

tions juridiques byzantines. Le régime social byzantin a été caractérisé par des synchronismes et des particularités d'un autre contenu et d'un autre rythme que ceux qui ont été propres à la société féodale occidentale. Ce fut un féodalisme non-achevé, comme nous l'avons défini par nos recherches publiées sous le titre *Feudalismul bizantin* dans la revue «Studii», XXIV, 1971, 1, pp. 139-152. Le régime social byzantin devrait être défini «régime para-féodal». L'expression appartient au savant D. A. Zakythinos, qui estime très judicieusement que la vie juridique byzantine n'a pas eu «des rapports typologiques avec la féodalité proprement-dite» (*Féodalité*, dans le volume «*Beiträge zu einem Lexikon historischer Grundbegriffe*», Braunschweig, 1959-1960, p. 56).

Bucarest

GHEORGHE CRONT

- A. Stavridou-Zafra, *Ἡ συνάντησις Συμεὼν καὶ Νικολάου Μυστικοῦ (Αὐγουστος 913) στὰ πλαίσια τοῦ Βυζαντινοβουλγαρικοῦ ἀνταγωνισμοῦ* (The meeting of Symeon and Nicholas Mysticus in the context of Byzantino-bulgarian antagonism), diss., Thessaloniki 1972, pp. 130, paper.

This is a doctoral dissertation of the author submitted to and approved by the School of Philosophy at the University of Salonica. It was directed and supervised by the erudite Professor John Karayiannopoulos.

The author's major thesis is that the Bulgarian general, Symeon, was never recognized as basileus (= emperor), nor was he ever given that title by the Byzantines; that the byzantine sources refer to Symeon up to his death, always, as *archon* (ἄρχων *knez* not *car*) of Bulgaria (pp. 114-115); that the incident of Symeon's meeting with the Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus in August 913, at Evdomon, and the latter's reading of a prayer and placing his *epiritrion* over Symeon's head, had no constitutional significance at all, nor did it convey to the Bulgarian general the imperial authority. The author succeeds in proving her point by using the sources in a thoroughly critical and consistent way. In this respect, this dissertation can be considered as an original and valuable addition to the relevant studies of Ostrogorsky, Jenkins, Zlatarsky, Dolger, Snegarov, Amantos, Angelov.

Particularly interesting is the author's treatment of the much discussed question, whether the presence or participation of the Patriarch in the coronation ceremony had constitutional significance or not (pp. 99-106). Dr. Stavridou rightly concludes that the Patriarchal participation was not a *conditio sine qua non*, and had no constitutional significance, though it was the usual custom. The three constitutional factors in the election and inauguration of a Byzantine Emperor were the army, the senate, and people—the *demoi*. She does not use, however, the important modern bibliography related to the question, like Boak, Manojlović, Vernadsky. In addition, the study of the reviewer on «The imperial coronation and theory in *DE CERIMONIIS...*» (published in *Kleronomia* 4 (1972), pp. 63-91) could be utilized profitably.

Dr. Stavridou concludes that the action of Patriarch Nicholas was a compromising response to the unreasonable demands and imperial aspirations of Symeon, and it had a moral effect and meaning for the Bulgarian king rather than constitutional consequences, changing Byzantine-bulgarian relations (pp. 117-118, 105).

The book ends with two helpful indexes: Sources (pp. 119-124), proper names and subjects (pp. 125-130).

New York Institute of Technology

CONSTANTINE N. TSIRPANLIS