

Lastly, in proof of the change from French to German influence, there are presented tables of translated French and German works (pp. 1487 ff., 1491 ff.) which were published from 1818 till Otho's expulsion in 1862. The whole study is completed with very useful detailed tables, sources, names and facts.

University of Thessaloniki

DR. GEORGE P. NAKOS

V. Tsiouni, *Παιδιόφραστος Διήγησις τῶν Ζώων τῶν Τετραπόδων* [Playful Story about Quadrupeds], Munich, Institut für Byzantinistik und Neugriechische Philologie der Universität, 1972, pp. 168 [Miscellanea Monacensia, No. 15].

Nearly a hundred years have passed since the publication of G. Wagner's *Carmina Graeca Medii Aevi*. No-one could argue that this collection of popular texts did not provide an invaluable service for Byzantine and modern Greek scholarship: indeed, it remains useful even today, since some of the texts published in it have never been superseded by newer and better editions. In the great space of time since 1881, many of these texts have been published in critical editions, many of the literary problems they raised have found satisfactory solutions, and the Greek language of the time has been better and more systematically studied. Such a piece of good critical work is Miss V. Tsiouni's edition of the poem «Παιδιόφραστος Διήγησις τῶν Ζώων τῶν Τετραπόδων».

The introduction to this edition concerns the manuscript tradition of the work (codd. PVCLA), the interrelationship of the various manuscripts (P represents an independent tradition), the chronology of the original poem (second half of the XIVth century) and particularly of the more modern manuscripts. All these problems are discussed succinctly, with clarity and persuasive arguments.

Miss Tsiouni makes some very interesting observations on the factual nature of the poem and the hints at important events in that troubled era. It is well-known that «Παιδιόφραστος Διήγησις τῶν Ζώων τῶν Τετραπόδων» belongs to the cycle of didactic poems, and of popular works in general, that are concerned with the natural world (Φυσιολόγος, Πουλλολόγος, Πωρικολόγος, Ὀψαρολόγος, etc.). The working-out of the subjects is skilfully achieved, and the anonymous poet gives us, apart from the positive and negative qualities of the quadrupeds quarrelling in the council, a mass of important information about the everyday life of Byzantium in the XIVth century.

In the dispute that breaks out between the «*bloodthirsty and abominable*» animals and the «*pure and useful*» ones, and the way in which the «*armistice*» that they attempt to agree on is destroyed, many scholars have discerned, besides the satire on general human conditions, the existence in the poem of certain shafts aimed at the ruling class of Byzantium and of references to contemporary political events. Miss Tsiouni's views on the matter, though put forward as simple hypotheses, are developed with great persuasiveness and are gaining ground.

There follows the critical edition of the poem which is on the whole well revised and even. At this point I would like to make a statement of principle. Xanthoudidis

has already shown the Cretan origin of ms. P, which is dated to the XVth century, and Shandrovskaja has accepted that, even if it was not written in Crete, it must have been written by a copyist familiar with the Cretan dialect. Both, of course, base their conclusions on the many Cretan elements in the version represented by ms. P. At the same time, however, it is accepted that the original poem must have been written in one of the great urban centres of the Byzantine empire (Constantinople, Thessaloniki etc.), and that it must be a work of the second half of the XIVth century—a period at which the Cretan dialect had not yet been formed. The works of early Cretan literature, of the so-called «period of preparation» (XVth - XIVth centuries), present, from the linguistic point of view, much the same picture as do other, non-Cretan, popular works. One wonders, therefore, to what degree the acceptance of the readings of the Cretan manuscript of «Παιδιόφραστος Διήγησις τῶν Ζῶων τῶν Τετραπόδων» are methodologically correct, since the point of a critical edition is to restore a poem as closely as possible to its original form, if not to that itself.

Certain lines in the poem are unmetrical, but the correct rhythm of the line is restored, either by a slight shift of the accent (e.g. ἐλαφιῶ for ἐλαφίου in l. 340, οὐδεμῶν for οὐδεμῶν in l. 383), or by the preference of a better reading from another ms. (cf. lines 499 and 680; the latter verse, as printed, is indeed an oxytone: καὶ οὐτε πίνεις οὐτε τρῶς οὐτε τὴν οὐράν σου σεῖς, while mss. PL have the reading: . . . οὐτε σεῖς τὴν οὐράν σου).

In certain words, as is noted in the chapter on the grammar of the poem (p. 115 ff.), a shift of the accent is observed e.g. φλωαρέ for φλώαρε (ll. 216, 649); yet it is nowhere mentioned that this shift of accent is made for metrical reasons. The curious thing is that mss. PL have the reading φλώαρε and that the above lines (216 and 649) function metrically well with the proparoxytone form of the word: ψέμματα λέγεις φλώαρε, καὶ περισσὰ καυχᾶσαι . . . (l. 649). The editor's correction is, therefore, not only high-handed but unnecessary (cf. l. 263).

The chapter of grammatical remarks is exceptionally deficient: firstly, it does not contain a list of all the phonetic and grammatical peculiarities of the work; cf. the omissions: α>ου: δουμάκιν (l. 592), but δαμῖν (ll. 732, 893), and δαμίτζικον (ll. 604, 729); ε>ο: δοκανῖα (l. 917); ο>ι: ἀπιλογεῖται (l. 58); κτ>κ: ἄρκος (l. 830), etc. Cf. also other significant errors: ι>ο: ἐρρουκάνισα (l. 147), κ>ο: τζουκαλογλειφῆ (l. 130), etc.

The word ἔλεφας (p. 121), refers to the augmentative formed by recessive accent; but the form ἔλεφας (ὄ) (l. 904), represents a violation of the accent to save the rhythm of the line. The poet generally uses the correct forms of the word, learned and popular, in different ways: ἐλέφαντας (ὄ) (l. 899), ἐλέφαντος (τοῦ) (l. 930) and ἐλέφα (τοῦ) (l. 977), ἐλέφαντα (τὸν) (l. 19) and ἐλέφαν (τὸν) (l. 935). Finally, some of the diminutive endings met in the poem are missing, e.g. -οῦδι(ον): λαγούδια (p. 255).

In addition, the fashion in which the various peculiarities are listed gives the impression that these grammatical phenomena are first noted in this XIVth century poem, whereas most of them—I will not say all—made their appearance several centuries earlier and are very common in popular works of this period. On each of these phenomena, Miss Tsiouni should have given us more information concerning its first appearance and its presence in other, similar works. She should also have assembled her glossary in the same way—as she has in fact attempted to do on one or two cases (e.g. the entries σκοούφια and φελλάρια). Finally, there is no mention of the syntactical peculiarities of the poem.

In the glossary (p. 137 ff.), some words are wrongly interpreted: e.g. γαῖδουρολάτης (l. 700) «one who loads a donkey», instead of «one who leads a donkey»; μοχθηρός (adj.) (ll. 419, 443) «malicious, wicked» instead of μοχθηρόν (noun) «pig» (v. Du Cange, s.v.), ψωριασμένος (l. 825) «lousy» instead of «itchy», etc., and the translation given for some others is unclear and inadequate, with the result that their particular semantic nuance is made incomprehensible: e.g. δοκανίκιν (l. 917) «staff», θρασιοφᾶς (l. 833) «rash, daring» (?), χολιάζω (l. 428) «provoke» (?), etc.

However, the general impression is that Miss Tsiouni has produced an edition of a popular Byzantine (and early modern Greek) text, which will be useful for many years.

*Institute for Balkan Studies*  
*Thessaloniki*

K. MITSAKIS

Ines Köhler, *Der Neubulgarische Alexanderroman. Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte und Verbreitung*, Amsterdam, Verlag A. M. Hakkert, 1973, pp. 316 [Bibliotheca Slavonica, No. 9].

It is well-known that the Hellenistic romance of Alexander the Great, from late antiquity almost to the present day, has been very widely spread and handed on. It is also well-known that Alexander, by passing into the folk traditions of so many countries, began little by little to shed some of his basic historical characteristics and to stand out, for reasons concerned with national pride or political opportunism, as the national hero of various peoples. In the medieval Persian epic tradition, for instance, Alexander appears as a descendant of the Achaemenid dynasty, and his war against Darius as a war of succession. Alexander moves against his «brother», who has usurped the royal authority, in order to take the Persian throne which belongs to him.

In modern Bulgarian adaptations of the romance, Alexander appears as king of the Bulgarians, and, naturally, the geographical and national terms «Macedonia» and «Macedonian» are used as synonymous with «Bulgaria» and «Bulgarian». As Köhler characteristically remarks, «*der Verfasser den Alexanderroman als Teil der Vorgeschichte Bulgariens auffaßt*» (p. 17). It must be noted, however, that in this case we are not dealing with the outworkings of the spirit of the people which, in order to embrace a legendary hero, must bring him closer to themselves, into its own environment and conditions of life. We have instead to deal with the fully conscious appropriation by learned circles of a hero belonging to a foreign historical and cultural tradition.

Among all the peoples bordering on Greece one may observe a generally systematic attempt to gain two ends: the removal from their own geographical area of every element of the once widespread Greek cultural presence; or, where possible, expedient or necessary, the appropriation of this presence to the people in question. This appropriation is frequently carried out with great discretion, as for example, with the