

Ioakeim Kyprios' Struggle and the Story of the Maltese Sultana: A Literary Account of Historical Events?

Tassos A. Kaplanis*

RÉSUMÉ

Le personnage et l'œuvre de Ioakeim le Chypriote ne sont pas encore très connus des chercheurs contemporains: dans cet article on parle d'un long poème narratif qui se réfère à la guerre entre Venise et l'Empire Ottoman des années 1645-1669. Plus particulièrement, on y examine si dans ce poème est présentée de façon littéraire (et même avec des éléments théâtraux) l'histoire de Sultana la Maltaise.

ABSTRACT

The personality and work of Ioakeim Kyprios are not yet well known by contemporary scholars. The author of this article discusses a long narrative poem written by Ioakeim about the Turco-Venetian conflict of 1645-1669. More precisely, he ponders whether this poem presents the story of the Maltese Sultana.

Ioakeim Kyprios' *Book called Struggle, i.e. Battle of the Turks against the most venerable and most illustrious Grand Ruler and Prince of the most illustrious City of Venice* [henceforth *Struggle*] is an unedited vernacular Greek text of the 17th century – best known in the bibliography as a verse history of the 'Cretan War' (1645-1669) – which has been preserved in an autograph manuscript in the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest (BAR ms. gr. 37).¹ The text was first brought to the attention of scholars by Prof. Nikolaos Tomadakis, who published a very brief note about it in the first volume of *Κρητικά Χρονικά* (1947).² Some years later, Prof. Emmanuel Kriaras, in a paper presented at the 1st Conference of Cretan Studies,³ provided for the first time a description of the contents of the work - based on its 'Prologue'⁴ -, presented

* University of Cyprus

the part of the story of the Maltese Sultana that was then known to him (737 verses)⁵ and underlined the linguistic importance of the text. In the same article, the author made some useful remarks on the vocabulary and the dialectal characteristics of the poem's language, which still retain their validity,⁶ edited a short passage of 33 verses and announced his intention to present a critical edition of the whole text in the future, i.e. as soon as he would get hold of it on microfilm. Kriaras did acquire such a microfilm some time in the late 1960s,⁷ but his unfortunate personal experiences did not allow him to realize the intended edition.⁸ In 1998, Prof. Kriaras – to whom I would like to express my deepest gratitude – encouraged me to undertake the task of editing *Struggle* and generously offered to me copies of the text made from the microfilms Γ16 and Γ17 of his personal archive. Ioakeim's *Struggle* has been the subject of my Cambridge PhD dissertation,⁹ which was brilliantly supervised by Prof. D. Holton – to whom I am also extremely grateful. The critical edition of the text, which is currently in its final stage of preparation, is expected to appear in 2009 in the publication series of the Cyprus Research Centre (Nicosia). The edition will be accompanied by a lengthy introduction where all major issues concerning the author, the manuscript, the text and its context will be thoroughly examined.

Since my research on Ioakeim and his *Struggle* is still ongoing and due to the restrictions that this research is subject to on part of its publisher I cannot provide here many details on issues that will be discussed in the forthcoming edition. Thus, the presentation of Ioakeim's biography in this paper will exclusively rely upon published material. What this paper aims to do is to present the content of the introductory part of *Struggle* (verses 1-1690), which includes one of the most important and interesting parts of Ioakeim's text, i.e. the story of the Maltese Sultana. The story of this Sultana, who was allegedly one of the Turks' reasons/excuses for invading Crete, will be presented here for the first time in its complete version, and the question of both its historicity and its literariness will be briefly discussed. But before getting to this let me first provide some information on Ioakeim himself.

In 1962, Kriaras stated that, despite his efforts, he could not find any information on the author of *Struggle*.¹⁰ Indeed, even today – with the exception of the catalogue of Litzica (1909) –, Ioakeim's name, i.e. 'Ιωακείμ αρχιμανδρίτης Κύπριος ο καντσελλιέρης',¹¹ is not mentioned in any published catalogue of Greek manuscripts¹² – and it has even been excluded from the standard catalogue of Greek scribes of the 17th-18th centuries.¹³ In this, otherwise extremely useful, catalogue, there are 33 entries of scribes

named Ioakeim:¹⁴ 23 of them, for chronological and other reasons, cannot possibly be identified with our Ioakeim; however, the identity of – ideally all – the remaining 10 needs to be cross-checked. My research so far, even though inevitably limited,¹⁵ shows that at least 2, perhaps even 3, of these scribes can be identified with the author of *Struggle* (details will be given in the forthcoming edition of the text). All we know about Ioakeim with certainty is based on the information he provides in his text. The secure information that we can gather from *Struggle* about its author summarises as follows:¹⁶

[Ioakeim] was a Cypriot monk from the Monastery of Kykkos who had at some time visited the Holy Land and who was established in Belgrade [Serbia] when he wrote his book. No chronological data are provided; we do not know when and where exactly he was born nor do we know when and why he left Cyprus and what he was doing in Serbia. We do not know anything about his education and of course we do not know the date of his death. But from the contents of his book we can presume that he must have died not long after 1667 and, probably, even before the end of the [Cretan] war in 1669 [...]. We can also assume that he had a basic, at least, ecclesiastical training and education, since the language he uses in the text is in general an awkward vernacular bearing the traces of his ecclesiastical readings. Finally, the extensive use of Italian and Turkish words, phrases and even passages [that occurs in *Struggle*] makes it reasonable to assume that he spoke both Turkish and Italian/Venetian.

As regards the text itself, *Struggle*, as preserved today, consists of 10,240 couplet-rhyming 15-syllable political verses, a book-title, a 6-verse epigram in 12-syllable iambic metre, a 75-line prose prologue (with a title), a 12-line prose *Synopsis*, 122 prose headings (section-titles) of varying length (average: c. 42 words per heading) and two prose 'endnotes' of 5 and 24 lines respectively. According to my calculations, some 400 verses are today lost as a result of the manuscript's missing folios.¹⁷ As I have argued elsewhere, internal reasons allow us to assume that¹⁸:

Ioakeim decided to write his book some time between 1648 and 1650, most probably after reading a book or pamphlet(s) about the Venetian victories of these years and also after reading a book about the story of the Maltese Sultana: he makes extensive use of this last source in the first part of his poem (ff. 10^v-34 [of the manuscript]), while the account of the events of the years 1648-1650 takes up the biggest part of the text

(ff. 70-146^v), with that of the year 1648 covering almost one fourth of the total (ff. 70-119^v).

The basic structure of the text is simple in concept and falls into the general scheme ‘introduction – main narrative – conclusion’, which was certainly very common in early modern Greek narratives.¹⁹ However, unlike the conclusion which is clearly introduced in the text by a separate chapter-heading,²⁰ the introductory part is not clearly defined and it is difficult to decide where it ends. For the sake of this paper’s economy, I will accept that the introduction includes all verses before 1691, where the narrative reaches the siege of Chania,²¹ and I will, thus, provide a summary of the first 1690 verses.

The first section of the introduction (*Struggle* 1-46) emphasizes the good diplomatic relations that the Venetians and the Turks enjoyed in a vaguely defined past and is immediately followed by a sneering description of the Turks and their religion (*Struggle* 47-216), which anticipates the pro-Venetian standpoint that the text will henceforth adopt;²² after this derisive description, the reader is transferred in time to the reign of Sultan Murad IV (1623-1640): it was during his reign that a Maltese lady – together with her mother and all the passengers of a ship that was taking them to Spain – was captured by Barbary corsairs, who gave her to the Sultan as a present; the Sultan fell in love with her, made her a Sultana and agreed to set her mother free to return to Malta (*Struggle* 217-294); later, Murad sets off to Babylon – read: Baghdad –,²³ but an incident that takes place in the port of Avlona and involves the destruction of a Barbary fleet by the Venetians makes him take a ‘horrid oath’: when he returns from Baghdad, he will attack Venice to avenge the destruction of his Barbary allies – but he dies soon after his return (*Struggle* 295-314); Murad is succeeded by Ibrahim in 1640 (*Struggle* 315-344) and it is during the latter’s reign that the ‘scandal’ between the Venetians and the Turks begins, not only as a result of Murad’s oath (*Struggle* 345-364), but also because a monk or priest (a ‘bandit and imposter’ in the text) of aristocratic Peloponnesian origin presents himself to Ibrahim with falsified documents and offers him his supposed ‘property’, Chania and Rethymno, as a present (*Struggle* 365-398); Ibrahim discusses the issue with his counsellors and negotiations begin with the Venetian *bailo* in Constantinople so that the Turks get what now, supposedly, belongs to them (*Struggle* 399-460); the *bailo* under the Turkish pressures writes to Venice (*Struggle* 461-470) and the *Serenissima*, as expected, answers the Turkish claims in the negative (*Struggle* 471-506). In the meantime, the Maltese Sultana, who was previously Sultan Murad’s *haseki*, i.e. favourite wife

(*Struggle* 507-530), never abandoned her Christian faith and always prayed to God for return to Malta (*Struggle* 531-574); when Murad died, she was transferred to the *Eski Sarayi*, on Ibrahim's orders, and in compensation for this transfer she was given property as well as hundreds of slaves and servants; among them there were two confidants who spoke her mother tongue (*Struggle* 574-614); when she found out about their existence, she asked them to send a letter to her mother, who in turn was asked to prepare a few ships to come and liberate the Sultana from the Turks in due course; the Sultana's plan was to set off on a supposed pilgrimage to Mecca, meet her mother's ships on the way and get freed by her people (*Struggle* 615-646); the Maltese Sultana asks the permission of the Sultan to go on the pilgrimage and with the intervention of his mother, the *valide* Sultana, permission is granted (*Struggle* 647-700); the Maltese Sultana prays to God to help her succeed in her plan and makes all necessary arrangements and preparations for her trip (*Struggle* 701-768); when everything is ready, the other members of the Harem come to wave her goodbye and, after an emotional farewell, during which both the Maltese Sultana and the *valide* fall in a faint (*Struggle* 769-862), the Maltese Sultana finally sets off, with the accompaniment of a ceremonial *donanma*; she informs the Maltese fleet about her departure and asks them to put in at Sigri, a port in Lesbos, and await her orders (*Struggle* 863-950); a storm obliges her fleet to berth in Sigri for the night and after a prophetic dream which foretells the success of her plans (*Struggle* 951-1068), the battle follows: the Maltese win, the Sultana rewards them with lavish presents and they all set off on their return journey to Malta, where preparations begin for her reception (*Struggle* 1069-1220); a festive ceremony is organized, the Maltese Sultana thanks God for her unhopd-for return and the whole of Malta comes out to meet her; the Sultana and her retinue are marshalled to St. John's Church where they are all baptized with all proper solemnities and the celebrations go on for 30 weeks (*Struggle* 1221-1402); when the Sultan finds out what happened, he reacts furiously (we are reminded that he was nicknamed *Deli*, the mad one): he wants to attack Malta immediately, but with the intervention of his mother he is persuaded to call a meeting of the *divan* first; the council regards his plan as unfeasible and the decision is made to attack Crete instead, on the basis of the documents that were given to the Sultan, documents which secured his ownership of Chania and Rethymno; negotiations with the Venetian *bailo* begin once again, but this time the Turks deceitfully ask the Venetians for help in order to attack Malta, although they had already decided to do

otherwise; the Venetians refuse and the *bailo* is then asked to secure a permit for the Turkish fleet to anchor at Souda on its way to attack Malta (*Struggle* 1403-1594); the *bailo*, being under enormous pressures, promises to do everything in his power to secure the permit and the Turks, satisfied, wait for Venice's reply (*Struggle* 1595-1688); but when a negative reply comes (*Struggle* 1688a), the war begins.

Ioakeim's description of the aftermath of the Sultana's capture includes many realistic elements: the diplomatic fever which followed the capture, with the successive meetings of Ottoman officials with the *bailo* Soranzo, the decision of the *divan* to attack Malta (including the conflicting views of the second Vizier and Cinci Hoca who supported an attack on Crete, on the one hand, and of the Grand Vizier who opposed it, on the other), the setting-sail of the Ottoman fleet to Malta and its sudden change of course and attack on Crete, have all been reported in contemporary historiographical and official/diplomatic Venetian sources.²⁴ Realistic elements are also to be found in many other parts of the introduction.²⁵ But, of course, the story of the Maltese Sultana as a whole is fictional: although contemporary sources are far from unanimous in their accounts of the Sultana, the 'official' version that is widely accepted by modern scholarship is significantly different.²⁶ Most importantly, this widely accepted version does not refer to a person, but to a ship.²⁷ Based on this fact alone, previous scholarship was at times particularly dismissive as regards the historical value of Ioakeim's text: Tomadakis e.g. – who had no further knowledge of *Struggle* but that provided by Kriaras (1962) – explicitly stated that Ioakeim's text is a 'novel'²⁸ and, more generally, a mythological work which cannot be taken seriously as a historical source,²⁹ for the additional reason that Ioakeim could not have been contemporary to the events of the 'Cretan War'.³⁰ Obviously, this is not the case.

As one may easily observe, the introductory part of *Struggle* offers a mixture of realistic events and fictional stories, in an attempt to create a narrative universe with claims to reality: the accurate details provide the narrative with verisimilitude and the reader is then forced to believe that the text depicts events as they actually happened. This is a characteristic retained throughout the text, but, unlike the introduction, which is both well planned and well executed/structured – and that is the main reason why it also summarizes well –, the main narrative presents weaknesses in both planning and execution. One may argue that it too is subject to a general plan where historical events unfold in chronological order; however, this must be regarded as a general observation only. There are many parts of the

main narrative, in particular from verse 3739 onwards, where flashbacks occur and as many others where digressions of various sorts (religious, eschatological, lyrical, etc.) are employed: the former usually reflect not only the flow of information that the author obtained, but also the time when he obtained it, whereas the latter often represent fillers, simply aiming to make up for the author's lack of information on specific events of the conflict. Of course, both flashbacks and digressions relate to the nature of Ioakeim's project: *Struggle* is a contemporary account of the events of the Turco-Venetian conflict over dominance in the Aegean of the years 1645-1663/4, and, as Ioakeim was not an eyewitness of the events he aimed to describe, his narrative depended exclusively on second-hand information; had his work been completed after the end of the war, the author would have had the possibility of organizing and presenting this information in a strict chronological order; unfortunately, this did not happen. For many years, Ioakeim incorporated information in his text as it became available to him and, when it was lacking, he filled the gaps of his narrative with digressions. Finally, in 1665, he gave up the whole project; the fact that he did not have the time – or the will – to reorganize his information and, in effect, to rewrite his work resulted in a main narrative that includes repetitions and recapitulations and, perhaps worst of all, a narrative that often moves back and forth in time, thus causing a great deal of confusion for the reader.

However, *Struggle* provides an historical account that is more often accurate than not; the subject of this account is not restricted exclusively to the 'Cretan War': the text, correctly, considers this war in the frame of a broader Ottoman-Venetian conflict and this is already depicted in the work's title, but also in other parts of the narrative – most significantly, in the parts where the theatre of war is transferred from Crete to Dalmatia. This inevitably brings to mind other contemporary Italian/Venetian historiographical works that deal with the *successi* of the *guerra di Candia e di Dalmatia*;³¹ from this point of view, Ioakeim's account is in line with the Italian/Venetian historiography of its time both in its general scope – it impressively resembles the account of Setton (1991), which is a reconstruction of accounts of this sort – and in some details that escape the attention of other 17th-century Greek histories of the 'Cretan War'. In addition, Ioakeim adopts a more general point of view: *Struggle* refers not only to the Turco-Venetian conflict that is described in its title, but also, more broadly, to the struggle of Christendom against Islam. This allows the author to include in his narrative accounts of Eastern Christians (Cossacks,

Russians) as potential adversaries of the ‘Turkish beast’, which are absent from Venetian sources, as well as accounts of the ‘Turkish beast’ itself. In this respect, the images of both the self and the other (the latter as an anti-type of the former) are revealed to be central to the text’s argument: in its own simplistic/dualistic terms, the whole story is about the battle of the evil Turks/Muslims against the good Christians, as the iconological analysis that I have provided elsewhere has attempted to demonstrate.³² This rhetoric is also adopted by many other 17th-century Greek texts, mostly non-historical ones, and Ioakeim’s text seems to belong to a specific ideological current of its time, in the context of which it is better understood.³³

This does not mean that Ioakeim’s narrative is not personalized; on the contrary, it is, and highly so; the ‘I’ of the author is omnipresent and the narrative itself often teeters between an accurate historical account and a fictitious demonology; in this sense, it raises many questions about the interrelation of history and literature. But this is by no means a shortcoming of the text, as scholars of the 20th century would think – or, indeed, some of them (e.g. N. Tomadakis) have thought; in all the early modern period and in the Greek 17th century in particular, authors who provided historical accounts readily produced literary/personalized narratives, where the ‘I’ of the author did not (have to) disappear behind impersonal expressions; Ioakeim’s text is no exception. *Struggle* does not have pretensions to objectivity either; its account is a subjective one, with clear political targets, and this is both programmatically stated³⁴ and consistently put forward throughout the text. But this does not make it less valuable to us: let us not forget that Ioakeim does not attempt to reconstruct an historical past (in which case the author’s complete abandonment of any effort to distance himself from the subject of his description would be a serious shortcoming); Ioakeim records historical events of his present and by doing so in the way he does makes things easier for modern scholarship: we always know where he stands.

As for the literary value of Ioakeim’s narrative, not much can be said here. The iconological analysis that I have provided in Kaplanis 2004 – and that will be expanded in my forthcoming edition – shows that the image of the self and the other in Ioakeim’s text, though predictably inaccurate at a factual level, is consistently constructed and, in parts, both amusing and inventive, in literary terms. This implies that Ioakeim’s narrative has literary values as well. Unfortunately, I have not been able to locate so far the model on which the long story of the Maltese Sultana may have been based. However, its dramatic elements in Ioakeim’s account (dialogues, organization of the

narrative material in episodes/scenes, limited number of ‘acting’ characters) point to a theatrical model, most probably an Italian *turquery* of the *Seicento*,³⁵ but the lack of a monograph on the subject has inevitably limited my research. Of course, the issue requires further investigation. In order to illustrate my point on the text’s dramatic elements and instead of a closing statement on the text’s literariness, I provide here a substantial excerpt from the text itself and I let the readers decide for themselves; in any case, some questions need to remain open.

ΙΟΑΚΕΙΜ ΚΥΠΡΙΟΣ’ *STRUGGLE* 730a-836

Περί πώς έκαμεν πάσα διόρθωσιν η σουλτάνα εις όλα της τα πράγματα, δούλους και τας δούλας της. Επήγαν και οι καπεταναίοι των γαλουνίων και έδωκαν λόγον πως ο καιρός είναι καλός, να || (f. 20v) ορίσει η σουλτάνα, χάριτι Θεού, να κάμει το ταξίδι. Και πώς έκαμεν η σουλτάνα δέησιν και προσευχήν εις τον Κύριον και εις την Παναγία Θεοτόκον.

Επήγαν οι αγάδες της στον πρώτον της εννούχον
 εκεί οπου εκάθητον σαν σκοτισμένον πούφον,
 σ’ εκείνον τον κισλάραγαν και τον καρασουράτη,
 είπαν τον: «Σύρε γλήγορα απάνω στο παλάτι,
 να ορίσει η σουλτάνα μας κατά τον ορισμόν της, 735
 διότις ήλθεν ο καιρός να κάμει την οδόν της».
 Πάγει· κατά το ειωθός αυτός προσκύνησέ την
 έως εδάφου και αυτός παρακάλησέ την.
 Είπεν της: «Όρισε, κυρά, να πάμεν στα καράβια
 και στόλισε τους σκλάβους σου με τα χρυσά καβάδια». 740
 Τότες εισέβηκεν αυτή εκεί μες στο ταμείο,
 γονατισθή εδέετον μετά πολλών δακρύων.
 Το «πατερόνόςτρε» άρχισεν, όλο τελείωσέν το,
 «Άβε Μαρία, πρόφθασε σε τούτο το κομέντο.
 Χαίρε, Μαρία Δέσποινα, και τάχυνον σιμά μου, 745
 βοήθει μοι, πανάχραντε, εις τα καμώματά μου.
 Στάσου μπροστά μου σαν το φως και πρόφθασε, έπαρέ με
 έως εις την πατρίδα μου και κατευδώσέ με».
 Γονατισθή εδέετον με δάκρυα περίσσα,
 αυτής τριγύρου έστεκον κυράδες και κορίτσια. 750
 Όλες αυτές εχύθησαν στα δάκρυα παραύθις
 από τον φόβον της κυράς κι από αγάπην αύτης.
 Και ελυπούνταν και αυτές διά την ξενιτείαν,

εκεί που ήθελαν να παν εις αύτην την δουλείαν.
 Τότες αυτή σπρώθηκεν από την II (f. 21) προσευχή της 755
 και πρόσταξεν να κάμουν, ως διά την ψυχή της,
 βόας και πρόβατα πολλά να κάμουν κουρουπάνια
 και μέσα στα γαλούνια να στείλουν κουμπάνια.
 Τότες αποφασίστηκεν πως θέλει να κινήσει
 την άλλην ημέρα το ταχύ την στράτα της να ποίσει. 760
 Ευθύς τους σκλάβους όρισεν, τες σκλάβες, τα κορίτσια
 και όλους τους ευνούχους της, μ' εσπάτια περίσσα,
 μες στα γαλούνια να βρεθούν, όλοι, να μην αργήσουν,
 κει μέσα να γερωλετιστούν διά να κατοικήσουν.
 Πάραυθις τούτοι κάμασιν τον ορισμόν σουλτάνας, 765
 αυτής της εκλαμπρότατης κυρίας Μαλτεζάνας.
 Και όλα εξορθώθησαν τα πράγματα και βίος
 μέσα εις τα γαλούνια συν Θεώ τω αγίω.

Περί πώς ήλθαν αι σουλτάνες να την αποχαιρετίσουν και πώς αυτή επήγεν εις την βαλετέ σουλτάνα, την πεθερά της, να την αποχαιρετίσει και πώς έγινε μεγάλος θρήνος μέσα εις το παλάτι. Και μυκτηρισμός περί του αυτών προσκυνήματος, ήγουν του Μεκκέ τους, και του προφήτη τω Μωάμεθ.

Τότες εφθάσασιν σ' αυτήν άπειρες κει κυράδες,
 που 'ταν σουλτάνες και αυτές, συμβίες τους πασιάδες, 770
 ως ν' αποχαιρετίσουν αυτήν την Μαλτεζάνα,
 σουλτάν Μοράτη σύμβιον, αυτείνην την σουλτάνα.
 Θρήνον πολύν εκάμασιν εκείνην την ημέρα
 'πό το ταχύ έως βραδύ που έγινεν εσπέρα.
 'Υστερα πάγει και αυτή στην βαλετέ ατή της, 775
 ως πενθερά της που 'τανε, να πάρει την ευχή της. II (f. 21v)
 Είπεν της: «Μάνα, ευχήσου μου, πάγω να προσκυνήσω,
 τον τάφον του προφήτη μας να δω και να φιλήσω.
 Τον άνδρα μου να κλαύσω 'γώ εκεί, σουλτάνον τον Μοράτη,
 που έβλεπαν τ' αμμάτια σου εδώ μες στο παλάτι, 780
 και την ψυχή μου και εγώ ν' αγιάσω από τώρα
 εκεί μέσα εις το Μεκκέ, που βιγαίνει εις την ώρα
 εκείνον το αγιοτικόν τεβητουβί σκυλάκι,
 ίσως και έλθει και εις εμέ να κατουρει λιγάκι.
 Να πάρω και αγιασμόν 'που το Μεκκέ μας κείνο, 785
 οπού 'ναι ο προφήτης μας μέσα στον λάκκον κείνον,
 και να σε φέρω και εσέν αγιασμόν να το 'χεις,

- ν' αγιάζεσαι αείποτας εις τας ημέρας πόχεις.
 Διότις βλέπω, μάνα μου, καρδιάν καμένην έχεις
 πως δεν επήγες και εσύ εις το Μεκκέ να πέσεις, 790
 να προσκυνήσεις και εσύ κάτω στον τάφον κείνον,
 οπού τον πάσα χρόνον απεκεί φοιτεί κείνος ο κύνος.
 Αμή αν θέλει ο Θεός να πα να προσκυνήσω,
 αγιασμόν σου φέρνω εγώ 'πεκεί οντάν γυρίσω.
 Και ενθυμού μου, σε παρακαλώ, διά αγάπην του ανδρός μου, 795
 οπού τον είχα εγώ ζωήν στ' αμμάτια κι εις το φως μου.
 Μην λησμονήσεις, μάνα μου, εμέν διά εκείνον,
 οπού διά του λόγου του παγαίννω εις εκείνον
 τον άγιον τόπον να ιδώ, καθώς σου είπα, μάνα,
 καθολική μητέρα μου και βαλετέ σουλτάνα. 800
 Και δώσ' μου την ευχίτσα σου να πα να προσκυνήσω,
 χατζίνα να αγιασθώ και πάλιν να γυρίσω.
 Να 'λθω να σ' εύρω, μάνα μου, και άλλον να μην ποίσω,
 τότες να δώσει ο Θεός εγώ να ξεψυχήσω. || (f. 22)
 Σιμά εις τον σουλτάνον μου Μοράτη να με βάλεις, 805
 να μας θωρούν τ' αμμάτια σου, όνταν έρχεσαι να ψάλλεις
 εκεί μέσα στους τάφους μας, υποκάτω στον τουρπέ μας,
 οπού βρισκόμασθεν οι δυο, και ό,τι ορίζεις πε μας».
 Τότες, αν ήτον και αυτή λίθινη η καρδιά της,
 εσπάραξαν τα μέλη της και όλα τα σωτικά της. 810
 Φωνές μεγάλες έβγαζεν ώσπερ ξετρομασμένη
 και μόλις αποκρίθηκεν: «Ω κόρη τιμημένη,
 ω κιόζουμ, ω σουλτάν' μετέτ! Σίντι ολούρουμ!
 Τζανούμ σίντι κιτέρ, σίντι ταμάμ ολούρουμ!...
 Κι εγώ σε 'χα, σουλτάνα μου, παρηγοριά μεγάλη, 815
 διότις ήσουν άξια και φρόνιμον κεφάλι.
 Εγώ διά την αγάπην σας, εσέν και του υιού μου,
 πολύν καιρόν επέρασα χωρίς από τον νουν μου.
 Σύρε, παιδί μου, στο καλόν εις το προσκύνημά μας
 κι έπαρε βίον άπειρον από τον χαζανά μας. 820
 Εγώ και ο Πραχίμ σουλτάν έχομεν έγνοιάν σου
 τα κάστη σου, τες χώρες σου κι εις τα προάσθιά σου.
 Γραφές πυκνά να βλέπομεν από την αυθεντιά σου,
 ν' ακούομεν πάντα διά σου και διά την υγειάν σου».

Περί πώς αγκαλιάσθησαν αι δύο σουλτάνες διά να φιληθούν και να δώσουν τον ύστερον χαιρετισμόν και παρενθύς επάρθησαν εις δισταγμόν και έκστασιν, και εις

αυτό έγινε θόρυβος και θρήνος μέγας μέσα εις το παλάτι και ήλθεν ατός του ο βασιλεύς και ελυπήθη μεγάλως.

Τότες αγκαλιαστήκασιν διά να φιληθούσιν, 825
ως έπρεπεν, με δάκρυα ν' απο- II (f. 22v) χαιρετισθούσιν.
Πράγμα 'γινεν εξάισιον τότες, κείνην την ώραν,
που δεν ακούστηκεν αυτό εις άλλην μίαν χώραν.
Εκεί που εφιλιόντησαν πάραυθις και αι δύο
εξεστηκές στα φρένα τως επόμειναν και αι δύο. 830
Εκ την λακτάραν έπεσαν κάτω στην γην εδάφου
και σαν επίληψις σ' αυτές ήταν έως κροτάφου.
Σαν είδασιν αι σκλάβες των τες δύο αυτού σουλτάνες
εκεί κάτω στο έδαφος εσκούζασιν: «Ω μάνες».
Έλεγαν, «Πρε, μετέτ!», ροδόσταμμα να φέρουν, 835
ως να τες περιχύσοσιν στο πρόσωπον, συμφέρουν.

NOTES

1. See Litzica 1909, 111-112. The original title is 'Βιβλίον ονομαζόμενον Πάλη, ήγουν μάχη των Τουρκών μετά του ευσεβεστάτου και εκλαμπροτάτου μεγάλου αυθεντός και πριντσίπου της λαμπροτάτης Βενετίας'. For the manuscript and its scribe/author see Kaplanis 2005.
2. See Tomadakis 1947b, 619 – in fact, this note is an addition to an article of his, printed in a previous fascicle of the same volume (see Tomadakis 1947a).
3. Kriaras 1962.
4. At the time, only the 'Prologue' and the first 737 verses of *Struggle* were available to Kriaras on a microfilm sent to him before World War II by N. Cartoijan; see Kriaras 1962, 399.
5. See previous note.
6. See his remarks on Turkish loanwords, double consonants and the replacement of the genitive by an accusative to denote possession in Kriaras 1962, 403.
7. According to his personal testimony to me.
8. It is well known that in January 1968, for political reasons, Kriaras was dismissed from his professorial duties at the University of Thessaloniki by the colonels' dictatorship then established in Greece. This was a critical turning-point in his academic career and from then on Kriaras devoted himself mostly to the preparation of his *Dictionary of Medieval Greek Vernacular Literature, 1100-1669* (on the issue see, conveniently, Kaplanis 2000, 15-16).
9. Kaplanis 2003.

10. See Kriaras 1962, 400.
11. This is his full name as it occurs in *Struggle*'s prose prologue (see Kaplanis 2005, 36).
12. Of course, for many libraries one has to rely upon insufficient descriptions, while there are still many collections lacking catalogues of any kind (for an overview of this problem see, conveniently, Mioni 1994, 133-140).
13. Politis and Politi 1994; the reason for this exclusion is that Litzica 1909 was not taken into account in this publication, but one may hope that it will be included in a future and, as promised by M. Politi, more complete version of the catalogue (see Politis and Politi 1994, 322).
14. See Politis and Politi 1994, 466-469.
15. Given the fact that the manuscripts of the 10 scribes that need to be cross-checked are today scattered in various places (Sinai, Jerusalem, St. Petersburg, Mount Athos, Thessaloniki, Ellassona, Athens), in both public and private collections, it was not possible for me to investigate all of them.
16. See Kaplanis 2005, 38. This paper, as stated in its 'Afterword' (Kaplanis 2005, 46) 'was prepared for publication in winter 2000 and inevitably reflects the state of my research at that time'. Nonetheless it still remains – together with Kriaras 1962 and Kaplanis 2004 – the main published source on Ioakeim and his work and it has already served, in typescript form and with my permission, as the main source for Kitromilides' entry on Ioakeim Kyrios (see Kitromilides 2002, 257-8).
17. For these see Kaplanis 2005, 40 and note 17.
18. See Kaplanis 2005, 44.
19. For other examples see Vlassopoulou 2000, 22-25, where the scheme is described as 'prologue – main narrative – epilogue'.
20. *Struggle* 9194a: Συμπέρασμα ωραιότατον της παρούσης πραγματείας, του παρόντος βιβλίου, της Πάλης, περιέχον συνόψεις στις υποθέσεις. Και λόγοι δεητικοί προς τον Κύριον ημών Ιησούν Χριστόν και εις την Αυτού υπέρρανον μητέρα, την Κυρίαν ημών και Δέσποινα Θεοτόκον. Και περί της αγίας και θεοβαδίστου πόλεως Ιερουσαλήμ και του αγίου και θεοβαδίστου όρους Σινά, ομού και του Άθωνος και Κύπρου, της πατρίδος του αναγραφέως.
21. The prose heading at the end of folio 38v (*Struggle* 1688a) still refers to the negotiations between the *Serenissima* and the *Sublime Porte* for the temporary use of the port of Souda by the Ottoman fleet; as we move to the next folio (39), however, we immediately realize that there is a gap, since we find ourselves inside the beleaguered city of Chania, and this certainly has to do with the missing folios of the manuscript (cf. note 17 above).
22. For an analysis see Kaplanis 2004.
23. *Struggle* 216a, where the confusion of Baghdad with Babylon occurs for the first time, comes immediately after the derisive description of the Turks and their religion, where Ioakeim attempts to create a stereotypical image of them – quite successfully, as I have argued in Kaplanis 2004; given the apocalyptic connotations that this image bears, not only in *Struggle* but also in other texts of the period (for references see Argyriou 1982,

- 720), the confusion of Baghdad with Babylon comes almost naturally in the text: the biblical and, more notably, apocalyptic (Rev. 17-18) ‘great whore’ of Babylon serves much more adequately the purposes of the text than the figuratively indifferent (for the 17th century) Baghdad and is, therefore, employed throughout this section.
24. For an insightful and detailed account see Setton 1991, 112-126.
 25. For example, the incident in the port of Avlona which is described in *Struggle* 295-314 took place in August 1638 and Murad was indeed furious about it (for an account of the event and its effect on Turco-Venetian relations see Setton 1991, 108-110). Other events and details reported accurately would include Murad’s expedition to Baghdad (for an explanation of the less accurate reference to Babylon see note 24 above), his death shortly after his return (cf. Shaw 1976, 200: ‘Murat IV died [...] on February 8, 1640, just after his return from Baghdad’), his succession by Ibrahim in 1640, the portray of *Deli* Ibrahim and the frequent interventions of his mother, the *valide* Sultana, in the *Porte*’s decision-making, etc. (more details will be given in the forthcoming edition of *Struggle*).
 26. This version (but again not without variations) is presented briefly in Vincent 1970, 239 and Greene 2000, 14; for more details see Setton 1991, 104-126.
 27. This has already been the subject of a debate between G. Spadaro and N. Tomadakis in the 1960s-1970s (see Spadaro 1967 and Tomadakis 1976).
 28. See Tomadakis 1976, 41: ‘ούτε άλλος τις ηδυνήθη να μας δώσει την συνέχεια του μυθιστορήματος τούτου του Ιωακείμ Καντζελλιέση’ (my emphasis).
 29. See Tomadakis 1976, 46: ‘<ουδέ> τα υπό [...] Ιωακείμ Κυπρίου μυθολογούμενα είναι δυνατόν να ληφθούν ως σοβαρά ιστορική πηγή’ (my emphasis).
 30. Tomadakis 1976, 41 note 47: ‘Δε νομίζω ότι ο Ιωακείμ ήτο σύγχρονος του Κρητικού Πολέμου, στερούμεθα άλλως τε πληροφορίες περί του ατόμου του.’
 31. Most notably the *Continuazione de’ successi della guerra di Candia e di Dalmatia, dall’ anno 1647, fino al 1662, tratta dall’ Istoria del sig. Girolamo Brusoni* (i.e. G. Brusoni, *Historia dell’ ultima guerra tra’ Venetiani e Turchi*, first edition in Venice: Curti, 1673, second edition in Bologna: Recaldini, 1676), for which see Cicogna 1847, 135. The authorship and other issues relating to this text are quite complicated and this has to do with Brusoni’s revising historiographical habits (for Brusoni see De Caro 1972, esp. 719-720 for his historiographical work and a bibliography). This and other related matters regarding the history of the ‘Cretan War’ are discussed in my paper ‘Recording the History of the “Cretan War” (1645-1669): An Overview’ in *Κάμπος. Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek*, 16, 2007 (forthcoming).
 32. See Kaplanis 2004.
 33. A detailed analysis will be included in the introduction of the forthcoming edition of the text.
 34. Ioakeim makes it clear already in his prose Prologue (lines 42-46) that emphasis will be put on the presentation of heroic events and (exclusively Christian) victories; cf. the passage presented in Kaplanis 2005, 43.
 35. For a general account see Preto 1985, where also basic bibliography.

REFERENCES

- ARGYRIOU, A. 1982. *Les Exégèses grecques de l'Apocalypse a l'époque turque (1453-1821). Esquisse d'une histoire des courants idéologiques au sein du peuple grec asservi*, Thessaloniki: Εταιρεία Μακεδονικών Σπουδών.
- ARGYRIOU, A., ed., 2004. *Η Ελλάδα των νησιών από τη Φραγκοκρατία ως σήμερα. Πρακτικά του Β' Ευρωπαϊκού Συνεδρίου Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (Ρέθυμνο, 10-12 Μαΐου 2002)*, 2 vols., Athens: Ελληνικά Γράμματα.
- CICOGNA, E. A. 1847. *Saggio di bibliografia veneziana*, Venice: Merlo.
- DE CARO, G. 1972. 'Brusoni, Girolamo' in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, Vol. 14, Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 712-720.
- GREENE, M. 2000. *A Shared World. Christians and Muslims in the Early Modern Mediterranean*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- JEFFREYS, E. and JEFFREYS, M., eds., 2005. *Neograeca Medii Aevi V. Αναδρομικά και Προδρομικά. Approaches to Texts in Early Modern Greek*, Oxford.
- KAPLANIS, T. A. 2000. 'Ο καθηγητής Εμμανουήλ Κριαράς και το Λεξικό του της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημόδους γραμματείας (1100-1669)', in *Pidonia* 2000, 16-25.
- KAPLANIS, T. A. 2003. *Ioakeim Kyprios' "Struggle" (mid-17th century). A Study of the Text with an Edition of Selected Passages*, unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge.
- KAPLANIS, T. A. 2004. 'Κατασκευάζοντας την εικόνα του Εαυτού και του Άλλου: η περίπτωση της Πάλης του Ιωακείμ Κύπριου' in *Argyriou* 2004/1, 129-150.
- KAPLANIS, T. A. 2005. 'Towards a critical edition of Ioakeim Kyprios' *Struggle*', in *Jeffreys and Jeffreys* 2005, 33-46.
- KITROMILIDES, P. 2002. *Κυπριακή Λογιοσύνη (1571-1878). Ερμηνευτική και Προσωπογραφική Θεώρηση*, Nicosia: Κέντρο Επιστημονικών Ερευνών Κύπρου.
- KRIARAS, E. 1962. 'Ιωακείμ ο Κύπριος και το ποίημά του για τον τουρκοβενετικό πόλεμο του 1645-1669', *Κρητικά Χρονικά*, 15-16/2, 399-405.
- LITZICA, C. 1909. *Catalogul manuscriselor grecești*, Bucharest: Biblioteca Academiei Române.
- ΜΙΟΝΙ, Ε. 1994. *Εισαγωγή στην ελληνική παλαιογραφία*, translated by N. M. Panagiotakis, fourth edition with additions by the author and the translator, Athens: Μορφωτικό Ίδρυμα Εθνικής Τραπέζης.
- PIDONIA, K., ed., 2000. *Τριάντα χρόνια από την παρουσία του Α' τόμου του*

μεσαιωνικού λεξικού του Εμμανουήλ Κριαρά. *Ενας εορτασμός*, Thessaloniki: Σφακιανιάκης.

PIROVANO, C., ed., 1985. *Venezia e i Turchi*, Milan: Electa.

POLITIS, L. and POLITI, M. 1994. 'Βιβλιογράφοι του 17ου-18ου αιώνα. Συνοπτική καταγραφή', *Δελτίο του Ιστορικού και Παλαιογραφικού Αρχείου (Μορφωτικού Ιδρύματος Εθνικής Τραπέζης)*, 6, (1988-1992), 313-490.

PRETO, P. 1985. 'Il mito del Turco nella letteratura veneziana' in Pirovano 1985, 134-143.

SETTON, K. M. 1991. *Venice, Austria and the Turks in the Seventeenth Century*, Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

SHAW, S. 1976. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey. Volume I: Empire of the Gazis: The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire, 1280-1808*, Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

SPADARO, G. 1967. 'Note marginali su Marinos Tzanes Bounialis', *Ελληνικά*, 20, 160-165.

TOMADAKIS, N. B. 1947a. 'Συγγραφείς του Κρητικού Πολέμου', *Κρητικά Χρονικά*, 1, 138-146.

TOMADAKIS, N. B. 1947b. 'Συγγραφείς του «Κρητικού Πολέμου» (Μικρά προσθήκη εις Α' σ. 124)', *Κρητικά Χρονικά*, 1, 618-619.

TOMADAKIS, N. B. 1976. 'Συμβολή εις τους ναυτικούς όρους του ΙΖ' αιώνας και ιδία εις τους παρ' Αθανασίω Πικρώ και Μ. Τζάνε Μπουνιαλή και αι ονομασάι των σκαφών παρ' αυτοίς', *Κρητολογία*, 3, 5-46.

VINCENT, A. 1970. 'The Two Sultanas: The Cretan War (1645-1669) in South Slav Heroic Songs', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, 12/2, 237-242.

VLASSOPOULOU, M. 2000. *Literary Writing and the Recording of History: A Study of Marinos Tzanes Bounialis' 'The Cretan War' (17th Century)*, unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge.