγατέρα του Ιεφθάε εθαύμασα· ότι αν εκείνη εστάθη ευπειθεστάτη εις τον πατέρα της και εθυσιάσθη εις τον Θεόν, η εκλαμπρότης σου ολιγοτέρα εις τους γονείς ευπείθειαν έδειξας και τιμήν και ευλάβειαν; Και αν δεν εθυσιάσθης ως εκείνη, της χρείας μη απαιτούσης, δεν έπαυες όμως θύουσα τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαν αινέσεως και προσφέρουσα Αυτῷ καρπόν χειλέων και οφθαλμών ως ιερόν ολοκαύτωμα. Εις την σωφρονεστάτην σου καρδίαν βλέπω εκείνο οπού εις την σωφρονεστάτην Σωσάννην απόρησα· ότι αν εκείνη πιστοτάτη εστάθηκεν εις τον άνδρα της και την τιμήν από την / (f. 4) ζωήν με θαύμα πάντων και έκπληξιν επροτίμησεν, η εκλαμπρότης σου ολιγότερα δεν ήθελες προτιμήσει διά την τιμήν μυρίους θανάτους και λιθασμούς; Εις την ευσεβεστάτην σου γνώμην θεωρώ εκείνο οπού εις την ευσεβεστάτην Εσθήρ μεγάλως επαίνεσα, ήτις και του βασιλέως το δόγμα επάτησε και την ζωήν εκινδύνευσε και ούτω την ζωήν των ομοφύλων εφύλαξεν. Η εκλαμπρότης σου ολιγότερον δεν ήθελες διαπράξει τα αυτά και δεν ήθελες τοιούτοτρόπως φερθεί, ίνα την ζωήν ενός και μόνου χαρίσεις —και ίσως εχάρισες—; Και αν η θαυμαστή Ιουδίθ και η γενναία Ιαήλ και η προφήτις Δεββώρα, ζήλω θείῳ κινούμεναι, εθανάτωσαν τους εχθρούς του Θεού και του λαού Αυτού και αυ-/ (f. 4v) τόν ελευθέρωσαν, η εκλαμπρότης σου δεν έχεις τον αυτόν ζήλον; Αμή δεν έχεις τους ορατούς και διά τούτο θανατώνεις τους νοητούς εχθρούς σου και του Θεού, τον κόσμον, την σάρκα και τον διάβολον, και την ψυχήν απαλλάττεις της κακουργίας αυτών. Και αν η αγία Σολομωνή ανέθρεψεν ευσεβώς και επαίδευσε καλώς τους επτά παιδιάς αυτής και περιβοήτους εις όλον τον κόσμον απέδειξεν, η εκλαμπρότης σου δεν θέλεις αναθρέψει και παιδαγωγήσει ομοίως καλώς τα τέκνα οπού ο επουράνιος Πατήρ σε εχάρισε και μέλλει να σε χαρίσει,

διά να τα αναδείξεις ζώσας εικόνας της μητρικής αρετής και εκμαγεία της πατρικής των δόξης τε και λαμπρότητος; Και αν τέλος πάντων / (f. 5) η φιλόσοφος εκείνη βασίλισσα αφείσα το βασίλειον ήλθεν εις τον Σολομώντα, διά να ακούσει την σοφίαν αυτού και να ιστορήσει την δόξαν του, η εκλαμπρότης σου δεν ήθελες αφήσει, αν ήτον δυνατόν, την αυθεντίαν μετά πάσης χαράς, και ήθελες υπάγει μετ' άκρας σπουδής ως έλαφος διψώσα εις τον Άγιον Τάφον και εις το Άγιον Όρος, διά να προσκυνήσεις τους αγίους εκείνους τόπους και να ιστορήσεις τα εν αυτοίς βασιλικά μοναστήρια και ασκητήρια και κειμήλια και άγια λείψανα; Διά ταύτα πάντα, ευκλεεστάτη πασών γυναικών προσφωνώ και προσφέρω σοι την βίβλον πασών των περιβοήτων εκείνων γυναικών, διά την σην μετ' αυτών ομοιότητα κατά την αξίαν και την προαί- / (f. 5v) ρεσιν. Εστάθηκα γαρ και εστοχάσθηκα εις αυτάς ωςάν μέσα εις ένα καθρέπτην την εικόνα την σην και παραβάλλων αυτήν την ηύρα κατ' εικόνα αυτών και ομοίωσιν. Όθεν έπρεπε να είναι εν μέσσω αυτών και να φαίνεται ομού μετ' αυτών και να συμπαραμένει επαινουμένη αεί μετ' αυτών. Πρόσδεξαι τοίνυν παρακαλώ μετά χαράς την βίβλον μου ταύτην. Υπόδεξαι το ευγενές τούτο θέατρον, τον πάντιμον τούτον χορόν προϋπάντησε, είσελθε εις τον πάντερπνον τούτον παράδεισον. Άρον τους οφθαλμούς σου, ευτυχεστάτη κυρία, και ιδέ εις το θεαυγές τούτο κατοπτρον και κατοπτρίζου συνεχώς και βλέπε χαρμονικώς· όχι διά να καλλωπίζεσαι, ότι είσαι με το κάλλος της / (f. 6) ταπεινώσεως· όχι διά να στολίζεσαι, ότι είσαι με την στολήν της σωφροσύνης, ούτε διά να ωραΐζεσαι, ότι είσαι με την της προσευχής ωραιότητα, αλλ' ούτε διά να λαμπρύνεσαι, ότι είσαι με την λαμπρότητα της ελεημοσύνης· αλλά διά να ευφραίνεσαι βλέπουσα μέσα εις αυτό και την σην εκλαμπρότητα και να χαίρεσαι συγχορεύουσα και να ευθυμείς συνοδεύουσα και να ευχαριστείς συνυπάρχουσα και η εκλαμπρότης σου και να επιμελείσαι να έχεις, αν όχι τα πρωτεία, όμως ουδέ τα δευτερεία των ενδόξων αυτών γυναικών, δοξάζουσα και αινούσα τον παντοδύναμον Θεόν, εξ ού πάσα δόσις αγαθή και παν δώρημα τέλειον τοις δοξάζουσι το υπερύμνητον και υπερένδοξον όνομα του Πατρός και του Υιού και του / (f. 6v) Αγίου Πνεύματος, ότι Αυτώ πρέπει πάσα δόξα, τιμή και προσκύνησις, νυν και αεί και εις τους αιώνας των αιώνων, αμήν. ,αψξγ' (1763). Μαρτίου πρώτη.

*Της υμετέρας εκλαμπρότητος  
Ευχέτης διάπυρος,  
Καισάριος Δαπόντες. / (f. 7)*



<Προοίμιον>

Τοις αναγινώσκουσι το παρόν αγαπητοίς αδελφοίς εν Κυρίῳ χαίρειν.

Καλόν ἦτον και λίαν καλόν, αδελφοί, να εβιάζαμεν να κάμομεν με το μέσον της αρετής τον εαυτόν μας άξιον να βλέπομεν τον Θεόν και να συνομιλούμεν με τον Θεόν και να διδασκόμεθα από τον Θεόν, ού ένεκα και επλάσθημεν, καθώς ο Μωυσής, ο Αβραάμ και ο Νώε και άλλοι τοιούτοι τον παλαιόν εκείνον καιρόν. Επειδή όμως τούτο το τόσον μέγα και αρχαίον καλόν το υστερήθημεν διά την αμέλειαν και αποξενώσαμεν από λόγου μας διά την κακίαν μας, καλόν ἦτον καν να βιάζομεν να κάμομεν με το μέσον της προκοπής τον εαυτόν μας άξιον να καταλαμβάνομεν τα λόγια των Αγίων Γραφών και τας ιστορίας των παλαιών, καθώς ο / (f. 7v) Χρυσόστομος, ο Γρηγόριος, ο Βασίλειος και άλλοι παρόμοιοι θεόπνευστοι άγιοι. Επειδή όμως και τούτο το υστερήθημεν οι ταλαίπωροι και εξεχάσαμεν και τελείως εχάσαμεν την πατροπαράδοτον και ευγενεστάτην εκείνην γλώσσαν των Ελλήνων και χρειαζόμεθα τώρα διδασκάλους και εξηγητάς, καν ας βιάζομεν του λόγου μας και ας επιμελούμεθα να αναγινώσκομεν τα βιβλία οπού εις την τωρινήν απλήν μας γλώσσαν μετέφρασαν και μετέφεραν διά ωφέλειαν του γένους ημών οι μεταγενέστεροι διδάσκαλοι. Τούτους κάγώ, ο ελάχιστος, μιμηθείς εκοπίασα και edιάλεξα μέσα από την Παλαιάν τας πλέον εκλεκτάς ιστορίας και τας εσύναξα και τας εξήγησα εις το απλούν. Επρόσθεσα δέ και ανακάτωσα και άλλας νεοτέρας. Διατί; Διά την αγάπην σας, αδελφοί, διά την ωφέλειάν σας, αγαπητοί, και διά μίαν της ψυχής τρυφήν και ανάπαυσιν ύστερον από τους βιοτικούς θορύβους τε και περισπασμούς. Και τας εσύνθεσα όλες διά στίχων διά πλέον γλυκύτητα. Ονόμασα δέ την ιστορικήν ταύτην και ποικίλην μου πραγματείαν εις δύο βιβλία διηρημένην *Καθρέπτην των Γυναικών*, ωσάν οπού περί γυναικών το πε- / (f. 8) [πε]ρισσότερον καταγίνεται και διηγείται, και ωσάν οπού τον καθρέπτην περισσότερον αυτές τον μεταχειρίζονται —στολίζονται όμως και άνδρες εις αυτόν αείποτε βλέποντες και αυτόν ανά χείρας κατέχοντες—. Ότι καθώς του καθρέπτου έργον και τέλος είναι ο εξωτερικός στολισμός, ούτω και αυτού ο εσωτερικός στολισμός. Και καθώς ο καθρέπτης εκείνος ο υάλινος από άμμον γίνεται και υδράργυρον, ούτω και αυτός ο λογικός από ιστορίας και την αλήθειαν. Και καθώς ο αισθητός καθρέπτης γίνεται από το πλέον καθαρόν και ακηλίδωτον υαλί, ούτω και ο νοητός αυτός από την πλέον ιεράν και πανευφρόσυτον ύλην. Και καθώς ο καθρέπτης ευρίσκεται σχεδόν εις όλα τα σπίτια, διά να τον κοιτάζουν οι πάντες, να περισσεύουν την ευμορφίαν τους και να ευμορφίζουν την ασχημίαν τους, ούτω και αυτός πρέπει παντού να ευρίσκεται, διά να τον δια-

βάζουν οι πάντες, να διορθώνουσι την κακίαν τους, να αυξάνουσι την αρετήν τους και να ευφραίνουσι την καρδίαν τους, βλέποντες προσέτι και πολιτικός τινάς νεοφανείς υποθέσεις, εκκλησιαστικός νουθεσίας, ευαγγελικός ιστορίας και ύμνους της Παναγίας και / (f. 8v) το εξαίρετον πάντων και τιμιότατον, τα Άγια Πάθη του Κυρίου ημών. Δέξασθε ουν, παρακαλώ πάντας ταπεινώς, δεχθείτε πάντες τα νεοφανή και επωφελή ταύτα βιβλία περιχαρώς και αναγινώσκετε προσεχώς και ζείτε θεοφιλώς και πολιτεύεσθε ευσεβώς, ίνα ευτυχείτε διαπαντός και υγιαίνητε ευτυχώς και αγαλλιάσθε διηνεκώς και δοξάζητε τον Θεόν δουλικώς, διά να σας δοξάσει και ο Θεός, ώ πρέπει πάσα δόξα, τιμή και προσκύνησις από αγγέλων τε και βροτών, από ανατολών ηλίου μέχρι δυσμών, από του νυν και έως του αιώνος των αιώνων, αμήν.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Professor Anna Tabaki (University of Athens) for her kind invitation to this round table and Ariti S.A., especially its director, Mr. John Kyrkos, for their generous sponsorship which made possible my participation in the Dublin conference. I am also grateful to Dr. Nicholas Dombros (University of Thessaloniki) and his wife Georgia Iggilizzi who first came up with the idea of sponsoring me and supported it with all their heart. Last but not least I would like to thank my supervisor at the University of Cambridge, Dr. David Holton, who read my paper and made many useful suggestions and corrections.

<sup>2</sup> I feel obliged to comment here that in most of the European languages one would (still...) use the term 'scientist' both to present and to define people who are involved in humanistic studies. In the English-speaking world, despite its political correctness —which comes along with the famous 'New Order' and the modern face of capitalism, es-

pecially in the States— we are denied this title and we become 'researchers'. The argument used to defend this choice is that it is just a matter of terminology and it does not express by any means a depreciation for the 'Humanities'. The acceptance of such an argument presumes the acceptance of the thesis that 'language is innocent'. As far as I am concerned, such an argument is not acceptable; if it is just a matter of terminology, then this terminology can easily be proved incorrect, since it does not define things properly nor does it describe them accurately: people who are involved in the so-called 'Sciences' (i.e. the exact or hard sciences) are correctly called 'scientists' when they simply study or teach 'Sciences' and again correctly called 'researchers' only if they are involved in real scientific research. Why then should the 'Humanities' be restricted to only one term? I am afraid it is because we are not dealing with just a matter of terminology but clearly

with a matter of ideology: the depreciation and devaluation of the 'Humanities' in the modern world can be easily demonstrated and we all experience it daily: reduced budgets, restricted new positions, eliminated social role. Linguistic depreciation probably comes after all this but we should at least defend ourselves by retaining the 'honorific' title of scientist. In this paper, for the sake of convention, I retained the term 'researcher' but I hope it is obvious that I strenuously oppose its logic.

<sup>3</sup> In the last 20 years, two editions of *Κήπος Χαρίτων* have been published (see Savvidis 1995 and Angelou 1997) which unfortunately did not contribute as much as one would expect to the solution of the various problems connected with Dapontes' works and life. Therefore, the articles published by Kehagioglou and Kadas in the 1980s still remain important (see Kehagioglou 1986 and Kadas 1988). All these books and articles were not included in the *Bibliography of Greek Enlightenment* (see Apostolopoulos, Frangiskos, et al. 1998). I see no obvious reason for this exclusion and I suggest that they should be added in a future second edition of the *Bibliography*.

<sup>4</sup> See Dapontes 1766.

<sup>5</sup> Defined as a sub-genre according to thematic criteria (see Kaplanis 1999 and a more detailed analysis in Kaplanis 1998). For a select bibliography on literary genres see Kaplanis 1999, 299, n. 23; for a critical bibliography on literary genres in Greek see Angelatos 1997.

<sup>6</sup> At least with regard to this period (12th-18th c.). There is another poet-

ical work entitled *Το αλέτο ήτοι Γυναικών Καθρέπτης / Αληθής και όχι ψεύτης* (a copy of which can be found in the Biblioteca Academiei Române [from here on: BAR], ms. gr. 589) that is most probably from the early 19th century, and there might even be more works from 1800 onwards, but I have not expanded my research into the 19th and 20th centuries.

<sup>7</sup> See Jónsson 1995. According to his analysis, the presence of the word 'mirror' in the title of a medieval literary work (usually 'suivi d'un substantif au génitif ou (un peu plus tard) d'un adjectif'; Jónsson 1995, 159) is by itself the most important generic element that can allow us to classify the work in the specific literary genre. And, as he notes, that is because "l'étude... a également montré que le mot miroir n'est pas seulement le véhicule d'une métaphore qui s'appuie sur un modèle complexe et désigne un 'livre-miroir', mais devient également, dans la première moitié du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, le lieu de jonction entre une structure philosophique et des formes d'élaboration littéraire, qui organisent le contenu de l'œuvre en fonction d'une vision particulière du monde ou de la destinée humaine. Il paraît donc tout à fait légitime d'utiliser ce mot comme un fil conducteur pour explorer le développement du genre, les relations des 'miroirs' postérieurs avec les deux premières œuvres, et le rapport entre le modèle, la métaphore et le contenu dans les différentes 'miroirs'." (see Jónsson 1995, 211-212)

<sup>8</sup> The data presented here are mainly based on Kehagioglou 1986 and Kadas 1988.

- <sup>9</sup> For a more systematic presentation of all the data concerning the dating of *Καθρέπτης Γυναικών* see Appendix I.
- <sup>10</sup> See for instance the text of 'Είδησις' that accompanied all Dapontes' books, as published in Savvidis' edition of *Η Θυσία του Ιεφθάε και Ιστορία Σωσάννης* (see Savvidis 1993, 184): "Και επειδή το βιβλίον μου, Καθρέπτης γυναικών ονομαζόμενον, οπού τώρα νεωστί, εις τους χιλίους επτακοσίους εξήνταεξ, ετυπώθη εις Λιψίαν, ο αντιγραφεύς, ή ο του τύπου διορθωτής, ενόθευσεν αυτό ο ασυνείδητος, το διέφθειρε, το ασχήμισε, της πατρικής ουσίας και χάριτος το εγύμνωσε, και άλλο εξ άλλου το έκαμεν, άλλα βάνοντας, άλλα εβγάλοντας, και άλλα αλλάζοντας, καθώς η δοκοφροσύνη, ανάθεμά την, τον υπαγόρευσε." For the changes that the editor Thomas Mandakassis made and for a corrected copy of *Καθρέπτης Γυναικών* by Dapontes see Lambros 1905.
- <sup>11</sup> In the Xeropotamou manuscript no. 344, which includes autograph notes of Dapontes that have been published by Sotiris Kadas, we read: 'Δεκεμβρίου τρίτη έστειλα εις Βενετίαν, εις τον σιορ Μηχαήλ Γλυκή τυπογράφον τον Καθρέπτην των Γυναικών / το βιβλίον μου οπού προ έξετών ετυπώθη εις Λιψίαν, να τυπωθή συν Θεώ και τώρα εις Βενετίαν.' (see Kadas 1988, 220) Although there is an inconsistency between the year of the hand-note's heading, which is 1776, and the data provided by the note itself (given the fact that the date of the Leipzig edition is 1766, the note must have been written in 1772 since, according to Dapontes, the book was published in Leipzig 'six years ago'), nevertheless it provides us with clear evidence that Dapontes was planning a second, corrected edition of *Καθρέπτης Γυναικών*.
- <sup>12</sup> Only its first two chapters were critically edited by Savvidis and separately published under the title *Η Θυσία του Ιεφθάε και Ιστορία Σωσάννης* (see Savvidis 1993).
- <sup>13</sup> See Savvidis 1991, 60: "γέφυρα νοητή ανάμεσα σε Ανατολή και Δύση, Άρκτο και Μεσημβρία, σε κοσμογονική πολυπραγμοσύνη και πνευματικήν αφιέρωση, σε φώτιση και διαφώτιση, λογιοςύνη και λαϊκότητα, παράδοση και νεοτερισμό, και σε 'ψυχικήν ωφέλειαν και χαράν της καρδιάς', καταμεσής στον λεγόμενο αιώνα του Διαφωτισμού μας."
- <sup>14</sup> Dapontes himself claims that he comes from a Venetian Daponte family in his unpublished *Φανάρι Γυναικών*. I copy here the text from BAR ms. gr. 1545 (a Dapontes autograph): "Και τον διδάσκαλόν σου δέ τον εν Βουκουρεστίω / Γεώργιον εγνώρισα εν τω Μοναστηρίω [του Αγίου Σάββα in marg.]. / Μάλιστα τον πατέρα σου· πολλά με αγαπούσεν, / έλεγες 'τι μ' εγέννησεν, ως τόσο με πονούσεν. / Άξιος ο πατέρας σου ήτον ο μακαρίτης / εκείνος, ναι, ο Στέφανος Δαπόντες Σκοπελίτης. / Μ' έλεγε πως κατάγεται από τους Δαποντέους / της Βενετίας άρχοντας ενδόξους και αρχαίους. / Με είπε δέ και ότι πως εις την της Φλωρεντίας / Σύνοδον εκ του γένους του ων τις εκ Βενετίας, / καθώς και άλλοι άρχοντες απ' άλλας αυθεντίας, / Γαλλίας, Ισπανίας τε και άλλας εξουσίας. / [8 lines omitted] Με είπε πως εστάθηκε και Ρήγας Βενετίας / ένας εκ της Δαποντικής ετούτης φαμιλίας / και ότι ο πατέρας του είχε διορι-

σμένον / εκείθεν σιτηρέσιον, εγγράφως ορισμένον.” (see BAR ms. gr. 1545, f. 211<sup>v</sup>)

<sup>15</sup> Probably the first scholar who noticed this was Voutieridis as early as 1933 (see Voutieridis 1934, 241-242).

<sup>16</sup> See Voutieridis 1933, 242: ‘[...] ο Δαπόντες αντιπροσωπεύει όσο λίγοι το πνεύμα της εποχής του. Γράφει για όλα, όπως οι συγκαιρινοί του Έλληνες είχαν αρχίσει να θέλουνε να τα μαθαίνουνε όλα, όσο μπορούσανε.’

<sup>17</sup> See Bloch 1991, 7.

<sup>18</sup> See his thorough study on medieval misogyny (Bloch 1991); for an anthology of medieval misogynous texts translated into English see Blamires, et al. 1992.

<sup>19</sup> See Brown-Grant 1999, 6.

<sup>20</sup> See Bloch 1991, 8.

<sup>21</sup> See Bloch 1991, 11.

<sup>22</sup> See Bloch 1991, 7.

<sup>23</sup> See Kaplanis 1999; especially 301, 304-306.

<sup>24</sup> For the form and the use of this proverbial phrase, which also occurs in medieval Greek vernacular literature, see Morgan 1960, 226. The passage from *Golias* cited here is also drawn from the same source.

<sup>25</sup> *Wife of Bath's Prologue*, III. 278-280.

<sup>26</sup> Aristotle, *Poetics*, I. 3, 6-9.

<sup>27</sup> Genette explains the difference: “La différence de statut entre genres et modes est essentiellement là: les genres sont des catégories proprement littéraires, les modes sont des catégories qui relèvent de la linguistique, ou plus exactement de ce que l'on appelle aujourd'hui la *pragmatique*” (Genette 1979, 68-69) and more specifically further down: “*épique*, par exemple, ne surplombe *épopée*, *roman*, *nouvelle*, *conte*, etc., que si

on l'entend comme mode (= narratif); si on l'entend comme genre (= *épopée*) et qu'on lui donne, comme fait Hegel, un contenu thématique spécifique, alors il ne *contient* plus le romanesque, le fantastique, etc., il se retrouve au même niveau.” (Genette 1979, 72)

<sup>28</sup> See Kaplanis 1998 and Kaplanis 1999.

<sup>29</sup> See Krumbacher 1905. The term translated in Greek as ‘καθρέπτης γυναικών’ was first used by Linos Politis in a study about *Apokorpos* (see Politis 1953) and not by Kehagioglou as I claimed in Kaplanis 1999, 296 (however, Kehagioglou was indeed the first to use the term in its demotic form ‘καθρέφτης’).

<sup>30</sup> See Morgan 1960, 223-224.

<sup>31</sup> See Panagiotakis 1995a; especially 128-131 and Panagiotakis 1995b; especially 314-317.

<sup>32</sup> For more details see Kaplanis 1999, 300.

<sup>33</sup> For more details see Kaplanis 1999, 302. In the select bibliography of that article one should add Vassiliou's study on *Apokorpos*, where the function of the mirror of women which is included in Bergadis' book is discussed in detail (see Vassiliou 1993; especially 149-159).

<sup>34</sup> See *Ανθ. χαρ.*, column 12: “πρώτον να γυρεύσω τινά ποιήματα των φρονίμων οπού είπαν καλόν δι' αυτές και τότε εκείνων που είπαν κακόν δι' αυτές και το τέλος να θέσω τες γραφές αντάμα και να δώσω αληθινήν λύσιν, και να κόψουν τες γλώσσες οπού λέγουν κακά.”

<sup>35</sup> See Grabes 1982, 19.

<sup>36</sup> See Grabes 1982.

<sup>37</sup> For the whole text of Dapontes' dedication and prologue to *Καθρέπτης Γυναικών* see Appendix II.

<sup>38</sup> See *Ανθ. χαρ.*, column 14: ‘Και η

αληθινή λύσις είναι να ορθώσεις τους λόγους ετούτους, ότι το εναντίον των γυναικών ήτον η Εύα, οπού εξημίωσε, και το εναντίον αυτής ήτον η Παρθένος Μαρία, οπού εκέρδισεν.'

<sup>39</sup> Examples can be found in many texts of the period 12th-18th century. I quote here only one, which is typical of the absolute social condemnation of women: "Ψέγουσι πάντες οι σοφοί τας πονηράς γυναίκας / πως έχουν τέχνην το κακόν, εργόχειρον το έργον, / εγώ δέ λέγω τας καλάς και τας κακάς αντάμα, / διότι ουδέν ευρίσκεται άψογος ουδεμία." (see Kakoulidi 1964, 112) Cf. the section entitled 'Σημειώσετε πως δίχως γυναικός τίποτες δεν γίνεται' in Diakrousis' *Κρητικός Πόλεμος* (see Xerouhakis 1908, 67-69).

<sup>40</sup> See BAR ms. gr. 1545, f. 203<sup>v</sup>: "Αν εστάθηκε ποτέ άλλος ένας φιλογύνης, / αλλ' εγώ καθώς θωρώ, κορυφαίος συ εγίνης. / Θάρσει, όμως, μη φοβού· τούτη η φιλογυνία / είναι έργον αγαθόν, ότι είναι ιστορία." I have translated the word 'ιστορία' as 'narration' in a broad sense and in accordance with the translation of the verb 'ιστορώ' as 'to give an account' (see below). However, I have to mention that Dapontes writes a whole introductory essay in *Φανάρι Γυναικών* about the sense of the word 'ιστορία' which is worth studying. Of course, it was impossible to include it in this paper.

<sup>41</sup> At one point, close to the end of the work, he writes: 'Χρόνους εγώ εξήντα τρεις μη συγκεχωρημένος / ως μη νηστεύων, μη πενθών, μη μετανοημένος' (see BAR ms. gr. 1545, f. 330). Since Dapontes was born in 1713, he must have been sixty three years old in 1776.

<sup>42</sup> 'Μακάριος εκείνος δέ οπού να το

τυπώσει / ως τον Καθρέπτην Γυναικών κι αυτό στον κόσμο να το δώσει' and 'Μακάριος ο άνθρωπος οπού να το τυπώσει, / να δευτερώσει βέβαια, θαρρώ, και να τριτώσει' (see Soulogiannis 1974, 36; I am grateful to Professor George Kehagioglou who made available to me his personal copy of Soulogiannis' rare study).

<sup>43</sup> This number is not entirely coincidental: "Ακόμη τρεις, πάτερ, να πεις, ίνα συμποσοθούσι / πενήντα τρεις και εκατόν, και διά να γενούσι / ίσια με τα εκατόν πενήντα και τρία / τα ψάρια οπού έπιασε (γνωστή η ιστορία) / Πέτρος, προστάξει του Χριστού· και έτσι περικλείεις / και τους ψαλμούς όλους εδώ, έτι δέ και δεικνύεις / και αριθμόν τον ιερόν Τριάδος της Αγίας, / ής χάριτι γράφεις, θαρρώ, αυτάς τας ιστορίας." (see Soulogiannis 1974, 43)

<sup>44</sup> With the only difference that in *Καθρέπτης* the narrator, Χαρίτων, converses with his soul (Ψυχή).

<sup>45</sup> The term is mentioned in *Φανάρι Γυναικών*: "Ησαύ πρωτότοκος υιός διά θηλυμανίαν / χάνει και πρωτόκια, χάνει και ευλογίαν. / Δι' αυτήν έχασα κι εγώ πλούτον και αρχοντίαν, / εκέρδισα δέ φυλακήν εις εικοσιμηνίαν." (see BAR, ms. gr. 1545, f. 302<sup>v</sup>-303)

<sup>46</sup> Apart from the notorious passage from *Κήπος Χαρίτων* 9, 161-165 ("Οι τράπεζες των λαϊκών, πλουσίων και πενήτων, / εις κάθε τόπον και καιρόν όλες δικές μου ήτον, / και οι γυναίκες των αυτές, μαζί κι οι θυγατέρες, / γυναίκες, θυγατέρες μου όλες μου τες ημέρες. / Μίαν γυναίκα έχασα, και ήβρα 'κατοστάδες"; see Savvidis 1995, 122-123), I quote here another excerpt from *Φα-*



νάρι Γυναικών ("Κατηγοράται δυνατά εκείνη η Αιγυπτία / ότι πολλή τον Ιωσήφ εβίασεν εν βία. / Πόσες φορές εβίασα εγώ τες εδικές μου, / και ξένες μάλιστα εγώ και τες γειτόνισσές μου; / Εκείνη εβιάσθηκε κι εβίασεν η μαύρη / διά το κάλλος το πολύ, οπού 'χε τύχει νά βρει. / Εμένα δέ και γύφτισσα ανίσως με βιάσει, / βέβαια με εκέρδισε, δεν είναι να με χάσει. / Εκείνη και δεν ήκουσε ποτέ το 'μη μοιχεύσεις', / εγώ δε καθημερινά, 'αλλ' ούτε να πορνεύσεις'. / Η κόλασις, λοιπόν, αυτής είναι ελαφροτέρα / από την εδικήν μου, ναι, και συγγνωμονεστέρα." (see BAR ms. gr. 1545, f. 310\*)

<sup>47</sup> See Nicholson 1997, 302.

<sup>48</sup> See Desai 1997, 265.

<sup>49</sup> See Angelou's very interesting study on Madame Tyaniti (1994).

<sup>50</sup> See Angelou 1994, 375.

<sup>51</sup> In the Index of the *Bibliography of Greek Enlightenment* (see Apostolopoulos, Frangiskos, et al. 1998) the entry 'woman' includes only three references —unfortunately, Angelou's very useful article (see note 49 above) is not among them.

<sup>52</sup> Kitromilides' very interesting, but not literary-orientated, study on 'Womanhood' (see Kitromilides 1983) is the single 'swallow' that, as we very well know, 'does not make a summer...'

## References

I use the author-date system with one exception: that of *Άνθος Χαρίτων*, for which the abbreviation *Άνθ. χαρ.* is used in the notes, because its author is anonymous and the text has not yet been critically edited. Classical texts are not included in these references; I have used their standard editions.

*Άνθ. χαρ. Άνθος των Χαρίτων* (Venice: Giovan-Antonio da Sabio & Fratelli, 1529).

Angelatos, D. 1997. *Η «φωνή» της μνήμης. Δοκίμιο για τα λογοτεχνικά είδη*, Athens: Καστανιώτης.

Angelou, A. 1994. 'Η Μαντάμ Τυανίτη', *Ελληνικά*, 44, 369-398.

Angelou, A., ed., 1997. *Καισάριος Δαπόντες, 'Κήπος Χαρίτων'*, Athens: Εστία.

Apostolopoulos, D.G., Frangiskos, E.N., et al. 1998. *Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός. Βιβλιογραφία 1945-1995*, Ερευνητικό Πρόγραμμα: Νεοελληνικός Διαφωτισμός: οι ιδέες – τα πρόσωπα – οι συλλογικοί φορείς – τα έργα, Athens: Κέντρο Νεοελληνικών Ερευνών του Εθνικού Ιδρύματος Ερευνών and Τομέας Φιλοσοφίας του Πανεπιστημίου Ιωαννίνων.

Argyriou, A., Dimadis, K.A., et al., eds., 1999. *Ο ελληνικός κόσμος ανάμεσα στην Ανατολή και τη Δύση (1453-1981)*, Πρακτικά του Α' Ευρωπαϊκού Συνεδρίου Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (Βερολίνο, 2-4 Οκτωβρίου 1998), 2 vols., Athens: Ελληνικά Γράμματα.

Blamires, A., et al., eds., 1992. *Woman Defamed and Woman Defended. An Anthology of Medieval Texts*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bloch, R.H. 1991. *Medieval Misogyny and the Invention of Western Romantic Love*, Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press.



- Brown-Grant, R., trans., 1999. *Christine de Pisan, 'The Book of the City of Ladies'*, with an introduction and notes, London: Penguin.
- Dapontes, K. 1766. *Καθρέπτis Γυναικῶν. Βιβλίον [...], εν ᾧ φαίνονται γραφικῶς αι εν τη Παλαιᾷ Γραφή περιεχόμεναι σποράδην ιστορίαι κακῶν τε και καλῶν γυναικῶν [...]*, 2 vols., Leipzig: Breitkopf (?).
- Davis, N.Z. and Farge, A., eds., 1997. *A History of Women in the West. III. Renaissance and Enlightenment Paradoxes*, 3rd print., Cambridge, Mass.-London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Desaive, J.-P. 1997. 'The Ambiguities of Literature', in Davis and Farge 1997, 261-294.
- Genette, G. 1979. *Introduction à l'architexte*, collection Poétique, Paris: Seuil.
- Grabes, H. 1982. *The Mutable Glass. Mirror-imagery in Titles and Texts of the Middle Ages and English Renaissance*, trans. from the German by G. Collier, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jónsson, E.M. 1995. *Le Miroir. Naissance d'un genre littéraire*, Histoire, 30, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Kadas, S.N. 1988. 'Χειρόγραφο με αυτόγραφες σημειώσεις του Kaisáριου Δαπόντε' in Tarnanidis, Lavas, et al. 1988, 183-235.
- Kakoulidi, E., ed., 1964. 'Αδάμ τον πρώτον άνθρωπον' in *Νεοελληνικά θρησκευτικά αλφαβητάρια*, doctoral thesis, Επιστημονική Επετηρίς Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής, Παράρτημα 9, Thessaloniki: Αριστοτέλειον Πανεπιστήμιον Θεσσαλονίκης, 110-112.
- Kaplanis, T.A. 1998. "'Καθρέφτες γυναικῶν". Μισογυνικά κείμενα της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημόδους γραμματείας', unpublished master's thesis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Kaplanis, T.A. 1999. "'Καθρέφτες γυναικῶν" ή μισογυνικά κείμενα της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημόδους γραμματείας,' in Argyriou, Dimadis, et al. 1999, 295-316.
- Kehagioglou, G. 1986. 'Ανέκδοτα στοιχεία για τον Kaisáριο Δαπόντε από το χειρόγραφο Βυτίνας αριθ. 1', *Ο Εραμιστής*, 18, 35-56.
- Kitromilides, P.M. 1983. 'The Enlightenment and Womanhood: Cultural Change and the Politics of Exclusion', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 1, 39-61.
- Krumbacher, K. 1905. 'Ein vulgärgriechischer Weiberspiegel', *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und der historischen Klasse der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, 3, 335-433.
- Lambros, S.P. 1905. 'Kaisáριος Δαπόντες και Θωμάς Μανδακάσης', *Νέος Ελληνομνήμων*, 2, 508-512.
- Morgan, G. 1960. 'Cretan Poetry: Sources and Inspiration', *Κρητικά Χρονικά*, 14, 7-68, 203-270, 379-434.
- Nicholson, E.A. 1997. 'The Theater' in Davis and Farge 1997, 295-347.
- Panagiotakis, N.M. 1995a. 'Le fonti italiane di un poema misogino cretese del tardo Quattrocento', *Θησαυρίσματα*, 25, 123-142.
- Panagiotakis, N.M. 1995b. 'The Italian Background of Early Cretan Literature', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 49, 281-323.
- Politis, L. 1953. 'Παρατηρήσεις στον Απόκοπο του Μπεργαδή', *Προσφορά εις Στίλπωνα Π. Κυριακίδη επί τη εικοσιπενταετηρίδι της καθηγεσίας αυτού (1926-1951)*, Thessaloniki: *Ελληνικά*, Παράρτημα 4, 546-560.

- Savvidis, G.P., ed., 1991. *Κωνσταντίνου Δαπόντε, καμινάρη, του μετονομασθέντος Καισαρίου, 'Κανών Περιεκτικός Πολλών Εξαιρέτων Πραγμάτων [...]' (1778)*, Ποικίλη Στοά, 4, Athens: Λέσχη.
- Savvidis, G.P., ed., 1993. *Κωνσταντίνου Δαπόντε, του μετονομασθέντος Καισαρίου, 'Η Θυσία του Ιερθάε και Ιστορία Σωσάννης'*, Athens: Ιστός.
- Savvidis, G.P., ed., 1995. *'Κήπος Χαρίτων' τουτέστι, βιβλίον περιέχον την περίοδον του τιμίου Εύλου του ζωοποιού Σταυρού [...] και άλλα διάφορα, συντεθέντα παρά Κωνσταντίνου Δαπόντε του μετονομασθέντος Καισαρίου [...]*, Athens: Ερμής.
- Soulogiannis, E. 1974. *'Καيسάριος Δαπόντες. Από την ποιητική ιστοριογραφία στην ηθικοδιδασκαλία. Το Φανάρι Γυναικών'*, unpublished 'tesi di laurea', University of Rome.
- Tarnanidis, I., Lavas, G., et al., eds., 1988. *Αφιέρωμα στον Εμμανουήλ Κριαρά, Πρακτικά Επιστημονικού Συμποσίου (3 Απριλίου 1987)*, Thessaloniki: Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης. Κέντρο Βυζαντινών Ερευνών.
- Vassiliou, P. 1993. *'Ερμηνευτικές παρατηρήσεις στον Απόκοπο του Μπεργαδής, Ελληνικά, 43, 125-172.*
- Voutieridis, E. 1933. *Σύντομη ιστορία της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας 1000-1930*, Athens: Ζηκάκης.
- Xerouhakis, A., ed., 1908. *Ο Κρητικός Πόλεμος (1645-1669) ή συλλογή των ελληνικών ποιημάτων Ανθίμου Διακρούση, Μαρίνου Ζάνε, Trieste: Lloyd (?)*.

## Περίληψη

Τάσος Α. ΚΑΠΛΑΝΗΣ: *Οι γυναίκες μέσα στον Καθρέπτη – Ο φιλογύνης Δαπόντες (1713-1784) και η μισογυνική παράδοση του Μεσαίωνα*

Ο Καισάριος Δαπόντες υπήρξε η σημαντικότερη ελληνική ποιητική μορφή του 18ου αιώνα. Το έργο του, που αγαπήθηκε ιδιαίτερα στην εποχή του, είναι σήμερα παραμελημένο· σύγχρονες κριτικές εκδόσεις, κατά κανόνα, δεν έχει γνωρίσει, ενώ ποικίλα προβλήματα της δαποντικής εργοβιογραφίας παραμένουν ανερευνήτα και ανεπίλυτα. Το άρθρο συνοψίζει τα πορίσματα της μέχρι τούδε έρευνας για το δημιουργό και εστιάζει την προσοχή του στον *Καθρέπτη Γυναικών* (Λιψία, 1766). Το έργο εξετάζεται στο γενολογικό πλαίσιο του ομώνυμου και ανθηρού στον όψιμο Μεσαίωνα λογοτεχνικού είδους, καθώς και σε σχέση με τη λογοτροπική παράμετρο του μισογυνισμού. Συζητείται η εικόνα της γυναίκας έτσι όπως αναδεικνύεται μέσα από τον *Καθρέπτη*, καθώς και η θέση του έργου μέσα στην προηγούμενη λογοτεχνική παράδοση. Για άλλη μία φορά επιβεβαιώνεται ότι ο Δαπόντες είναι «άνθρωπος-γέφυρα»: παρά τις πολλαπλές οφειλές του στη μεσαιωνική παράδοση, πάνω στην οποία βασίζεται, καταφέρνει πάντα να απομακρύνεται από αυτήν ή, καλύτερα, να την ανανεώνει, κομίζοντας παράλληλα το νέο πνεύμα της εποχής του. Το άρθρο συνοδεύεται από δύο επίμετρα: στο πρώτο επιχειρείται χρονολόγηση της συγγραφής του *Καθρέπτη Γυναικών* και στο δεύτερο εκδίδεται η «Αφιέρωσις» και το «Προοίμιον» του έργου, πάνω στα οποία, ελλείψει συνολικής κριτικής έκδοσης, βασίστηκε κυρίως η επιχειρηματολογία του άρθρου.