

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

important collection of Byzantine and post-Byzantine icons in the crypt of St. Alexander Nevski in Sofia, where no mention is made of the fact that the greater and better part of the collection consists of Greek works; or it may be in maladroit, braggadocio fashion, as happens with the various publications that emanate from the Federal State of Skopje. And while on the subject of Alexander the Great, it is perhaps appropriate to mention here that in the tourist guide recently published in Skopje under the misleading title «Macedonia» (*Tourist Guide Book: Macedonia*), Skopje-Belgrade, Tourist Association of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia - Newspaper, Publishing and Printing Company «Jez», no date, but at all events post-1971), the foreign reader and visitor is informed, in a brief «informative» note on the-historical past of the «ancient» state of Skopje (date of foundation: 1944), that Philip II and Alexander the Great were «Macedonian» kings — that is, the ancestors of the present-day inhabitants of the self-styled «Macedonia» of Skopje.

Further, in B. Višinski's book *Vision de la Macédoine* (Belgrade, no date, but at all events post-1973), the following is noted: «*Le territoire peuplé par les Slaves macédoniens coïncide pour ainsi dire en tout points avec celui de la Macédoine antique de Philippe II et d'Alexandre le Grand*» (p. 50). That, in fact, nine-tenths of the historical area of ancient Macedonia is situated within the present boundaries of the Greek state, and is definitely Greek soil; and that the State of Skopje neither has nor ever had any connection with ancient or modern Macedonia; these are details that worry neither the historical nor the provincial governmental authorities of Skopje. Even the most ill-informed reader of the above publications, however, might reasonably wonder what could be the connection between the Slavs of the Balkans, who only came down into the geographical region they now inhabit in the VIth and VIIth centuries A.D., and the age of Alexander the Great, from which an unbridgeable abyss of about ten centuries separates them. Ivan the Terrible may be regarded as a Greek much easier than Alexander the Great a Slav!

Miss Köhler's book is her doctoral dissertation. She has collected and handled her material with great care, and it was not her intention to give us only a purely literary study, but to examine her subject within a much wider historical, social and cultural framework. Thus, apart from the complex literary problems, concerning the sources, the manuscript and printed tradition, the peculiarities of translation and the popularity of the romance of Alexander the Great in Bulgaria in the XIXth century, she gives us a very interesting picture of the intellectual movement and the gradual awakening of national consciousness in Roumania and Bulgaria during the last centuries of Ottoman rule, especially in the XIXth century.

I have no first-hand knowledge of the literary problems presented by the Roumanian and Bulgarian versions of the romance of Alexander, but as far as I am able to judge, Miss Köhler examines them with sound method and great informativeness in her dissertation. However, since the work is set, as I observed above, in a more general framework, I would like to comment on the existence of the romance of Alexander as a historical and cultural phenomenon in Bulgarian literature of the XIXth century.

It is well-known that Greece had close intellectual ties with Bulgaria not only in the Middle Ages, but also in more recent times, from the fall of Constantinople to about the middle of the last century.

This is evident from Miss Köhler's book, but still clearer from another book, recently published in Sofia, a collective work by several scholars on the history of

Bulgarian education: *Istorija na obrazovanieto i pedagogičeskata misal v Bălgarija*, vol. I, Sofia, Narodna Prosveta, 1975.

We live in an age when the Balkan peoples are making a sincere effort to set aside their differences and to find the common points of contact which will allow them not only to coexist peacefully, but to cooperate cordially in all walks of life. But an indispensable precondition for the realization of this drawing together and collaboration is, of course, reciprocal respect for the historical and cultural heritage of the other nations, and, in the second phase, research into and study of all common points of contact between the various Balkan peoples. This is why I mentioned, above, the negative attitude of Skopje, which, by misrepresenting historical truth and pressing territorial claims against Greece, sometimes openly and sometimes in veiled fashion, not only fails to serve the common cause of the Balkan peoples, but contributes to the creation of strain and of a climate of hostility.

At this point I must mention the great change and progress that has been marked in Greek-Bulgarian cultural relations in recent years. The importance and extent of the influence of Greek education on the reascent Bulgaria of the XIXth century had previously been the subject of works by Greek scholars. (See D. Petropoulos, *Πνευματικές Σχέσεις 'Ελλήνων και Βουλγάρων κατά τόν ΙΘ' αιώνα* [*Cultural Relations between Greeks and Bulgarians during the XIXth Century*], Thessaloniki 1968). Today Bulgarian scholars too are beginning to study this subject, so vital to them, and to recognize the positive contribution of Greek education to the national and intellectual life of their land during the years of Ottoman rule. (See *Istorija na obrazovanieto i pedagogičeskata misal v Bălgarija*, mentioned above). This will also be the subject of a Greek-Bulgarian symposium, in March 1977, organized together by the Institute for Balkan Studies of Thessaloniki and the corresponding Institute for Balkan Studies of Sofia.

Miss Köhler's book also gives us very interesting information on the equally multifarious and fruitful intellectual relations between Bulgaria and Roumania during the period of Ottoman rule. One result of these Bulgaro-Roumanian intellectual links was the translation from Roumanian into modern Bulgarian of the romance of Alexander the Great, at the beginning of the XIXth century.

The curious thing is that the modern Bulgarian version of the romance of Alexander has no connection with the Old Bulgarian version, which is a translation from a Russian original and probably dates from the Xth or XIth century (Köhler, p. 2), nor with the corresponding middle Bulgarian version, which comes from a Serbian original and is represented by some manuscripts of the XVth and XVIth centuries (Köhler, p. 8). The modern Bulgarian version of the XIXth century contains a dual tradition, manuscript and printed. The manuscript tradition is represented by a series of twelve manuscripts, which date between 1810 and 1834 and go back to Roumanian originals. On the other hand the printed tradition is represented by the edition of 1844 (with two reprints, in 1854 and 1877), which go back to a Greek original, the famous «Φοινίξ τοῦ Μεγαλέξανδρου» [*Chapbook of Alexander the Great*] (Venice, «Phoenix» Publications, 1844). The translator and adaptor was Hristo P. Vasiliev Protopopovič. Miss Köhler, while she studies the manuscript versions' connection with and dependence on the Roumanian original quite exhaustively, fails to examine the probable relation (as regards similarities and differences) between the modern Bulgarian versions and the old and middle Bulgarian ones, and the 1844 printed

version's proven connection with and dependence on the corresponding Greek original.

Miss Köhler's remarks on the geographical spreading of the romance of Alexander in Bulgaria, on the reading public it found, on its place in Bulgarian literature and education in the XIXth century, etc., are most interesting. In Byzantine and modern Greek literature the romance of Alexander belongs to the so-called popular literature; but in Bulgarian literature, by reason of the educational level and the absence of a learned literature in the country during the first half of the XIXth century, the romance of Alexander expressed a particular state of affairs, being a work directed at the unformed or part-formed middle class (Bürgertum) which was coming into existence at that time. Miss Köhler notes the difference observable between the Bulgarian reading public that the manuscript versions of the beginning of the XIXth century (1810-1834) reached, and the public that read the printed versions of 1844 and after.

In the modern Bulgarian versions of the romance, Alexander, as I mentioned at the beginning of this criticism, is presented as a national hero of the Bulgarians. This naturalisation of Alexander's to a Bulgarian leader is a discrepancy, if it is not a matter of political expediency of the period, the period of the Bulgarian *Vŭzraždane* [Renaissance], characterized by a vigorous awakening of Bulgarian national consciousness and a tendency to turn back to the roots of the Bulgarian historical traditions and to heroic national symbols. How, then, can one reconcile the projection, at such a time, of a world-famous foreign hero, in point of fact a Greek hero, as a Bulgarian national symbol, and what were the reasons that dictated this conscious appropriation on the part of the Bulgarian adaptors? Miss Köhler offers us in her book a fair amount of evidence to show that the ground for Alexander's metamorphosis into a Bulgarian national hero had already been prepared by certain works of folk history of the end of the XVIIIth and the beginning of the XIXth centuries, which connected Alexander with the Bulgarian past.

As it has been already noted above, in the modern Bulgarian versions of the romance of Alexander the geographical and national terms «Macedonia» and «Macedonian» are used as synonymous with «Bulgaria» and «Bulgarian». What is more, the author of the version of ms. A writes that he translated the romance into Macedonian-Bulgarian dialect, and by that he certainly does not mean the dialect which is spoken in Macedonia round Pirin, or which used to be spoken by the Bulgarians who were settled in certain areas of Greek Macedonia during the years of Ottoman rule; because, as Miss Köhler remarks, «*sich der Verfasser nicht eines mazedonischen, sondern eines ost-bulgarischen Dialekts, bedient*» (p. 219).

Another translator-adaptor, however, Todor Pirdopski, to whom are owed the versions of mss. F and G, avers that Alexander came from Greek Macedonia.

The bulgarization of the romance, and in consequence of its hero, it is true that was made easier by the Greek work itself, in which Philippoupolis is referred to as one of the centres of the Macedonian state of Philip II; a city that is now situated within the bounds of the Bulgarian state and known as Plovdiv: «Καὶ ὁ Φίλιππος ὁ Ἑλληνας ἐβασίλευσεν τὴν Μακεδονίαν μετὰ τοὺς Φιλίππους καὶ τὴν Φιλίππουπόλιν». (See K. Mitsakis, *Der byzantinische Alexanderroman nach dem Codex Vindob. Theol. Gr. 244*, Munich 1967, p. 21, l. 15. Cf. also the Bulgarian version of ms. H).

In the prologue to the version of ms. H one must note the insertion of an episode that is completely characteristic of the conscious efforts on the part of the translator-

adaptor to connect Alexander with Bulgarian pre-history. In this it is stated, for example, that after the death of King Perun of the Bulgarians Alexander took possession of his land and enrolled his men in his own army. Later the Bulgarians, as a reward for their contribution to Alexander's victories, besought him to grant them a piece of land. Alexander granted them his own inherited land, Macedonia, and ratified the grant by an official document. Since then, the Slav Bulgarians have for this reason been called Macedonians.

This insertion, as it has been proved, comes from *Istorija vo kratce o bolgarskom narode slavenskom* by the monk Spyridon (1792). A similar appropriation of Alexander is made in *Istorija slavenobolgarskaja* of Paisij Hilendarski (version of 1784) and in the so-called *Zografska bǎlgarska istorija* (more precisely: *Istorija v kratce o bolgaroslavenskam narode*, 1785).

One also realizes from Miss Köhler's work that the romance underwent very great spreading and popularity in Bulgaria in the XIXth century, since it was even used as a reading book in schools. In very recent years historians of Bulgarian literature (B. Penev, P. Dinekov, I. Bogdanov) have made a systematic attempt to belittle the importance of the romance at this critical period in the national and intellectual life of Bulgaria. Miss Köhler states that it was a «Neueinfuhr» (p. 255). Bogdanov, on the other hand, views it as an element that had survived from ancient (sc. Greek) literature and which was outside the interests of modern Bulgarians, with no special significance for Bulgarian literature. (See I. Bogdanov, *Kratka istorija na bǎlgarskata literatura*, vol. II, Sofia 1970, p. 42 ff.)

Miss Köhler's work is a fine example of a comparative study of Balkan literatures. It inaugurates a new effort which, if more systematically organized, will reveal a whole network of common points of contact between the various peoples of the Balkans in this field too.

*Institute for Balkan Studies
Thessaloniki*

K. MITSAKIS

W. Puchner, *Das Neugriechische Schattentheater Karagiozis*, Munich, Institut für Byzantinistik und Neugriechische Philologie der Universität, 1975, pp. 250 + pl. 7 [Miscellanea Byzantina Monacensia, No. 21].

One must first of all remark that Puchner's book on the Greek *Karagiozis* is one of the fullest and most important studies on the subject that has been written in recent years. The author, with a sound knowledge of first-hand material and the relevant bibliography, examines the subject not only from the purely historical point of view, but also as an expression of the special environment that gave rise to it or received it.

The work begins with a detailed examination of the vexed question of the origin of the shadow-theatre. Puchner, in a very critical spirit, discusses and rejects one after another the various theories that attempt to connect the shadow-theatre with