

received the name "Macedonian" this text becomes the oldest linguistic monument of a new national language which is cultivated with unbound zeal as the official language of this state and as its banner of its independent existence.

It is worth mentioning in this connection that as the inhabitants of today's federal republic of Skopje have always called themselves Bugari, i.e. *Bulgarians* and as one hundred years ago, the Mihadinov brothers entitled the collection of popular ballads of this region—published in Zagreb 1861—*Bulgarski Narodni Pesni*, i.e. "Bulgarian popular songs", so the author of this 16th century manuscript refers to the words of his manuscript as *Bulgarian*: (Ἑλληνὶ ἐν Βουλγαρίῳις γημάτων...). At that time there was no reason why the Greek names *Macedonia* and *Macedonian language* should be used while referring to a Slavic region and to a Slavic idiom. Foreign to contemporary political expediencies, those people were closer to the historical and ethnological truths.

N. P. ANDRIOTES

Kienitz F. K., *Existenzfragen des griechischen Bauerntums*. Pp. 122, Duncker Humblot, Berlin 1960.

The author, who is thoroughly familiar with the Greek language, tries to give a concise picture of the conditions of Greek agriculture. His book is divided into an introduction, a first and a second part.

In the introduction he tries to draw a brief picture of the entire Greek economy and to examine the position and duties of agriculture within this wide framework.

The next section, i.e. the first part of the book (pp. 21-43), the author reviews the evolution of the principle of ownership in Greek agriculture, reaching the correct conclusion that, despite certain errors and deficiencies, the agricultural reform helped considerably Greece not only economically but politically and socially as well. Probably the author does not appreciate sufficiently the progress of Greek agriculture since 1953, but it should not escape the attention of the reader that Greek writers have also expressed similar critical views on the matter.

In the last part the author deals with agricultural credit and agricultural co-operatives in Greece. He does not reveal anything new but this does not minimize the importance of the author's work. However, his book would have been more fruitful should the author had not confined himself to non-Greek sources but had consulted as well Greek books written on the subject. If he had consulted the reviews on the Greek economy published by the Bank of Greece since 1954 he could have acquainted himself more deeply with his subject.

In its present form, Mr. F. K. Kienitz' book may be used rather as an introductory by those interested in acquiring some general idea of Greek agriculture.

D. J. DELIVANIS

Kienitz F. K., *Türkei: Anschluss an die moderne Wirtschaft unter Kemal Ataturk*. Weltarchiv, Hamburg 1959, pp. 148.

The author of the book discusses the economic growth of Turkey from 1923 to 1938, when Kemal Ataturk was in charge of the Turkish government. The first chapter deals with the very bad repercussions of the capitulations, the loss to Turkey of the right to set its tariffs and, last but not least, the unwillingness and the inability of the Turks to enter into commercial enterprise. The change of the regime after 1922 gives the opportunity to the author to analyze the consequences of the compulsory departure of the quasi totality of the Greeks living in Turkey—except for about 100,000—and of the disappearance of the Armenians. He takes cognizance of the fact that the only minority worth mentioning left in Turkey are the Kurds (pp. 11-43).

In the second chapter (pp. 44-70) the author stresses the efforts of Kemal Ataturk to develop communication and education; in the third chapter (pp. 71-119), Ataturk's policy toward agriculture, industry and minerals, in the fourth chapter (pp. 120-127), the development of foreign trade and foreign trade policy, in the fifth chapter (pp. 128-141) the principles which governed his financial policy. The author is right in insisting on the soundness of the financial policy applied at that time in Turkey. This observation is correct in matters related to the budget but does not apply to monetary developments, independently of the fact that they were much better at that time than those we notice now in Turkey.

The whole analysis is objective. The very serious difficulties of Kemal Ataturk are exposed. It is doubtless that it would have been better to continue the book up to the present time.

D. J. DELIVANIS

*Φωτίου Ὁμιλίας. Ἐκδόσεις κειμένων, εἰσαγωγή καὶ σχόλια ὑπὸ Βασιλείου Λαούρδα* [*The Homilies of Photius*. Edition of the text, introduction and commentaries, by Basil Laourdas], «*Ἑλληνικά*», Appendix, 12, Thessalonike 1959, pp. 128\* + 269.

Because he was in the forefront of ecclesiastical controversies of the day, he has become the symbol for partisan theologies seeking to defend their own entrenched positions. The classicist, on the other hand, has been vaguely aware that he is indebted to Photius *Bibliotheca* for certain notices upon the text of classical authors now lost to us. Even the Byzantinist up to now, who should have known better, has been affected by the bias of his colleagues so as to limit his view to one or another particular dimension of the man and his work. It is only in recent years that a wider historical vision has been brought to bear upon the Photian period. The researches of Dvornik on the ecclesiastical politics of the ninth century and those of Ladner, Alexander, Anastos, Kitzinger, Grabar and others on the iconoclastic period have helped restore a balance in the name of scholarship and common sense.

One of the major obstacles to a proper appreciation of Photius