

GIOVANNA CARBONARO – ZISIS MELISSAKIS (eds.), «E l'allodora innalzarono al trono»: il Λόγος τοῦ Ἰγνηλάτου περὶ τῶν πουλλίων del cod. Atheniensis EBE 701. Con prefazione di CATERINA CARPINATO. Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino 2025. 128 pp. – ISBN 978-88-498-8623-8

• MARC D. LAUXTERMANN, Exeter College, Oxford
(marc.lauxtermann@exeter.ox.ac.uk)

The text commonly known as *Poulologos* is a highly amusing poem that relates how king Eagle invited all the birds to his son's wedding and how they engaged in unfriendly banter, mocking and counter-mocking one another at the table. The poem has come down to us in seven manuscripts that offer widely divergent readings: these can roughly be divided into two main manuscript branches, CPVL and AZ, while E stands apart.¹ While the standard edition by ISAVELLA TSAVARI attempted to reconstruct the archetype on the basis of a stemmatic model, the recent edition by HANS EIDENEIER reproduces the text of a single manuscript, C, which he considers to be the χειρόγραφο-οδηγός or *Leithandschrift*.² The edition under review, by GIOVANNA CARBONARO, follows suit and offers the text of a single manuscript, A = Athens, Εθνική Βιβλιοθήκη της Ελλάδος 701 (Diktyon 2997).³ Though there are two names on the title page, ZISIS MELISSAKIS is responsible solely for the excellent description of the manuscript (pp. 35–39) and the identification of its scribe as Meletios, a monk at the Dousikon Monastery in Thessaly in the second half of the sixteenth century. Text, translation, and introduction are the work of CARBONARO.⁴

The *Poulologos* has a different title in A: Λόγος τοῦ Ἰγνηλάτου περὶ τῶν πουλίων, 'The hunter's tale on birds', which is a rather clumsy circumlocution for the word πουλολόγος which means both 'fowler, bird's catcher'

1. For the manuscripts, see ISAVELLA TSAVARI (ed.), *Ο Πουλολόγος*. Κριτική έκδοση με εισαγωγή, σχόλια και λεξιλόγιο. Athens 1987, pp. 37–93.

2. HANS EIDENEIER (ed.), *Μεσαιωνικές ιστορίες ζώων: Διήγησις των τετραπόδων ζώων & Πουλολόγος*. Irakleio 2016, pp. 161–165.

3. Already published in GEORGIOS TH. ZORAS, *Ο Πουλλολόγος (κατά τον Αθηναϊκόν κώδικα 701)*. Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών 30 (1961), pp. 150–167.

4. The preface, the bibliography, and the figures are the work of both. CATERINA CARPINATO wrote the foreword.

and ‘tale of the birds’.⁵ However, as rightly noted by HINTERBERGER,⁶ the alternative title also alludes to the collection of oriental tales *Stephanites and Ichnelates*, presumably because it was regarded as a prime example of beast literature.⁷ It is worth noting that in the preface of the roughly contemporary poem *Εἰς τὴν Σωφροσύνην*, Meliteniotes views the two eponymous heroes of *Stephanites and Ichnelates* alongside Aesop as tellers of deceitful stories.⁸ If the author of the *Λόγος τοῦ Ἰχνηλάτου* did the same, the title might be translated as ‘the tale of the storyteller Ichnelates about birds’. CARBONARO assumes that behind the name Ἰχνηλάτης hides an author: an ‘indagatore’, ‘un saggio intento ad investigare la realtà e rivelare (...) un suo messaggio sapienziale’ (p. 14). This interpretation is rather far-fetched.

As already stated, CARBONARO bases her edition solely on A and disregards the readings of Z (Athens, Ἰδιωτική συλλογή του Γ. Ζώρα, sine numero, Diktyon 1905, a manuscript from the seventeenth century).⁹ A and Z have many readings in common, some excellent and some less so. More importantly, these two manuscripts have a totally different ending from

5. EIDENEIER, *Μεσαιωνικές ιστορίες ζώων*, p. 164, avers that in the latter meaning the word should be *πουλιολόγος* and not *πουλολόγος*. But it is *κρασοβόλιν* and *κρασοπατέρας* (not *κρασιοβόλιν* and *κρασιοπατέρας*) in *Ptochoprodromika*, III.184 (ed. EIDENEIER) and *Krasopateras*, title (ed. EIDENEIER). The form *πουλιολόγος* appears to be influenced by the medieval bestseller *Φυσιολόγος*.

6. MARTIN HINTERBERGER, *Ο Ανδρέας Λιβαδηνός, συγγραφέας/γραφέας λογίων κειμένων, αναγνώστης/γραφέας δημοδών κειμένων: ο ελληνικός κώδικας 525 του Μονάχου*. In: DAVID HOLTON et al. (eds.), *Κωδικογράφοι, συλλέκτες, διασκευαστές και εκδότες: Χειρόγραφα και εκδόσεις της όψιμης βυζαντινής και πρωιμής νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*. Irakleio 2005, pp. 25–42, at 40n.30.

7. For the concept of beast literature, see MARC D. LAUXTERMANN, *Of Cats and Mice: The Katomyomachia as Drama, Parody, School Text, and Animal Tale*. In: BAUKJE VAN DEN BERG – NIKOS ZAGKLAS (eds.), *Poetry in Byzantine Literature and Society (1081–1204): New Texts, New Approaches*. Cambridge 2024, pp. 183–202, at 194–198, and KIRSTY STEWART, *Animals in Satire*. In: PRZEMYSŁAW MARCINIAK – TRISTAN SCHMIDT (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook on Human-Animal Relations in the Byzantine World*. Abingdon 2025, pp. 169–186.

8. EMMANUEL MILLER, *Poème allégorique de Meliténiote. Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque impériale 19.2 (1857)*, pp. 1–138, at 11–12, esp. lines 15–17 and 18–22.

9. GEORGIOS TH. ZORAS (ed.), *Ο Πουλλολόγος (κατά νέαν παραλλαγήν)*. Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών 25 (1956), pp. 173–206. The provenance of Z is unknown, but it has a few dialectal features that may point in the direction of Northern Greece: 107 πάνεις, 295 μιομπή, northern raising: 211 τοῦτους (τοῦτος), hypercorrection: 396 ὁδὲ instead of οὐδὲ, and crasis of ὀπού plus verb with ου instead of ο: e.g. 221 ὀπούχω instead of ὀπόχω.

CPVLE, which in itself would seem to justify a separate edition of this particular redaction of the *Poulologos*.¹⁰ The reason why CARBONARO did not include Z in her edition is that, according to her, it is a ‘probabile copia tarda’ of A (p. 9n.3). This is clearly not the case. To start with the obvious, Z does not have lines 47, 102, 124–126, 199–237, 326, 337, 351, 361–364, and 423, and since there is no apparent reason for the scribe of Z to omit these lines, the conclusion can only be that the exemplar he used differed from A in this respect. And not only in this respect: Z offers numerous variant readings that one cannot completely ascribe to the scribe’s idiosyncratic whims or literary strivings: e.g. 66 ἐγείρου, ἀνάστα, μίσευσε καθόλου ἐκ τὴν τάβλα A, κάθου, σήκω, ὕπαγε ἐδῶθεν ἐκ τοῦ γάμου Z, and 109 σηκώνεσαι, ᾧ βαριόμοιρε, καὶ εἰς τὸν βουνὸν ὑπάγεις A, σηκώνεσαι, κακόμοιρε, καὶ πάνεις εἰς τὸ ὄρος Z. Had CARBONARO decided to produce an edition of the redaction AZ, as she should have in my opinion, she could easily have corrected obvious erroneous readings of A. For example, 425 ἐξέβηκεν, ἐκάθισεν κοντὰ της καὶ καθίζει: emend to ἐξέβηκε καὶ ἐκάθισε κοντὰ εἰς τὸ πλευρόν της on the basis of Z. Or 183 ἔχω καὶ χεῖλη κόκκινα, μάτια πλουμισμένα: follow Z and add καὶ before μάτια.

In her introduction, CARBONARO somehow manages to ignore almost all publications that deal with the *Poulologos*. It is good scholarly practice to take into account previous scholarship even if one fundamentally disagrees with the arguments and findings of these studies. Whereas in 2020, in an article entitled in Italian ‘Rereading the *Poulologos*’, she argued that the text provides a sustained social critique, she has apparently re-reread the text and is now arguing that the text is devoid of any satirical impulse.¹¹ It is just a piece of entertainment literature, to be recited by professional performers at some kind of social gathering. Here she is clearly echoing the views of HANS EIDENEIER.¹² There is nothing wrong with this, but not mentioning that this is in fact a minority opinion is disingenuous, especially in a publication that is aimed at non-specialists.¹³ In a brilliant article published some thirty years ago (and disregarded by CARBONARO),

10. As rightly argued by EIDENEIER, *Μεσαιωνικές ιστορίες ζώων*, pp. 162–163.

11. GIOVANNA CARBONARO, *Per una rilettura del Πουλολόγος greco medieval*. In: ROSSANA BARCELLONA et al. (eds.), *Confini e oltre: Studi fra Oriente e Occidente* per Francesca Rizzo Nervo. Soveria Mannelli 2020, pp. 77–90, at 81–87.

12. EIDENEIER, *Μεσαιωνικές ιστορίες ζώων*, *passim*, esp. pp. 20–24, 31–32, and 33–39.

13. ‘La nostra edizione nasce dall’esigenza di rendere fruibile ai non ellenofoni un testo ad oggi poco conosciuto al di fuori della ristretta cerchia degli specialisti di letteratura bizantina e greca medievale’ (p. 10).

MAKRIS convincingly argued that (1) the *Poulologos* does not aim to provide accurate ornithological information (*pace* TSAVARI and other scholars), but (2) clearly anthropomorphizes the birds and (3) repeatedly refers to human activities set in recognizable locations (such as buying the rights to salt flats) and, more specifically, (4) exhibits unmistakable allusions to well-known historical actors, such as notably Alexios Apokaukos and his trusted henchman Tzephres.¹⁴ Satire, in other words. MAKRIS' findings have found general approval,¹⁵ with the exception of EIDENEIER, whose sole argument for not following MAKRIS is that the general public listening to the recital of the *Poulologos* would not have been interested in veiled criticisms of political figures, but simply wanted to be entertained.¹⁶ However, vernacular texts are not by definition 'popular': there is absolutely no reason to assume that the elite attending the literary *theatra* of Constantinople would not have enjoyed verbal abuse of their political opponents in the vernacular. It is certainly true that later audiences will have been unable to get all the puns (just as no one did in recent times before MAKRIS rediscovered them) and will therefore have interpreted the *Poulologos* in a different manner than originally intended, but this does not mean the puns are not there.

Another important publication not referenced in the book under review is by PRINZING, who considers the *Poulologos* and the *Tale of Quadrupeds* to be examples of *Rangstreitdichtung*, 'literary debates over precedence'.¹⁷ As he rightly pointed out, the quarelling pairs of birds, without exception, claim that the other party does not have the right to attend the banquet because they are inferior in social rank.¹⁸ The *Poulologos* is thus not only a political satire, but also bears witness to disquiet and angst over matters of protocol. GAUL (not referenced either) took PRINZING's argument

14. GEORGIOS MAKRIS, *Zum literarischen Genus des Pulologos*. In: NIKOLAOS M. PANAGIOTAKIS (ed.), *Αρχές της νεοελληνικής λογοτεχνίας*, 2 vols. Venice 1993, I, pp. 391–412.

15. See the papers mentioned in the next paragraph. Recent papers that accept MAKRIS' findings but came out too late for the book under review include: DIONYSIOS STATHAKOPOULOS, *Who was Alexios Apokaukos?* *Revue des études byzantines* 82 (2024), pp. 181–213, at 185–186, and STEWART, *Animals in Satire*, pp. 173–174.

16. EIDENEIER, *Μεσαιωνικές ιστορίες ζώων*, pp. 31–32.

17. GÜNTER PRINZING, *Zur byzantinischen Rangstreitliteratur in Prosa und Dichtung*. *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 45 (2003), pp. 241–286, especially 260–271. See also ULRICH MOENNIG, *Ρητορική και Διήγησις των τετραπόδων ζώων*. In: GIANNIS K. MAVROMATIS – NIKOS AGIOTIS (eds.), *Πρώιμη νεοελληνική δημόδια γραμματεία*. Irakleio 2012, pp. 573–590.

18. PRINZING, *Zur byzantinischen Rangstreitliteratur*, pp. 265–267.

one step further and demonstrated that the *Poulologos* reflects fourteenth-century court ceremonial, as laid down in Ps. Kodinos' *On Dignities and Offices*.¹⁹ NICHOLAS and BALOGLOU (equally not referenced) elaborated upon MAKRIS' arguments and argued, in my view convincingly, that while the *Poulologos* itself dates from before the *Tale of the Quadrupeds*, the alternative ending of AZ presupposes that its author was familiar with the *Tale*.²⁰ Since the *Tale of the Quadrupeds* most probably dates from not long after 1364,²¹ this would give us an approximate *terminus post quem* for the composition of redaction AZ.

CARBONARO dates the redaction AZ to the latter half of the fifteenth century because of the word βασιλίσκος next to the figure of a double-headed eagle. She takes this as a reference to Orban's cannon, a bombard that played a minor role in Mehmet II's conquest of Constantinople: this type of bombard, however, is called a 'basilic', not a 'basilisk' (the latter is a later development). Βασιλίσκος ('petty king') is most likely a disparaging comment on rulership: in the redaction AZ, the birds rise up against king Eagle who 'merits neither reign nor power' (line 449). In addition, CARBONARO asserts that the lark (the leader of the revolt) symbolizes the hope of all of Christianity that the two churches would be reunited and fight together against the Ottomans (pp. 33–34). In fact, most Orthodox were dead set against the Council of Ferrara-Florence and regarded the uniates as heretics. No larking around with religion.

The chapter on language is disappointing (pp. 28–32). CARBONARO rightly points out that the Λόγος τοῦ Ἰγνηλάτου, like most late medieval texts in the vernacular, makes use of a literary idiom that is non-dialectal and allows for archaisms next to more innovative forms. But most of her 'archaisms' are in fact pretty standard. Endings in -ουσι, for example, are not archaic, but are used in certain dialects up to the present day; augments such as in ἐσίγησαν are not archaic either: the SMG rule that augment only ap-

19. NIELS GAUL, *The Partridge's Purple Stockings: Observations on the Historical, Literary and Manuscript Context of Pseudo-Kodinos' Handbook on Court Ceremonial*. In: MICHAEL GRÜNBART (ed.), *Theatron: Rhetorische Kultur in Spätantike und Mittelalter*. Berlin 2007, pp. 69–103, at 90–94.

20. NICK NICHOLAS – GEORGE BALOGLOU, *An Entertaining Tale of Quadrupeds: Translation and Commentary*. New York 2003, pp. 413–430. See also NICK NICHOLAS, *How the Entertaining Tale of Quadrupeds Became a Tale: Grafting Narrative*. In: JOHN BURKE (ed.), *Byzantine Narrative: Papers in Honour of Roger Scott*. Melbourne 2006, pp. 182–192.

21. NICHOLAS – BALOGLOU, *Entertaining Tale of Quadrupeds*, pp. 60–63.

pears when stressed does not apply to medieval and early modern Greek.²² Despite rightly claiming that the language is a non-dialectal *Dichterkoine*, CARBONARO is eager to find Cretan forms and words in the Λόγος τοῦ Ἰχνηλάτου. This is problematic for two reasons. First of all, the language of A, a late sixteenth-century manuscript, is not necessarily indicative of the linguistic idiom used by the author of the Λόγος τοῦ Ἰχνηλάτου (late fourteenth-century?). Secondly, in order to establish the Cretan provenance of a text, it does not suffice to point out that certain words are also attested in Cretan authors: the criterium ought to be whether these words are attested only in Cretan literature. Anyone who opens their copy of ΚΡΙΑΡΑΣ will soon detect that θωρῶ, μαλέα, πούπετε, and even δαμάκι, do not figure solely in Cretan authors, whatever CARBONARO may say. She also avers that the i-augment in ἦφεραν is Cretan, which is emphatically not the case.²³ Strangely enough, she labours under the impression that the vocative in -ε is the sole prerogative of Cretan writers.²⁴ Furthermore, if she really believed that the text is Cretan, then she should not have introduced the negative marker ἐν in her edition: ἐν is predominantly Cypriot and Rhodian, not Cretan. In 292, πάντως ἄν λέγω ψέματα, she needlessly emends ἄν to ἐν. In 383 and 406, the manuscript reads τί γὰρ ἐ λέγω ψέματα, which she corrects to τί γὰρ ἐν λέγω ψέματα: read τίγαρε λέγω ψέματα; ('do you think I am lying?!?').²⁵ The text contains one undeniably Heptanesian word, τσιμί, at 334, in a passage in which the merlin accuses the red kite of eating carrion, including stranded fish, and mocks him for waiting days on end near the coast: μὴ νὰ εὐρῆς ποθὲν τσιμί,²⁶ 'in the hope that you may find some tiny fish'. Σκάλτσες instead of κάλτσες (at 182, 184, and 289) also appears to be Heptanesian.²⁷ It is not clear, however, whether these Heptanesian words go back to the original Λόγος τοῦ Ἰχνηλάτου or entered the text at a later stage (not in A itself because the manuscript was copied in Thessaly).

The text consists of 499 lines. According to CARBONARO, there are three

22. CGMEMG, pp. 1441–1142 and 1394–1395.

23. CGMEMG, pp. 1401–1402.

24. CGMEMG, pp. 268, 278 and 291–292.

25. For τίγαρε (=μήπως) see ΚΡΙΑΡΑΣ, s.v. τίγαρι. The word can be found in Sofianos' grammar (spelled as τοίγαρη): see the edition MARJOLIJNE JANSSEN and I are currently preparing, line 1002.

26. The *Ιστορικό Λεξικό* defines τσιμί as follows: 1 Πολύ λίγο, τίποτα, καθόλου, π.χ. Κέρκ.: Δεν πιάσαμε ψάρια τσιμί; 2 Μικρό ψάρι. I am grateful to IO MANOLESSOU for providing me with this information.

27. CGMEMG, pp. 142, quoting a 1473 document from Corfu.

lacunas in the text: after 211, 276, and 390 (pp. 16–17 and 27). The first lacuna is not after 211, but after 210: line 210 corresponds to line 224 and line 211 to line 257 in the editions of TSAVARI and EIDENEIER.²⁸ And the line ἐκεῖνα οὐκ ἐσίγησαν τὴν ὄχλησιν τὴν εἶχαν (or something similar) is not missing after 276 and 390 because birds that have already left the banquet (cf. 274–276 and 389–390) cannot possibly still be disturbing the banquet with their quarrelling. CARBONARO did not notice the lacuna after 345: the conditional clause of 339–345 misses its apodosis in AZ, namely line 482 in CPVLE.²⁹ So there are two lacunas: after 210 and 345; there may be more, but if there are, they are not recognizable as such.

This is an edition without a critical apparatus, but with a ‘nota critica’ separated from the text (pp. 42–45). This is becoming increasingly common practice in editions of medieval vernacular literature,³⁰ but it is extremely annoying, first of all because it is not user-friendly and secondly because, by relegating the variant readings to an appendix, it makes the text more final and certain than anyone could or should claim for their edition. In the ‘nota critica’, CARBONARO refers to ZORAS’ *editio princeps* of A and EIDENEIER’s edition of C, but ignores TSAVARI who, in her meticulous critical apparatus, notes the readings of all seven manuscripts, including those of A and Z, and offers a separate edition of lines 367–499 of the redaction AZ.³¹ Because she wrongly holds Z to be a copy of A, CARBONARO omits to mention its readings in the ‘nota critica’. She equally fails to notice that there is an English translation of lines 424–499 of the Λόγος τοῦ Ἰχνηλάτου.³²

As the perceptive reader will have understood, in her edition CARBONARO adopts the polytonic accentuation system of Modern Greek although it was abolished in 1982 for a reason; in fact, its abolition was long overdue because it does not correspond to the actual pronunciation of Greek – and it hasn’t for more than 2000 years. It does not even reflect ancient or medieval scribal practices because in that case one would expect γλώσσα, not γλώσσα; παπᾶδες, not παπάδες; μακρυσφονδυλάτος, not μακρυσφονδυλά-

28. TSAVARI explicitly states in her critical apparatus *ad locum*: ‘225–256 praeb. CPVLE : om. AZ’.

29. TSAVARI misplaced this line in her edition: it should be put after 479 (as it is in EIDENEIER’s edition who, however, does not include lines 480–481).

30. For example, EIDENEIER, *Μεσαιωνικές ιστορίες ζώων*, pp. 303–314, puts the *Κριτικό υπόμνημα* after his edition of the *Poulologos*.

31. TSAVARI, *Πουλολόγος*, pp. 300–305.

32. NICHOLAS – BALOGLU, *Entertaining Tale of Quadrupeds*, pp. 422–424.

τος. The distinction between homophonous indicative and subjunctive forms in polytonic Greek is entirely arbitrary: -εις vs -ης, -ει vs -η, -ομεν vs -ομεν, but -ετε and -ουσι (not -ητε and -ωσι). It also leads to linguistic monstrosities such as 254 νὰ σῆς (<σειώ): in contracted forms, it is the ending, not the stem, that is absorbed: e.g. ακοῦς, μιλάς (sorry, ἀκοῦς, μιλάς).

But once one adopts the polytonic system, one has to live by its rules. Misspellings in this edition include: 12 νὰ παίζεις, 49 ὅπου τὰ ἰδεῖς, 194 νὰ κάθονται; 141 κολυμπάς, 249 κρούς, 441 παππούδες; 49 ἄπιστα, 262 ὄντα ('when'), p. 78, n. 128 ὠμός; 64 ἐπιλοῦρικον, 91 χωρίον (grave instead of acute occurs quite often in this edition). Some of CARBONARO's spelling choices are obsolete even in polytonic Greek: τζ instead of τσ (240 τζαγγάρη, 281 ἀτζίπωτε, 402 τζαμπουνίζεις); needless use of apostrophe (60 ἄβριζη, 323 ἄβγάλη, 430 ἄγκαρδιώση, 457 ἄπαινοῦν); ῥ τὰ instead of στὰ (171 ἀπάνω ῥ τὰ μηχανία, 202 ῥ τὰ σκοτεινὰ); and geminate spellings (193 πουλλία, 424 ἀσκορδιαλλός).

The punctuation is often erratic. CARBONARO tends to put commas before the relative pronoun: e.g. 32 αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐσίγησαν τὴν ὄχλησιν, τὴν εἶχαν; she once even has a full stop: 77–78 (...) τὸν γέρανον ὑβρίζει. Τὸν κυνηγοῦν οἱ βασιλεῖς ('he insults the crane, whom kings hunt ...').³³ There are more redundant commas: 107 βρόμα νὰ παρηγορηθῆς, τὴν πείναν σου τὴν τόσην (πέινα is the direct object of παρηγοροῦμαι), 346 καὶ δὲν ὑπάγεις πούπετε, νὰ πέσης νὰ ψοφήσης, etc. The worst case is in line 195, νὰ μοῦ τὰ πάρη, δεῦτερον νὰ κάψη τὴν καρδιά μου: remove the comma as logic and metre dictate ('to take them again and thus burn my heart'). The punctuation at 72–73 is wrong: καὶ τώρα ὅπου (read ὅπου) νὰ εὐρῆς ὀκάπου παλαιοκάρφιν; Ἄπο ἐκκλησιὰν εἰς ἐκκλησιὰν ὑπάγεις καὶ καθίζεις – remove the question mark, place a comma, and write ἀπό.

'Ho preferito optare per un approccio sostanzialmente conservativo al testo', CARBONARO writes (p. 41). 'Conservative' is not the word that comes to mind when one sees how often and how drastically she has intervened in the text. I have lost count of the number of times she needlessly adds final ν: e.g. 43 εἰς ἀτιμία τοῦ γάμου > εἰς ἀτιμίαν τοῦ γάμου. The stress shift is also unwarranted: ἀτιμία obviously needs to be read as [ati'mja] for metrical reasons, but this does not necessarily mean that the linguistic change from -ία to -ιά had already taken full effect.³⁴

33. If this were the personal pronoun, then the word order would have been: κυνηγοῦν τον οἱ βασιλεῖς.

34. CGMEMG, p. 249.

Even if one disregards the multiple instances of addition of final *v*, there are many unnecessary corrections in this edition: for a long list, see the appendix. The most serious ones involve metre. CARBONARO regularly ‘corrects’ *καὶ* before vowel to *κι/κ’*, even if this means that the line becomes hypometric: e.g. (first hemistich) 18 ἀπὸ νησὶν κ’ εἰς νησὶν (also in 20, 60, 184, 190, 268, 272, 330, 347, 422, 448); (second hemistich) 397 *κι ἀδικεῖς τοὺς πάντας* (also in 175, 185, 254). The same problem occurs with other emendations: e.g. (second hemistich) 141 ὄλη νὰ κολυμπάης > ὄλη νὰ κολυμπάς; (first hemistich) 193 *μανθάνω καὶ διδάσκω τα / ὅλα μου τὰ πουλία* > *μανθάνω καὶ διδάσκω / τ’ ὅλα μου τὰ πουλία* (for more examples, see 32, 49, 141, 158, 204). She has no feel for the caesura: 462 *καὶ στὸ κεφάλι βάνουν τον, / καπάσι τοῦ φορέσαν* > *καὶ στὸ κεφάλι βάνουν, / τὸ καπάσι τοῦ φορέσαν*. Some of her emendations result in hypermetric lines: (first hemistich) 443 *διὰ τὴν φήμην καὶ χαρὰν* > *διὰ τὴν φήμην καὶ τὴν χαρὰν*; (second hemistich) 93 *κ’ ἐμένα συνερίζεις* > *κ’ ἐμένα συνερίζεσαι* (also in 366 and 493). As the last example shows, she is clearly not interested in rhythmical patterns: cf. 260 *καὶ ἐμὲν γνωρίζουσί με* > *κ’ ἐμένα γνωρίζουσι* before line end; 385 *καὶ καταδιώχνουνέ σε Α* (*καταδιώχνουσί Ζ*) > *κ’ ἐσὲν καταδιώχνουν* (with an awful hiatus); 428 *ἐκάθονταν κοντά του* > *ἐκάθονταν κοντά του*. In addition, she quite often misplaces the accent resulting in unmetrical lines: (first hemistich) 98 *ὀπίσω πρὸς τὸν κῶλον σου* > *ὀπίσω πρὸς τὸν κῶλόν σου*; 321 *καὶ τὰ μικρὰ φασσόπουλα* > *καὶ τὰ μικρὰ φασσοπούλα*; 384 *ἐκ τὴν κατάρα τοῦ Νωέ* > *ἐκ τὴν κατάρα τοῦ Νῶε*; (second hemistich) 310 *ἄφρον τε, πῶς τὸ ’ποῖκες* > *ἄφρόντε πῶς τὸ ’ποικες*; 441 *πάππους καὶ ἐξαδέλφους* > *παππούδες κ’ ἐξάδελφους*. In line 253 (first hemistich) the verb εἶμαι is enclitic: 253 *ὅτι τζαγγάρου υἱὸς εἶσαι*, read *εἶσαι*.³⁵

As the appendix will show, CARBONARO changes the text beyond recognition, and this despite the fact that her stated aim is to edit the Λόγος τοῦ Ἰγνηλάτου, with A as her *Leithandschrift*: ‘tutto ciò fa della versione dell’EBE 701 un testo che, modificato all’ uopo dal suo anonimo autore, si è praticamente affrancato dall’originale ed è di certo degno di essere letto ed interpretato come un’opera a sé’ (p. 21). I couldn’t agree more. But this means that one should treat the text as transmitted in A with respect and restrict corrections to an absolute minimum. If the author of AZ does not understand a topical reference to the region Mesothynia (north of Bithynia),

35. MARC D. LAUXTERMANN, *Byzantine Poetry from Geometres to Pisides: Texts and Contexts*, vol. II. Vienna 2019, pp. 343–346.

a toponym scarcely mentioned in our sources, and changes it to Mesofonia, should we correct this back on the basis of the other manuscripts of the *Poulologos*? My answer would be no; hers is to intervene: 230 κ' ἐσύ 'σαι ἐκ τὴν Μεσοφονία > κ' ἐσύ 'σαι ἐκ τὴν Μεσοθυνίαν and 257 πὼς εἶμαι Σοφονίτης > πὼς εἶμαι Μεσοθυνιάτης (once again, one syllable too many). Likewise, if the author of AZ ironically derides the swan as being μικροσφονδύλατος against all evidence to the contrary, the right editorial principle should be to leave the joke as it is and not correct it because it is ornithologically inaccurate; but CARBONARO thinks otherwise: 9 καὶ μικροσφονδύλατε > καὶ μακροσφονδύλατε.³⁶

However, it cannot be denied that emendations are sometimes necessary. For example, 248 εἰς ἄμμον ἢ σ' ἀκρωτήρι: correct metri causa to εἰς ἄμμον ἢ ἀκρωτήρι. 373 μήπως τ' ἀκούσουν καὶ λαλεῖς A, μήπως ἀκούσουν καὶ λαλεῖς Z: read μήπως σ' ἀκούσουν καὶ λαλεῖς. 313 διατ' ἤμουν ἀπὸ εὐγενικόν, εἶμαι τετιμημένον: correct with TSAVARI to διατὶ ἤμουν ἀπὸ εὐγενικόν αἶμα τετιμημένον.³⁷ The text of 178–179 is problematic; so too is the corresponding text of the *Poulologos* (lines 184–185): πὼς ἔναι μαύρη ἢ ράχη σου καὶ ἡ κοιλία σου καίεται A / καὶ εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν σου κεῖται CPVL (τὸ ἄσπρον τὸ ἐμπάλωμαν ἀπὸ λινὸν πανίτισιν) — cruces are in order here. In 276, I would write ἐτροπήν as ἐ<v>τροπήν, with angle brackets around the v to indicate nasal deletion: [edro'pin].³⁸

The translation is generally accurate, but not always. In 89 σώνεσαι does not mean 'ti salvi', but 'you die'.³⁹ In 187 τὸ δὲ (left untranslated by CARBONARO) introduces a temporal clause, 'and when'. In 213 ἐγὼ πουλάκια τὰ γεννῶ, μὲ χάδια τ' ἀναθρέφω, 'io gli uccellini li partorisco e fra coccole li allevo', the translation does not make clear that τὰ γεννῶ is a relative clause. The translation of 346 καὶ δὲν ὑπάγεις πούπετε νὰ πέσης νὰ ψοφήσης, 'non vai da nessuna parte – sono sul punto di morire', is absurd — it means: 'why don't you just bugger off and die somewhere?'. Line 442 ἄς εἶναι ὡς ἐσυντύχασιν καὶ τ' ἄλλα τὰ πουλία does not mean 'lasciamo che discutano anche gli altri uccelli', but 'let it be the way the other birds spoke'.⁴⁰ In

36. EIDENEIER, *Μεσαιωνικές ιστορίες ζώων*, p. 160, too, fails to see that this is irony and, therefore, criticizes the scribes of A and Z for their utter stupidity.

37. TSAVARI, *Πουλόλογος*, p. 278, app. crit. ad 367.

38. CGMEMG, pp. 157–158.

39. KRIARAS s.v. σώνω, II, 2ε.

40. Here the translation by NICHOLAS – BALOGLOU, *Entertaining Tale of Quadrupeds*, p. 423, could have helped: 'the way the other birds already spoke (...) is how it should be'.

three passages, CARBONARO is curiously enough not translating the version of AZ, but the version of CPVL. In 283–285 she translates the second person in ὀπόφαγες τὴν θήκην σου, ἐπούλησες and ἀγόρασες as if the text is in the third person (as it is in the *Poulologos* 332–334): ‘che dissipò i suoi beni’, ‘vendette’, ‘comprò a te’. The same mistake in line 296: the second person translated as if the text offers the third person because of the corresponding passage in the *Poulologos* (line 347). And in lines 352–357, she fails to understand that in the redaction AZ the owl is not the servant of a priest and his wife (as he is in the *Poulologos* 488–491), but their son, and therefore rather perversely translates τὸν ταπεινὸν σου κύρη and ὁ πατήρ σου as ‘il tuo povero padrone’ and ‘il tuo prete’.⁴¹

41. The translation of 52 μούρμουρες as ‘ants’ rather than ‘seabreams’ is a comparable case: the *Poulologos* (line 49) offers here μύρμηγκες.

Appendix: List of Unnecessary ‘Corrections’

- 9 εἰπές με > εἰπέ με
 21 θωρία > θωριά
 38 τζαμπουνομύτα > τζαμπουνομύτη
 40–41 τὴν ποδία σου / αὐτὴν τὴν κατατύλικτην > τὰ ποδία σου / αὐτὴν τὴν κατατύλικτην
 49 κατάπιστα (‘from behind’) > ἄπιστα
 49 ὥσπερ τὸν λίθον πίπτεις > πρὸς τὸν λίθον τὰ πίπτεις (the pelican plunges for fish ‘like a stone’)
 67 κάμνεις τῆς συντροφίας (indirect object) > κάμνεις στὴν συντροφίαν
 82 ἐκ τὸ Ραγούζιν > ἐκ τὸ Ῥαούσιον
 89 and 362 νύκτα > νύχτα
 93 συνερίζεις > συνερίζεσαι
 102 ψεματοφωνορίκτουσα > ψέματα φωνορίκτουσα, ‘che vai sbraitando bugie’ (as if from *φωνορίκτω)
 195 νὰ κάγη τὴν καρδιά μου > νὰ πάγη τὴν καρδιά μου
 201 καὶ ὀρίση σε τοῦ νὰ γενῆς > καὶ νὰ ὀρίση νὰ γενῆς
 205 ἐβρίζει > ὑβρίζειν
 210 σπαθοκαταλοῦνται > σπαθοκαταλοῦνται
 211 and 264 μέφεσαι > μέμφεσαι
 225 ἔχεις > ἔχει
 240 and 253 τσαγγάρου > τσαγγάρη (for the genitive τσαγγάρου, see KRIPARAS s.v. τσαγκάρης)
 244 κ’ ἐγένεσουν ρημάδι > κ’ ἐγένης ἐρημάδιν
 250 τὸν τόπον ὅπου τὰ εἶχες > τὸν τόπον ποῦ τὰ εἶχες
 261 τὰ φόρειες ἀπὸ πρῶτα > τὰ φορεῖς ἀπὸ πρῶτα
 273 ἐξήσπασαν > ἐξέσπασαν
 309 γοφοζαρωμένον > μπουφοζαρωμένον (read with Z γνοφοζαρωμένον, cf. ζοφοζαρωμένον E, ψοφοζαρωμένον CPV)
 293 καθέζεσ’ (καθέζεσαι) > καθίζεις
 310 ἄφρον τε > ἀφρόντε (ᾧ ἄφρον Z)
 317 λύκο > λύκε
 334 τσιμί > τσιμί
 353 Ρίμνης > Ρώμης⁴²

42. AZ offer ἐκ Ζαγορὰν ὑπάρχεις ... ἐκ τὸ χωρίον τῆς Ρίμνης in lines 352–353, and CPVLE ἐκ Ζαγορὰν ὑπάρχεις ... ἐκ τὸ χωρίον τῆς Ρώμης (488–489 in TSAVARI). Ρίμνη is not only the lectio difficilior, but also the lectio potior because Rome obviously does not lie in the Balkans (Zagora) and is hardly a village. In line 507 TSAVARI, the text indicates that there were Bulgarians and Vlachs nearby: καὶ ἂν τύχουν ἐκ τὴν Ζαγορὰν Βούλγαροι

- 362 νὰ δικονίσης > νὰ διακονίσης
376 σκοτίδι μαυρισμένον > σκοτιδιμαυρισμένο (contrary to what CARBONARO states on p. 86n.162, KRIARAS does not offer this compound but quotes the two words s.v. σκοτίδι)
390 ἐκ τὸ μέσος > ἐκ τὸ μέσον
405 καὶ ἐκ τοὺς συμβουλάτορας > κι ἀπὸ τοὺς συμβουλάτορες
441 πάππους > παππούδες
456 συμβουλάτορας > συμβουλάτορες
465 and 482 αὐτα > ταῦτα
466 τῆς ὥρας ἀγριώθην > ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ἡγριώθη
493 τὸ ὀρτύκιον > τὸν ὀρτύκιον⁴³

Keywords

medieval Greek; late Byzantine vernacular poetry; editorial principles

εἶτε Βλάχοι. Ρίμνη could well be Ρίμνικον (Râmnicu), a bishopric in Wallachia in the later Middle Ages: see JOHANNES PREISER-KAPELLER, *The Episcopacy of Late Byzantium: A Register of All the Metropolitans and Bishops of the Patriarchate of Constantinople for the Period between 1204 and 1453*. Saarbrücken 2008. But it could equally be Ρίμνιτζα, a small Vlach settlement near Moglena in 1184 (see PAUL LEMERLE et al., *Actes de Lavra*. Paris 1970, p. 344 : no. 66, line 13), or other not yet identified Balkan villages called Ρίμνικον, Ρίμνιτζα, or the like, of which there will have been many given the etymology: Slavonic *rybnik* or *rymnik* means ‘pond, lake’.

43. Bibliographical abbreviations used in this review:

KRIARAS = EMMANUEL KRIARAS (ed.), *Λεξικό της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημόδους γραμματείας 1100–1699*, 23 vols. Thessaloniki 1969–2024.

CGMEMG = DAVID W. HOLTON – GEOFFREY C. HORROCKS – MARJOLIJNE C. JANSSEN – TINA LENDARI – IO MANOLESSOU – NOTIS TOUFEXIS, *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*. Cambridge 2019.