

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

a particular place. «*Ursprungsraum und Ursprungszeit des Schattentheaters*», he notes, «*können auf Grund der vorhandenen Spuren nicht exakt ausgemacht werden; die Wanderungstheorie ist als Hypothese zu schwach fundiert, um heute noch Geltung zu besitzen; die Erstellung einer Geschichte des Schattentheaters im Sinne sukzessiver Aufeinanderfolge von Phänomenen ist nicht durchführbar, besser wäre es von der Deskription geographisch getrennter oder nicht getrennter, simultan oder scheinbar sukzessiv vorhandener Spieltypen zu sprechen; die einleitend postulierte Phasenabfolge entlang des Zeitkontinuums hat sich also nur methodisch bewährt, nicht aber faktisch; die Streuung des Spurenmaterials legt mehrere autonome Entstehungszentren nahe, die sich möglicherweise in Wechselwirkung befunden haben; grundsätzlich ist der Ursprung des Schattentheaters aber ungeklärt*» (p. 195).

The work continues with a study of the Turkish *Karagiozis* as an expression of the closed social group of the Constantinopolitan «mahala» [quarter], of its transplantation to Greece (c. 1850), and of the gradual hellenization of the shadow-theatre, not only for the sake of its enrichment with new characters and new subjects, but by reason of the inevitable change in its basic nature and ideology.

The author rejects as a mistake in method the tendency of certain students, mainly Greek, to see in the *Karagiozis* characteristics of men of our time—for instance, viewing the hero as an opponent of the establishment. «*Der zerlumpte, bloßfüßige Armutsphilosoph predigt aber keine Widerstandsmoral*», writes Puchner, «*gegen die Plutokratie, sein Realitätssinn ist vom Hunger geschwächt; nur wenn es gilt, gegen irgendwelche Idealismen anzutreten, ist er der große Realist. Seine Lebensart ist die des Überlebens, an seinem Hunger zerschellen alle intellektuellen Gebäude, nur die Wunschphantasie wuchert wild*» (p. 90).

According to the author the hellenization of the *Karagiozis* occurred in three successive phases: i) the geographical transfer by Vrachalis, ii) the enrichment in themes in the Epirote tradition, and iii) the reform by Mimaros. «*In der ab 1890 ausgeformt vorliegenden, klassischen Gestalt ist der Karagiozis Reflektor jenes kulturtopologischen und phylopsychischen Gefüges, das man römische Volkskultur nennt. Seine 'Weiterentwicklung' in den Städten Griechenlands ist nur eine äußerliche Perfektionierung mit Tendenzen zu optischer Extravertiertheit; wo die Grundstrukturen des Spieles angegriffen werden, kommt es zu Degenerationserscheinungen.*

*Die entscheidende Ursache für die quantitative und qualitative Regression der Spiele ist die partielle Auflösung der Volkskultur (Urbanisierung, Europäisierung, Industrialisierung). Die Aufführung erhält die Funktion einer beglückenden Annäherung an die Geborgenheit der Volkskultur ober der eigenen Kindheit*» (p. 195-6).

Finally, Puchner gives evidence for the influence of the *Karagiozis* on modern Greek literature, painting and music.

The book ends with an appendix, in which are noted, in alphabetical order, all the known names of Greek *Karagiozis* performers (145 in all) and all the plays in the Greek repertoire of the shadow-theatre (264 in all), with an exhaustive bibliography and pictures of the principal figures in the Greek and Turkish *Karagiozis*.

Puchner's book constitutes a landmark in the international bibliography on the Greek *Karagiozis* and on the shadow-theatre generally. It is a substantial and composite work. No-one will in future be able to write about the *Karagiozis* without keeping Puchner's observations in view.