

Ralph-Johannes LILIE, *Byzanz und die Kreuzzüge (Urban Taschenbücher 595)*. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer 2004. 280 S. ISBN 3-17-17033-3.

Nell'ottocentesimo della conquista latina di Costantinopoli (1204–2004) è pressoché inevitabile, quanto meno prevedibile, tornare ad occuparsi di Bisanzio, del papa, dei pellegrini e dei cavalieri occidentali: in una parola delle *crociate*. Molti validi studiosi, sia medievalisti che bizantinisti, si sono pertanto concentrati su questo tema, dando vita ad interpretazioni più o meno innovative degli eventi che hanno coinvolto perlomeno tre mondi: l'occidente cattolico, la Bisanzio ortodossa e il vicino oriente musulmano. C'è chi ha sentito il bisogno di legittimare questa sua fatica, premurandosi di specificare fin dalle prime righe che non si trattava di un nuovo libro sulle crociate, ma di un nuovo libro su Bisanzio, di cui riteneva ci fosse comunque bisogno. È il caso di Jonathan HARRIS¹, sul quale ancora pesa, a quanto pare, un senso di timore reverenziale e uno scrupolo di coscienza all'idea di confrontarsi con l'argomento indissolubilmente legato al nome del venerato Steven RUNCIMAN², e forse non è un problema che riguarda soltanto la storiografia di lingua inglese. Accomuna questo libro di H. a quello di Ralph-Johannes LILIE non solo il titolo, ma anche il presupposto di partenza, e cioè la volontà di approfondire l'analisi della mentalità bizantina e delle interrelazioni tra Bisanzio, gli occidentali e gli stati crociati da loro creati in Palestina e Siria. Sia H. che L. ritengono che l'impero romano d'oriente abbia svolto un ruolo molto importante anche per l'occidente e che sia ciononostante tuttora troppo poco conosciuto nelle sue dinamiche e nei suoi fondamenti. Va detto che H. sin da principio si riconosce in debito rispetto a L. e in effetti il suo lavoro è fortemente influenzato, nella struttura e nell'interpretazione, dall'autorevole testo di L. che aveva trattato più nello specifico l'argomento dei rapporti tra Bisanzio e quegli stati che furono la creazione delle crociate in Terra Santa³. L. comunque è un passo avanti, nella misura in cui, per esempio, pur riconoscendo il valore dell'opera del RUNCIMAN – e come lui vedendo in Bisanzio il baluardo contro l'espansione islamica (p.10) che l'occidente, in una visione politicamente miope e scarsamente strategica, mandò in rovina – si sente libero di affermare che la sua interpretazione delle fonti è in molti casi superata e che quindi dedicarsi ad un nuovo studio critico sulle crociate e su Bisanzio risulta legittimo e sensato. L'errore di fondo, come L. dice sin da principio (p.12), è che sinora non ci si è mai confrontati con questo tema in modo obiettivo e privo di pregiudizi. E in questo senso si spiega il suo intento di una narrazione delle crociate con prospettiva incentrata *su Bisanzio*, seppure non necessariamente *pro Bisanzio*, com'era invece quella del RUNCIMAN. Ecco perché la scelta programmatica di concentrarsi in particolare sul XII secolo e sulle prime quattro crociate per indagare l'atteggiamento dei bizantini verso i crociati e viceversa. Lo schema delle relazioni tra i due mondi è già stato abbozzato da L. in altri suoi studi⁴, e s'è così in lui consolidata la visione

¹ J. HARRIS, *Byzantium and the crusades*. London and New York 2003, p. IX. Come afferma a p. 238, n. 9 L. non ha potuto considerare in tempo questo libro di H.

² S. RUNCIMAN, *A History of the Crusades*. London 1951.

³ R.-J. LILIE, *Byzantium and the Crusader States 1096–1204*. Oxford 1993 (edizione ampliata e corretta nella traduzione inglese di J. C. MORRIS and J. E. RIDINGS di: R.-J. LILIE, *Byzanz und die Kreuzfahrerstaaten. Studien zur Politik des byzantinischen Reiches gegenüber den Staaten der Kreuzfahrer in Syrien und Palästina bis zum Vierten Kreuzzug [1096–1204]*. München 1981).

⁴ Questo schema risulta già funzionale all'interpretazione dei rapporti tra l'impero e il mondo esterno in: R.-J. LILIE, *Byzanz. Kaiser und Reich*. Köln–Weimar–Wien 1994; è

di un impero bizantino che sino al tempo delle crociate aveva costituito un *modello* per l'occidente, mentre, nella parabola evolutiva dei loro reciproci rapporti, durante le crociate ne era diventato un *concorrente*; e poi, per colpa delle crociate stesse e degli attacchi subiti da parte degli occidentali, aveva imboccato la strada del *declino*.

Nella struttura il libro di L. pare intenzionalmente rapportarsi a quello di Hans Eberhard MAYER⁵ e rispecchiare un analogo schema basato, introduzione e conclusioni a parte, sull'alternanza di un capitolo dedicato ad una crociata ed uno alla fase intermedia tra quella e la successiva, con attenzione predominante per gli sviluppi geopolitici negli stati crociati e le relazioni con l'impero. Alla premessa (pp.9–14) segue un'introduzione (pp.15–32), poi sette capitoli sulle spedizioni in Terra Santa e sugli anni intercorsi tra l'una e l'altra: la prima crociata (cap.1, pp.33–63), il periodo tra prima e seconda (cap. 2 pp.64–82), la seconda (cap.3, pp.83–107), gli sviluppi tra seconda e terza (cap. 4, pp.108–126), la terza (cap.5, pp.127–148), l'intermezzo tra terza e quarta (cap.6, pp.149–156), la quarta (cap.7, pp.157–180). Nel capitolo ottavo (pp.181–199) si concentrano le riflessioni e le conclusioni, poi seguite da due appendici, la prima (pp.200–210) sulle crociate posteriori al 1204, la seconda (pp.211–231) sulle fonti. Seguono alcune tavole delle date e degli eventi principali (pp.232–236), le note (pp.237–251), la bibliografia (pp.252–269) e un registro dei nomi delle persone e dei luoghi (pp.270–280) ricorsi nel libro.

Sia M. che L. introducono innanzitutto la situazione sociale, politica e militare degli anni immediatamente precedenti alla prima crociata, M. con uno sguardo di medievalista concentrato sugli sviluppi nel mediterraneo (cap.1) e L. con un'attenzione speciale per Bisanzio (pp.15–20) e per i suoi rapporti con l'occidente alla fine dell'XI secolo (pp.20–22) ed in particolare con Venezia e le altre città marinare (p.23)⁶. Il concetto più rilevante è quello che, al di là della politica aggressiva dei Normanni, l'occidente dimostrò con le crociate per la prima volta di essere in grado di attaccare l'oriente e questo costituì una minaccia del tutto nuova per Bisanzio (p.22). Un lungo ed intenso capitolo in M.(cap.2) illustra dettagliatamente l'idea occidentale di crociata, nata associando alla tradizione dei pellegrinaggi ai luoghi santi la missione militare di guerra agli infedeli: il devoto pellegrino compariva cioè ora in armi. L. riprende (p.24) questo concetto e anche quello agostiniano del *bellum iustum*, che doveva assurgere a parola d'ordine nell'occidente e trovare i suoi ferventi sostenitori nel papato dell'XI secolo, con la sua pretesa di universalità, perché si potesse davvero pensare ad una spedizione in oriente. Non solo l'ispirazione religiosa, ma anche il desiderio d'avventura e di gloria e la mentalità stessa cavalleresca e feudale si sposavano con il progetto di conquiste care allo spirito, ma anche all'onore o, più banalmente, al portafoglio. Ma la dimensione spirituale e religiosa doveva essere veramente la predominante per cui la maggior parte dei crociati credeva di fare cosa gradita a Dio recandosi a riconquistare la Terra Santa alla vera fede. L. accoglie su tutta la linea l'interpretazione fondata e articolata di M., ma vi aggiunge la prospettiva bizantina (pp.25–32) e l'interpretazione di quella che fu

ulteriormente confermato anche dalla ripartizione stessa dei capitoli e dei paragrafi dell'altro suo recente grosso lavoro: R.-J. LILIE, *Byzanz. Das zweite Rom*. Berlin 2003.

⁵ H. E. MAYER, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*. Stuttgart–Berlin–Köln 2000⁹.

⁶ Delle relazioni tra Bisanzio e le città marinare L. ha trattato estesamente in: R.-J. LILIE, *Handel und Politik zwischen dem Byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeloi (1081–1204)*. Amsterdam 1984.

la più profonda delle distanze ideologico-culturali tra i due mondi: l'entusiasmo occidentale per la crociata era del tutto incomprensibile ai bizantini e tale rimase (p.25). Del resto l'impero era sempre stato circondato da non-cristiani e da sempre era stato abituato a concludere patti ed accordi con loro. Sarebbe esagerato parlare di tolleranza religiosa, dice L. (p.26), ma un certo pragmatismo bizantino e una sorta di rispetto reciproco tra greci e musulmani rese possibile questa convivenza. Un atteggiamento del genere sarebbe stato impensabile in occidente. Così come impensabile sarebbe stato a Bisanzio considerare martiri i caduti nella guerra contro i pagani. L. si inserisce perciò nella folta schiera dei sostenitori dell'inesistenza a Bisanzio del concetto di *guerra santa*, pur rinviando a studi specifici su questa complessa e dibattuta problematica. La guerra era un male necessario, che fosse cristiani o meno, volta per volta, i nemici⁷. In M. era soltanto brevemente accennato (p.20) che nell'oriente bizantino i teologi avevano condannato inequivocabilmente la guerra, ma tutto il problema dell'atteggiamento bizantino rispetto all'idea di crociata, della diversa mentalità e delle incomprensioni tra i due mondi viene sistematicamente tralasciato e in ciò risulta particolarmente utile e chiarificatrice la trattazione di L. che – riassumendo in termini chiari e precisi una delle questioni più discusse – permette di comprendere il sostanziale scetticismo di Bisanzio non di fronte ai pellegrini in quanto tali, ma piuttosto di fronte ad un esercito in armi, che con un pellegrinaggio agli occhi dei bizantini aveva ben poco a che fare. Segue una breve analisi del punto di vista in proposito delle fonti bizantine Anna Comnena, Giovanni Cinnamo e Niceta Coniata (pp.28–32). Il racconto dei fatti della prima crociata in L. (cap.I, pp.33–63) non differisce, come poi anche per le successive crociate, in maniera sostanziale da M. e dove ci sono alcune divergenze d'opinione riguardo a singoli episodi, sia l'uno che l'altro rinviano reciprocamente agli studi del collega in nota. Il cambio di prospettiva è dato dal fatto che in L. l'attenzione è costantemente centrata sull'atteggiamento di Bisanzio rispetto ai crociati e che continuo è lo sforzo di spiegare e interpretare la mentalità bizantina differente, spesso in modo radicale, da quella occidentale e l'assoluta incapacità dei crociati di prendere coscienza delle diversità o di scendere a compromessi. Interessante è la chiave di lettura di L. che, già dal suo libro sui rapporti tra Bisanzio e gli stati crociati⁸ in poi, assegna un ruolo primario alle strategie politiche dei diversi imperatori bizantini Comneni e Angeli rispetto agli stati crociati e indaga così il modificarsi di questa immagine, del *Byzanzbild*, e la conseguente propaganda più o meno anti-bizantina in occidente⁹. Anche il problema della restituzione all'impero bizantino dei

⁷ Anche HARRIS, *Byzantium and the crusades*, 102: i colti bizantini – Anna Comnena – reagivano con perplessità e disgusto all'idea che dei membri del clero predicassero guerra e promettessero premi spirituali.

⁸ Cfr. supra n. 3.

⁹ Sulla scia di questa chiave di lettura anche HARRIS, *Byzantium and the crusades*, cfr. supra n.1; H. però, oltre a riconoscere il terribile errore umano e strategico dell'occidente crociato, è comunque più preoccupato di L. di spiegarsi la fine di Bisanzio. Concluderà (pp. 184–185) con un concetto di logica stringente, ancorché piuttosto fatalista, richiamandosi a Critobulo e al suo senso storico ormai celeberrimo: la conquista di Costantinopoli sarebbe dunque il risultato del fallimento di un'istituzione umana da ricercarsi negli obiettivi e nei metodi della codificata politica estera preservati nei secoli dalla élite di governo bizantina. In altre parole (p.92) la collisione con l'Europa occidentale era inevitabile perché l'ideologia fermamente rivendicata da Bisanzio andava contro il papato riformato e le sue creazioni: le crociate e gli stati crociati di Siria.

territori riconquistati agli infedeli dai crociati e quello del giuramento di vassallaggio prestato o meno all'imperatore, su cui spesso M. è in disaccordo con L., hanno una rilevanza notevole nell'indagine di L., che comunque riconduce anche queste problematiche alle incomprensioni di fondo tra Bisanzio e gli occidentali. Si tratta di un problema di mentalità, di ideologie e di gerarchie di valori differenti, di culture, di mondi diversi e del tutto impreparati a comprendersi vicendevolmente. E questo mi sembra l'aspetto più importante, al di là della successione degli eventi in sé e per sé¹⁰. Peraltro, se la narrazione della quarta crociata (cap.7, pp.157–180) risulta piuttosto fresca e brillante, ricca di argomenti connessi alla contrapposizione culturale e ideologica tra bizantini e latini – nonostante L. si confronti anche con la non nuova problematica della deviazione verso Costantinopoli – il racconto delle prime tre spedizioni risulta a volte un po' ripetitivo, in particolare il capitolo sulla seconda (cap.3, pp.83–107) veramente disseminato di brani talvolta addirittura espressi con identiche parole; valga da esempio, ma se ne potrebbero scegliere altri, data la frequenza degli elementi ripetuti, l'episodio del nobile tedesco derubato e ucciso da alcuni soldati bizantini nei pressi di Adrianopoli, ma poi vendicato da un indignato Federico Barbarossa, al seguito di Corrado, che diede il convento alle fiamme (p.89, p.91 e pp.96–97). È comprensibile che, data la struttura del capitolo, e visto che L. presenta prima la versione dei fatti di Cinnamo (pp.88–91), poi quella di Niceta (pp.91–93), poi quella di Otto di Freising (p.93) e di Odo di Deuil (pp.93–95) e infine un ulteriore paragrafo (pp.95–101) in cui tiene conto di tutte queste testimonianze, gli elementi narrativi e anche i singoli episodi e le considerazioni del caso si ripetano; però in questo capitolo, nonostante la pertinenza degli argomenti, la loro reiterata ricorrenza risulta davvero eccessiva.

Nel capitolo 8 (pp.181–199) L. tira le conclusioni. Innanzitutto ribadisce il concetto di novità assoluta per il mondo medievale che le crociate costituirono, essendo il passaggio di un esercito straniero attraverso un altro stato sino ad allora sempre stato connesso o a intenzioni di conquista, o quanto meno a propositi di saccheggio. Da ciò derivò il comprensibile scetticismo di Bisanzio.

Poi si sofferma sul tema della priorità religiosa del papa e sul comportamento della chiesa latina in Siria e Palestina, con la sostituzione dei patriarchi ortodossi con ecclesiastici latini, come prova del disinteresse da parte latina ad una qualsivoglia forma di collaborazione con la popolazione locale. Di fatto i latini organizzarono e governarono quegli stati secondo le consuetudini e le regole occidentali, non solo ignorando, ma andando addirittura contro il diritto ecclesiastico, con il consenso e il sostegno del papa stesso. I franchi non erano interessati al dialogo, né con i vicini musulmani – infedeli – né con i bizantini – scismatici –, salvo quando quel sostegno poteva tornar loro utile nei loro propositi di conquista e nel loro bisogno di protezione. Su queste basi i regni d'Oltremare potevano essere solo di breve durata. L'ironia della sorte (p.186, p.199) fu che all'origine i bizantini si erano rivolti all'occidente per ottenere aiuto contro i turchi. Ma, alla fine, di tutta questa conflittualità tra Bisanzio e l'occidente, erano proprio i turchi a trarre vantaggio, e l'irreversibile indebolimento e il declino dell'impero bizantino provocato dalle crociate e dalla disastrosa

L'impero bizantino fu longevissimo, ma alla fine scomparve perché nessuna istituzione umana può sopravvivere all'infinito, dato che le circostanze cambiano e nuove sfide sorgono [cfr. Critobuli Imbriotae *Historiae*, rec. D. R. REINSCH (*CFHB* XXII), Berolini et Novi Eboraci 1983, 14, r.18–31].

¹⁰ Lo stesso L. afferma che si può partire dal presupposto che i fatti principali della storia della prima crociata, per esempio, siano già noti. Cfr. LILIE, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, VIII.

conquista latina ad altro non avrebbe portato che al consolidamento del potere turco. E ironico sembra pure che Nicea sia stata la sede del sopravvissuto impero bizantino fino alla riconquista del 1261, quando proprio Nicea era stata la prima città ad essere riconquistata dall'esercito della prima crociata (p.176).

Tutto il capitolo rielabora la questione delle diverse identità sociali, politiche, religiose e culturali che determinarono un conflitto che ancora oggi risulta attuale, se il papa, a distanza di ottocento anni, ad Atene nel 2001, ha dovuto ufficialmente chiedere perdono alla chiesa ortodossa a nome della chiesa cattolica per i fatti della quarta crociata (p.10). E a proposito di ricorrenze e di date! In un certo senso conforta scoprire anche nel rigore scientifico di stampo teutonico di uno studioso notevole come L. un umanissimo errore: così nell'indice (p.6), come poi nel paragrafo stesso (p.170) persino lui è caduto nell'infida trappola delle date, scambiando il 1203 e il 1204 con il 2003-2004. Non resta che sorridere di questo errore di stampa¹¹.

Un capitolo aggiuntivo in appendice (pp.200-210) riporta le più importanti crociate del XIV e XV secolo che coinvolsero Bisanzio per consentire al lettore quantomeno un'idea sommaria di quest'ultima fase. Come sin da principio annunciato, L. non tratta delle crociate che poco o niente riguardarono Bisanzio, mentre un racconto più esaustivo, cui egli stesso rinvia, anche di quelle successive alla quarta si può trovare in M., che vi dedica cinque ulteriori capitoli (capp.10-14).

Una seconda appendice (pp.211-231), decisamente più importante, presenta e analizza brevemente, ma in modo chiaro ed efficace, i contenuti delle varie fonti, occidentali e bizantine, per evidenziarne il punto di vista e illustrare il pensiero dei diversi autori. Questo capitolo ad esempio è completamente trascurato da M., che preferisce rinunciarvi e non citare le fonti neanche nelle note, a favore di una maggiore quantità di citazioni di letteratura secondaria, dalla quale, sostiene, si possono dedurre¹². Trovo l'atteggiamento di L. decisamente più condivisibile e ritengo che l'analisi delle fonti e la comprensione dei diversi punti di vista degli autori sia essenziale all'interpretazione degli eventi. Questo è comunque un interesse di L. confermato anche dagli altri precedenti lavori¹³. Solo una precisazione, per quanto riguarda Robert de Clari. In effetti non mi trovo del tutto d'accordo con l'interpretazione di questo autore data da L. (pp.228-229): innanzitutto avrei sottolineato il fatto che la teoria qui citata che i greci siano persino peggiori degli ebrei, e che quindi la guerra contro di loro sia giusta e pia, viene attribuita da Clari al clero presente nell'esercito crociato in risposta al dubbio e all'insicurezza sollevatisi in seguito agli insuccessi negli scontri con i greci, se fosse cosa poi tanto cristiana muovere loro guerra. E questo, a mio giudizio mette in rilievo che Clari e i protagonisti del suo racconto lo scrupolo morale ce l'ebbero e chiesero conforto ai membri della chiesa in un momento di incertezza¹⁴. Inoltre avrei senz'altro accentuato l'elemento di critica di cui solo Clari è capace, e non il Villehar-

¹¹ Rarissimi sono altrimenti in questo libro gli errori tipografici.

¹² MAYER, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, 6.

¹³ Cfr. per esempio l'Appendix II „Objectivity and Bias in John Cinnamus, Nicetas Choniates, and William of Tyre“, in: LILIE, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, 277-297.

¹⁴ Robert de Clari, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. par P. LAUER. Paris 1924, §§LXXII-LXXIII: Quant li baron furent revenu et il furent descendu des nes, si s'assemblerent et furent molt abaubi et disent que ch'estoit par pechié qu'il riens ne pooient faire ne forfaire a le chité; tant que li vesque et li cleric de l'ost parlerent ensanle, et jugierent que le bataille estoit droituriere et que les devoit bien assalir (...) LXXIII (...)et qu'il ne doutaissent mie a assalir les Griens, car il estoient enemi Damedieu.

douin tutto preso a stilare la difesa a posteriori per l'operato dei crociati. Clari condanna i grandi cavalieri per le loro colpe e sottolinea che se l'impero latino ebbe così breve vita, fu per via dei ricchi capi dell'esercito, che s'erano spartiti il bottino tra loro, senza dare il dovuto ai meno potenti, come lui, e che si erano macchiati di orribili peccati dopo la conquista di Costantinopoli¹⁵. Anche solo quest'ultima affermazione andrebbe messa in rilievo, tanto più che nella versione del Villehardouin, com'è noto, sul saccheggio non si fanno commenti.

Il libro di L. è corredato di diverse carte che non solo risultano più numerose, ma anche di più facile lettura delle – pochissime – presenti nel testo di M., spesso un po' troppo preoccupato di ridurre tutto il riducibile¹⁶.

Le note e la letteratura secondaria non hanno la pretesa di esaurire l'argomento, come dichiara L. sin dalla premessa, ma si ripropongono di introdurre all'attuale stadio della discussione scientifica. Ciononostante la bibliografia risulta decisamente più completa delle due scarse pagine di M¹⁷.

Nell'ottica didattica e nella prospettiva di un utilizzo di questo testo anche da parte di un ampio pubblico, le tavole a pp. 232–236 offrono un altro elemento estremamente utile, a mio avviso, per ricapitolare in modo chiaro gli eventi e le date fondamentali dal 1025 al 1461.

Lo scopo dichiarato (p.12) di questo studio era quello¹⁸ di presentare una visione il più possibile oggettiva degli eventi e si può dire che, grazie ad una costante analisi precisa e meticolosa delle fonti, di matrice sia occidentale che bizantina, sulla cui testimonianza quest'opera risulta saldamente strutturata, e grazie inoltre ad uno scrupolo scientifico rigoroso nel rinviare anche ad altri autorevoli studi, alle opere che trattino nello specifico le problematiche più discusse e alla molteplicità delle interpretazioni, L. abbia condotto un'indagine vigile e il più possibile monda da pregiudizi o anche da coinvolgimenti emotivi di qualsivoglia parte. E se, come infatti è il caso, pur essendo accurata e puntuale, non risulta pesante, ma anzi di scorrevole lettura, che invita ad approfondire, è già di per sé un notevole successo. Alcuni temi sono già stati trattati altrove da L.: poco male, qui si trova un buon quadro riassuntivo dell'evoluzione della sua, e non solo sua, teoria interpretativa e la precisa informazione sull'attuale stato della ricerca.

Laura Isnenghi

¹⁵ Clari, LAUER, §CXII: Si fu perdus li empereres, que on ne seut onques que il devint, et li cuens Loeis et molt d'autres haus hommes, et tant d'autre gent que nous n'en savons le nombre, mais que bien i perdi on trois chens chevaliers; (...) Ensi faitement se venja Damedieus d'aus pour leur orguel et pour le male foi qu'il avoient portee a le povre gent de l'ost, et les oribles pekiés qu'il avoient fais en le chité, après chou qu'i l'eurent prise.

¹⁶ Anche il carattere della grafia – ma ciò non è certo frutto di una scelta dell'autore – è talmente ridotto da mettere a dura prova anche gli occhi più esercitati alla consultazione di vocabolari e manoscritti! Anche da questo punto di vista il testo di L. risulta senz'altro di più agevole lettura.

¹⁷ MAYER, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, 253–254.

¹⁸ Come già in LILIE, *Byzantium and the Crusader States*, VII: finora le relazioni tra Bisanzio e gli stati crociati nel vicino oriente sono stati indagati o da parte di medievalisti che scrivono sulle crociate o di bizantinisti che si occupano dell'impero bizantino. Sono sempre state considerate solo da due punti di vista.

Georgios Pachymeres, *Philosophia*: Buch 10, Kommentar zur Metaphysik des Aristoteles. Editio princeps. Einleitung, Text, Indices von Eleni PAPPÀ (Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi, Commentaria in Aristotelem Byzantina 2). Athens, Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν, Κέντρον ἐκδόσεως ἔργων Ἑλλήνων συγγραφέων 2002. X, 142*, 118 S. ISBN 960-7099-92-3.

To Late Byzantine students of philosophy, Aristotle's obscurity was a commonplace. In Theodore Metochites' *Semeioseis gnomikai* (c. 1326), it was attributed to the Stagirite's wish to seem wiser than he actually was, his *doxosophia*. Metochites complained that when Aristotle in his *Metaphysics* finally has to deal with the questions he has postponed in his treatises on natural philosophy, 'he eludes his hearers by means of obscurity and contrives to be completely incomprehensible, presumably in order that they shall not realise that he is far from living up to his promises and the expectations which he has created ...' (3.4.1).¹

Yet the Late Byzantine students were relatively privileged. In contrast to their contemporaries at the Western European universities, they were able to read Aristotle in the original. And in contrast to many earlier generations of Greek readers, they had access to a corpus of learned commentary which covered practically every part of Aristotle's work. The remaining gaps in this corpus were filled in the early 12th century by men like Michael of Ephesus, Eustratios of Nicaea, and Stephanos (?Skylitzes), at least some of whom were commissioned by the princess Anna Komnene. One important product of these men's activity is the continuation of the extant commentary of Alexander of Aphrodisias on *Metaphysics* 1–5, which was executed by Michael of Ephesus.²

In addition, the Late Byzantine student who did not have the time or patience to bother about the many puzzles of Aristotelian exegesis, but wished to have a general understanding of Aristotle's thought, could often turn to a kind of ready-made interpretations of Aristotle's writings known to us as paraphrases. The Aristotelian paraphrase as a genre dates back to Late Antiquity, when Themistius claimed to have invented it (*In An. post.* 1.2–16). But it has probably never been more popular than it was in Middle and Late Byzantium. From c. 1050 and forward a number of learned men tried their hands at rewriting various parts of the *corpus aristotelicum* in a less allusive and elliptical language, the most well-known being, perhaps, Michael Psellos, Theodore of Smyrna, Leon Magentenos, Sophonias, and indeed Theodore Metochites himself.

The paraphrase genre was congenial to an educational culture which favoured literary elegance and broad encyclopaedic learning. It seems natural that it should develop in the direction of greater brevity and lesser loyalty to the progression of the authorial text. Such a development is manifest in the *Philosophia* by the historian and polymath George Pachymeres (1242–c. 1310).

The *Philosophia* offers an overview of Aristotle's philosophy in 12 books. The only parts of it which have hitherto been printed in the original Greek are Book 1 (*Organon*, Paris 1548 etc.) and Book 12, Part 2 (*De lineis insecabilibus*, which has supplanted the pseudo-Aristo-

¹ Translation by K. HULT, in: Theodore Metochites on Ancient Authors and Philosophy: *Semeioseis gnomikai* 1–26 & 71. Göteborg 2002, 41.

² His identity has been conclusively proved by C. LUNA, in: Trois études sur la tradition des commentaires anciens à la *Métaphysique* d'Aristote. Leiden, Boston and Cologne 2001, 1–71.

telian text in some early printed editions). To these is now added Book 10 (*Metaphysics*), in a critical edition with prolegomena and indexes by Eleni PAPPÀ.

This is a most welcome contribution to the history of philosophical studies in Late Byzantium. It is especially important for the history of the Aristotelian commentary as a philosophical genre. P. argues (p. 35*) that the *Philosophia* cannot be described simply as an Aristotelian paraphrase. She is obviously right. It is true that Pachymeres' work shares with the paraphrase the aim of presenting Aristotle's thought in a more readily accessible form. But in its quest for brevity and orderly structure it crosses over into the genre of compendium, as exemplified by Nikephoros Blemmydes' *Introductory Epitome* (c. 1260). Thus both the work as a whole and the 12 individual books are organized on thematic principles, rather than following the Aristotelian corpus book by book, chapter by chapter, paragraph by paragraph.

It seems to me that the most adequate description of the *Philosophia* would be 'a hybrid between paraphrase and compendium'. This accounts for the fact that we find in it some clear expressions of disagreement with Aristotle, a feature normally associated more closely with the genre of compendium than with that of paraphrase. The disagreement is over Aristotle's doctrine of the eternity of the heavens (chapter 4.4).³ The hybrid form may also go some way towards explaining certain inconsistencies in Pachymeres' way of referring to passages in Aristotle's works sometimes in the first person (paraphrase style), sometimes in the third (as might be expected in a compendium). I shall come back to this.

P.'s edition, a revised doctoral dissertation from the University of Hamburg, is the second volume in the series *Commentaria in Aristotelem Byzantina* edited by the Academy of Athens (parallel to the series *Philosophi Byzantini*). The book is well produced. I have spotted about twelve misprints, none of them very serious (unless the ungrammatical sentence on p. 35* is due to one).

It falls into two main parts: prolegomena (pp. 1*–142*) and edition proper (pp. 1–118). The prolegomena treat in 11 chapters of questions pertaining to the author and his work (chaps. 1–6), of the MS tradition (chaps. 7–10), and of the editorial principles embraced by P. (chap. 11). They are followed by a select bibliography (pp. 139*–142*). The edition proper contains a Greek text, an *apparatus aristotelicus*, an *apparatus fontium*, and an *apparatus criticus*. There are three indexes to the edition: *nominum*, *verborum memorabilium* and *locorum*. (There are no indexes to the prolegomena.) Four plates illustrate Pachymeres' handwriting in the two main witnesses to the text (see further below).

Chapter 1 offers a reliable summary of the known facts about Pachymeres' life and writings. My only quibbles are that I miss an authority for the statement that Pachymeres was a student of George Akropolites (p. 4*), and that I think the description of the 'Weiterbearbeitung der Holobolos-Übersetzung von Boethius' Schrift *De topicis differentiis*' is misguided (p. 5*; more on this later). Also, the classification of Pachymeres' *Quadrivium* as natural science (p. 6*) is an anachronism.

³ In addition, Pachymeres insists that 'those who say that Being and Unity are the principles of all things' would have withstood Aristotle's criticism if they had only transcended sensible Being and Unity, which are but predicates (section 4.3.1: I missed references in P.'s apparatuses to Aristotle's discussions of the Platonic and Pythagorean view that Being and Unity are substances, in Beta 4, 1001a4–b25; Zeta 16, 1040b16–27; Iota 2; Mu 8, 1084b13–32).

Chapter 2 treats briefly of the contents, structure, manuscript transmission, and previous translations and editions of the *Philosophia*. Chapter 3 addresses the question of the title of the work. This is absent in one of the autograph MSS owing to the loss of the first 22 leaves. P. seems to make contradictory statements about its presence in the other autograph MS (p. 13*). The work is however referred to as Φιλοσοφία in the author's own preface, and this is also the title it bears in the bulk of the MS tradition, so P.'s decision to edit it under that title seems absolutely warranted.

In Chapter 4, the date of the *Philosophia* is discussed. P. argues (pp. 16*–17*) from the fact that Pachymeres is called by the title of *protekdikos* in parts of the MS tradition to the conclusion that the work in its final form probably dates from after 1285. This seems over-cautious in view of the fact that the paper of the two autograph MSS is dated by watermarks to 1300–05. The statement on p. 17* that the title of *protekdikos* is common also in MSS of the 'Weiterbearbeitung' (which is supposedly earlier than 1282) need not cause any worry, since it is false. As is clear from P.'s own MS descriptions, the oldest MS in which this work is attributed to Pachymeres is Esc. R.I.10 (copied by Andreas Darnarios in 1570). I shall come back to this below. Another oddity on p. 17* is that even though P. states that Pachymeres' *Quadrivium* was probably published around the turn of the 14th century, it is impossible to know what the implication will be, since she omits to say whether or not the title of *protekdikos* occurs in the MSS of this work.

In the latter half of Chapter 4 (which could well have been converted into a separate chapter), P. turns to Book 10, the *Metaphysics*. A survey of the points of contact between this book and the many other learned activities in which Pachymeres was engaged is interesting in itself, even if (as P. admits, p. 19*, p. 22*) it does not yield any certain conclusions as to the relative dates of these activities. P. is sceptical (pp. 21*–22* n. 74) about the recent suggestion that the unedited pseudo-Philoponean commentary on the *Metaphysics* should be attributed to Pachymeres (as part of it is, in Cod. Ambros. F 113 sup. [gr. 363]).⁴ Some further discussion of this issue would have been appropriate in this chapter.

Chapter 5 outlines the contents of the 14 chapters of *Philosophia* 10. These do not correspond with the 14 books of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, though the order of discussion is roughly the same (see the synopsis on pp. 32*–33*). One notable difference is that Pachymeres' work ends with two chapters on the eternity of movement (which Pachymeres rejects) and the unmoved mover, based on *Physics* 7–8 as well as *Metaphysics* Lambda.

Chapter 6 raises some important questions about Pachymeres' aims and methods. I have already mentioned P.'s discussion of the genre problem. Another point of interest in this connection is how the author conceived of his own work. If the *Philosophia* is, as I suggested above, a hybrid between paraphrase and compendium, it may reasonably be asked whether Pachymeres was deliberately crossing over the genre boundaries, as his contemporary Sophonias was, who expressly tried to strike a balance between paraphrase and exegetical commentary, in his *In De anima*. In P.'s opinion, 'Pachymeres' Arbeit zielt durch seine eigenen Hinzufügungen, die Überleitungen und Verbindungen von Stellen sowie durch die Auswahl, die Zusammenfassung und die Umgestaltung der aristotelischen Passagen auf eine neue, einheitliche Synthese' (p. 34*). She especially points to the author's cross-references as evidence of his attempt to create a self-contained work. This seems plausible in

⁴ See S. ALEXANDRU, A New Manuscript of Pseudo-Philoponus' Commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* Containing a Hitherto Unknown Ascription of the Work. *Phronesis* 44 (1999) 347–352.

some cases, but the reference ἐν τῷ Λάβδα διαληφόμεθα (11.15) is incomprehensible as a cross-reference (the passage of Pachymeres' work which according to P. is meant is numbered δ'. ε'). It can only be understood as a reference to *Aristotle's* Lambda.⁵ The use of the first person in conjunction with this reference suggests identification with the commented author, which is a not uncommon feature of the paraphrase genre. Contrast, for example, 9.22–10.5, where the third person is used in referring to Mu and Nu 'of the present work' (which, again, can only mean the commented work). This sort of vacillation is found throughout the whole book. It seems to suggest that Pachymeres may not have had a very clear idea of the specific nature of the work he was composing.

As regards its purpose, P.'s assumption that it 'entweder dem Elementarunterricht in der Philosophie diente oder als stark bearbeitete Zusammenfassung aus einem Unterrichtslehrstoff hervorgegangen ist' (p. 35*) seems to overestimate the level of education in early 14th-century Constantinople, where I think only the most advanced philosophy students would have a go at Aristotelian metaphysics. There is also no evidence for Pachymeres' having taught so extensively in the field of philosophy (cf. p. 22*), although Manuel Philes' funeral poem on his teacher (not adduced by P. in this connection) bears witness that he lectured on logic (*Carmina* 2:400–5, ll. 33–38 Miller).

Chapters 5–6 of P.'s prolegomena suffer from a certain repetitiveness: the superscriptions, contents, and sources of Pachymeres' chapters are specified with many overlaps on pp. 23*–33*. One inconsistency here is that on p. 27* it is said that section 4.2.4 contains 'Aporien aus Buch B', but on p. 31* the same section is correctly described as a reproduction of 'die im Buch K stehende Zusammenfassung von im Buch B gestellten Problemen ...'.

Chapter 7 offers detailed descriptions of the 35 extant MS witnesses to the text, among which are one wholly and one partially autograph MS (**B** = Berol. Ham. 512 [gr. 408] and **P** = Par. gr. 1930, respectively). Seven of these descriptions are based on *in situ* inspection, the others on microfilm copies. I have not been able to test their reliability, but they seem very thorough. Among the 'noch nicht identifizierte oder verschollene Handschriften' listed on p. 39* the two MSS used by Bechius might have been included (cf. p. 11* n. 40).

Chapter 8 treats of the relationship between the two autographs. P. declares that '[e]ine Untersuchung des Verhältnisses der Apographa zueinander ist bei Vorhandensein von Autographa selbstverständlich überflüssig' (p. 98* n. 234). This may be true so far as the *constitutio textus* is concerned, but there are other respects in which it is certainly not. Let me illustrate my point by turning to Chapter 10, 'Zur Verbreitung der *Metaphysik* und der *Philosophia*.' In it, P. wishes to shed light on the use of the *Philosophia* by contemporary and later scholars, by discussing its circulation as an integral work as well as in separate books, in the form of excerpts, and in indirect transmission (since the chapter deals not only with the *Metaphysics* some mention might have been made here of the borrowings from the *Philosophia* in Joseph the Philosopher's *Encyclopaedia*).

P. first points to the fact that the *Philosophia* (or parts of it) is often transmitted together with certain other philosophical works by Pachymeres and others. The most obvious example is the group of MSS in which it is transmitted together with what P. calls 'die Weiterbearbeitung der von Manuel Holobolos angefertigten Übersetzung des Werkes des Boethius *De topicis differentiis* von Pachymeres' (p. 120*; cf. p. 5*; p. 11*; p. 17*; p. 53*;

⁵ Cf. 84.21, where P. in her apparatus refers not to Pachymeres' *Physics* (*Philosophia* 2), but only to Aristotle's.

p. 61*; p. 70*; p. 82*; p. 90*). This short text was edited by NIKITAS.⁶ It has been argued (to my mind convincingly) by EBBESEN that it is not at all based on Holobolos' translation (also edited by NIKITAS *op. cit.*), but is itself a free translation of some Latin 13th-century material, perhaps found in a MS of Peter of Spain's *Summulae* or a similar work.⁷ EBBESEN also pointed out that the attribution to Pachymeres is found in no MS older than Esc. R.I.10 (copied by Andreas Darmarios in 1570) and therefore is of no value;⁸ he hypothesized that the 'Weiterbearbeitung' and the *Philosophia* 'were copied from different sources and only joined when the gathering containing [the 'Weiterbearbeitung'] was bound with the bigger work' (p. 170).

EBBESEN's hypothesis receives support from P., who contends (pp. 120*–121*) that it is improbable that the two autographs contained the 'Weiterbearbeitung' before they were mutilated. Indeed, this is what her persuasive reconstruction of their lost parts strongly suggests (pp. 99*–100*). Her conclusion is that the 'Weiterbearbeitung' 'höchstwahrscheinlich in einer späteren Phase der Überlieferung der *Philosophia* einverleibt wurde'.

There are, however, certain points that need to be clarified before this conclusion can be accepted. The oldest MS in which the 'Weiterbearbeitung' appears together with the *Philosophia* is Athous 4311 (Iviron 191). It was dated by LAMBROS⁹ and NIKITAS¹⁰ to the 13th century. It is dated by P. (pp. 52*–55*) to the 14th century. This may well be correct, but it would have been more convincing if P. had stated her reasons. A few years ago, I read a conference paper (forthcoming) in which I concluded on the basis of the information given in NIKITAS' edition that there must have been at least two lost MSS of the 'Weiterbearbeitung', both of which were ancestors to the Athos MS and both of which contained the *Philosophia*. It now appears from P.'s MS descriptions that this information may not have been reliable (most importantly, the 'Weiterbearbeitung' may not occupy ff. 1v–4r in the Athos MS, as stated by Nikitas [p. cxl], but ff. 1v–4v, as stated by P. [p. 53*]), and my conclusion may therefore not be supported by the actual facts. Still, supposing that the readings of Laur. plut. 86,22 implied in Nikitas' apparatus are correct (it is once certainly and three times probably in the right against all other MSS), it seems likely that this MS is independent of the Athos MS, and that accordingly there must have been at least one MS prior to the Athos MS which also contained the *Philosophia*.

At this point an investigation of the relationship of the *Philosophia* texts in the Athos and the Florence MSS not only to each other but also to the rest of the tradition would have come in very handy. It could have made it possible for us to ascertain whether the Florence MS is really independent of the Athos MS, and if so, whether the lost archetype must after all be identical with one of the autographs. These questions are not of purely pedantic interest. If it could be shown that one of the autographs did contain the 'Weiter-

⁶ Boethius, *De topicis differentiis καὶ οἱ μεταφράσεις τῶν Μανουήλ Ὀλοβόλου καὶ Προχόρου Κυδώνη. Εἰσαγωγή καὶ κριτική ἔκδοση τῶν καμμένων ὑπὸ Δ. Ζ. Νιζήτα. Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi: Philosophi Byzantini* 5. Athens, Paris and Brussels 1990.

⁷ S. EBBESEN, George Pachymeres and the Topics. *CIMAGL* 66 (1996) 169–85.

⁸ In fact it is found also in Bechius' Latin translation, published in print for the first time in 1560, and it may have been in one or both of the MSS on which this was based (they have not been identified and may be lost).

⁹ S. P. LAMBROS, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*, vol. 2. Cambridge 1900, 54.

¹⁰ Pp. cxl–cxli; cf. EBBESEN, p. 184.

bearbeitung', this would make a strong case for the authorship (or rather translatorship) of Pachymeres, and would thus allow the inference that Pachymeres – who may have belonged to the milieu around Manuel Holobolos at the Patriarchal School of Constantinople in 1265–1273 – knew Latin.

It may be added that P.'s repeated statement that Berol. Phill. 1521 is a direct copy of **B** (p. 98*–100*; cf. p. 14*; p. 58*) would have been even more plausible had she undertaken the investigation to show that there are no extant intermediates or descendants of intermediates. Also, the question as to whether or not the proem to the whole work was originally in **B** could possibly have been definitively solved by such an investigation.

Chapter 9 accounts for an abridged version of *Philosophia* 10, which is circulated in three MSS. The relations between the MSS are correctly judged, although I fail to understand the statement that 'Die Codices Esc. Y.I.10 und Marc. 218 ... sind vom [sic] ihm [sc. Vat. gr. 267] nicht abhängig, so daß eine weitere Stufe zwischen dem Vaticanus und den beiden anderen Hss. angenommen werden muß' (p. 114*). I do not see how there can be any intermediate stage between unrelated MSS. Apart from that, I find the comprehensiveness of this account quite admirable.

I have already discussed Chapter 10, so I turn now to the editorial principles which P. embraces in Chapter 11. These are ones that over the last 15 years or so have gained increasingly widespread acceptance in editions of Byzantine texts generally and in those based on autograph witnesses especially.¹¹ Only 'sheer errors' (125*) are corrected, and punctuation is normalized (137*); other deviations from the classical rules are faithfully transcribed from **B**.

In the present reviewer's opinion, these principles are essentially sound, but they need to be modified in the light of two important considerations. The first is that even authors do make mistakes. That an author's mistakes should be corrected may seem evident in cases such as spelling errors and dittographies (as in 78.23 of P.'s edition). But I think the same holds when it comes to the accentuation of enclitics, where Byzantine scribes and authors clearly tried to follow certain rules, but quite understandably not always succeeded. If a Byzantine author fails to maintain any consistent system of such rules, this is to my mind sufficient evidence that he or she committed mistakes, and I think it would be preferable for an editor to correct these mistakes. Much the same is true of word division.

The other consideration is that a – if not the – primary purpose of most Greek editions must be to make the text accessible to readers. Depending on the type of text, these will be familiar in various degrees with the Byzantine rules of punctuation and accentuation. This consideration is especially valid in the case of *editiones principes*.

Both of these considerations apply to such passages as pp. 27.21–22 and 56.9 of P.'s edition, where it is somewhat disconcerting to find ἐξαοχῆς and ἐξ ἄοχῆς in successive lines, and καθυποκειμένου and καθ' ὑποκειμένου in the same line, although there is apparently no semantic or stylistic point in the variation.

But these are trifles. Those cases where the accentuation affects the sense and the MSS are nevertheless followed against established convention are a more serious matter. These are mostly cases of the indefinite pronoun τις, which is sometimes enclitic, sometimes oxytone (some of these cases occur in verbatim excerpts of Aristotle). It may be that to some

¹¹ See e.g. the prolegomena to REINSCH'S and KAMBYLIS' edition of Anna Comnena: *Annae Comnenae Alexias. Recensuerunt D. R. REINSCH et A. KAMBYLIS. Pars prior: prolegomena et textus*. Berlin and New York 2001, 34–57.

specialists it is important to know exactly how the author vacillates on this point. If this is so, I think it would be well to indicate his vacillations in the apparatus criticus. Most readers are bound to be confused when they encounter an oxytone indefinite pronoun in the text. One example is 4.24, where ... μὴ ἐὼν ἐννοεῖσθαι τί, ἢ πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἢ μετ' αὐτό (for ... ἐννοεῖσθαι τι ἢ πρὸ αὐτοῦ ...) does not make for smooth reading.

In the above example, the punctuation seems contrary to the stated principle that '[d]ie Interpunktion der Hs. ... wurde nur in den Fällen beibehalten, in denen durch sie der Sinn verdeutlicht wird' (p. 137*¹²). Other seeming violations of this principle include 6.18 (read: ... νοεῖ, καὶ τί ἐστὶ τοῦτο καταλαμβάνει); 11.13–14 (substitute two commas for the full stop and colon); 14.12 (substitute a comma for the full stop); 17.8 (substitute a comma for the full stop); 24.23 (substitute a comma for the full stop); 49.15 (where the text seems to be corrupt:¹³ for δεῖ δὲ αἰεὶ ἕκαστον τῶ οἰκείῳ λέγεσθαι ὡς ἡξίου λόγῳ, ἄλλως δὲ μὴ λέγεσθαι. ἀναγεῖται πάντως τὸ ἀντιλέγειν, one should probably read εἰ δὲ δεῖ αἰεὶ ..., ἀναγεῖται ...); 53.6 (substitute a comma for the full stop); 63.20 (remove the comma); 69.9 (substitute a comma for the full stop). At 74.10–13 the reading of **P** *ante correctionem* in combination with the removal of the comma in 74.12 seems necessary.

The *apparatus fontium* is impressive, including as it does references to unedited works such as Michael Psellos' commentary on the *Physics* and Ps.-Philoponus' on the *Metaphysics*. Especially valuable are the references to other parts of the *Philosophia*. Occasionally the *apparatus fontium* as well as the *apparatus aristotelicus* contain too much information (e.g. the reference to *An. post.* at 4.6 is superfluous), occasionally too little (e.g. 60.10–13 is based on Eta 2, 1043a2–4; and see n. 3 above). As P. notes (p. 20*), the commentaries of Alexander and Michael have been put to extensive use by Pachymeres. This is not always indicated in the *apparatus fontium* (e.g. 53.18–23 is based on Michael, 495.22–25; and the reading μηδαμῆ at 67.16 is shared only with Michael). One may also wonder why, if Pachymeres' arguments against the eternity of the world betray the influence of Philoponus, as P. states (p. 32*), Philoponus does not figure in the *apparatus fontium* to sections 4.4–5.

There are some inconsistencies in the use of the apparatuses. Occasionally Aristotelian references are in the *apparatus fontium* (e.g. 54.4–6) and other references in the *apparatus aristotelicus* (e.g., at 16.12–13 Anaxagoras B1 appears in the *apparatus aristotelicus*, whereas at 16.5–6 Homer, *Iliad* 14.201 and 14.302 are in the *apparatus fontium*; both authors are quoted from Aristotle). Some passages of authors quoted from Aristotle are specified, others are not: as a consequence Hesiod, who is quoted at length at 18.1–3, does not make it to the *Index locorum*. Similarly, Aristotle's reference to Plato's *Hippias Minor* in Delta 29 is followed up (50.1–6), but not the one to *Gorgias* 448c5–7 in Alpha 1 (5.4–6).

At 30.6–7 a paraphrase of a paraphrase of part of Protagoras B 1 from Gamma 5 passes unnoticed in the *apparatus fontium*. It is interesting to note that Pachymeres goes on (30.7–8) to ascribe also part of Democritus B 125 (not in Aristotle) to Protagoras,

¹² P.'s example of the application of this principle is not very well chosen. The relevance of the explanatory note (p. 137* n. 305) is not clear. The Anmerkung in KÜHNER-BLASS (1:331) has to do with cases where a word is 'mentioned, not used'; the example is not of this kind.

¹³ This is indeed surprising, since it implies that Pachymeres must have used a now lost earlier source which he did not take the trouble to emend in spite of its patently defective state.

apparently equating the latter's view that truth is relative with the former's view that sensible qualities are. This equation is indeed implied by Aristotle in Gamma 5 (1009a38–b17), and expressly stated by Philoponus in his *De anima* commentary (71.23–28). It is, however, repudiated by Democritus B 69 (Democrates) and Plutarch, *Adv. Col.* 4, 1108F. Anyway, there is no reference to the Democritus fragment in P.'s apparatuses.

As P. notes (p. 33*), Pachymeres' faithfulness to his source(s) varies. Sometimes he takes more or less verbatim excerpts, sometimes he summarizes or paraphrases. In the latter cases P. sometimes observes the commendable practice of writing 'cf.' immediately before the source-reference, sometimes not (e.g. the paraphrase of *Phaedo* 99a–b at 14.8–15). In view of Pachymeres' wayward habits it is understandable if P. abstains from noting his every departure from the Aristotelian text (although a more clear-cut distinction between paraphrase and excerpt in the apparatus would have made this possible in the case of excerpts). In some cases, however, where Pachymeres' text is more or less incomprehensible, as in 32.10 (περί : παρά Aristotle) and 59.12 (αὐτή : αὔτη Aristotle), a note of the authentic reading in the apparatus would have been helpful.

As I said, this edition is a significant contribution to the much-neglected study of philosophical teaching and learning in Late Byzantium. The editor has carried out a large task with considerable skill and patience. She can be proud of her achievement.

Börje Bydén

Theodore Metochites On Ancient Authors and Philosophy. *Semeioseis gnomikai* 1–26 & 71. A Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, Notes, and Indexes by Karin HULT. With a Contribution by Börje BYDÉN (*Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* 65). Göteborg, Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis 2002. XLIV, 360 S. ISBN 91-7346-434-1.

This book is an exemplary work of philology. By combining edition, translation, and interpretation – each of the finest quality –, this book makes a text of the distant past accessible to modern readers and, more importantly, it renders premodern philosophical thought fascinating. As the abstract that appears on page iv informs us, “the book contains a critical edition of 27 chapters of the *Semeioseis gnomikai*, a collection of 120 essays by the Byzantine statesman and scholar Theodore Metochites (1270–1332).” This is the first critical edition of Metochites's essays (for the full contents see pp. xv and 4–19), replacing the nineteenth century edition by C. G. MÜLLER and Th. KIESSLING (*Theodori Metochitae Miscellanea philosophica et historica*. Leipzig 1821). This new edition will be completed in four volumes; it is an undertaking of the Metochites Project, a collaborative effort between the Department of Greek Studies, Philosophy and History of the University of Cyprus and the Department of Classical Studies of the Göteborg University. The Project was initiated in 1993 by Ole L. Smith and Panagiotis A. Agapitos; beyond the edition it includes studies on the *Semeioseis* within the wider context of Metochites's work and fourteenth century Byzantine culture.¹

¹ See Theodoros Metochites on Philosophic Irony and Greek History: *Miscellanea* 8 and 93. Edited with an introduction, translation, and notes by Panagiotis A. AGAPITOS, Karin HULT, and Ole L. SMITH. Nicosia and Göteborg 1996.

In this first volume of the *Semeioseis*, Karin HULT wrote the introduction and produced the edition and translation of the Greek text, while Börje BYDÉN has contributed an essay on “The Nature and Purpose of the *Semeioseis Gnomikai*: The Antithesis of Philosophy and Rhetoric” (pp. 245–288). Both scholars have performed an excellent work with deep knowledge of Metochites and the literary and philosophical tradition, of which he was part, and with an exceptional sense of how to accentuate details in editing, translating, interpreting. In the introduction, HULT deals with the date of the first publication (May 1326–May 1328) and character of the *Semeioseis* as well as with the principles of the present edition. She also presents the three manuscripts on which the edition is based: two early fourteenth century mss, Par. gr. 2003 (P), a copy supervised by Metochites’s student Nikephoros Gregoras shortly after Metochites’s death, and Marc. gr. 532 (M), a ms. perhaps once owned by Bessarion, and a sixteenth century copy of M (Scor. gr. 248 = E). As HULT convincingly argues P and M appear to be independent of one another but could have been copies of the same exemplar (for a diagram of the likely genealogy of the manuscript tradition see p. xxx; see also p. xxxii for a list of another seventeen mss., dating mostly in the sixteenth century, all copies of P). Both the edited Greek text and its translation read well. In all of her editorial and translation choices, HULT offers a valid interpretation of Metochites’s demanding Greek. The notes that accompany the text clarify issues of translation, point to sources and parallel texts, and demarcate seminal concepts, images, issues of both content and form. In all respects, edition and translation are models of how one should work with Byzantine philosophical texts.²

BYDÉN’s essay is of an equal value. With a careful reading of original texts, their meta-textual assumptions, and modern interpretations (primarily the brilliant reading of Metochites by Hans-Georg Beck³) BYDÉN defines the horizon of cultural and literary expectations that the *Semeioseis* evoked within the context of their original production. It is what BYDÉN calls the “communicative function of the work” (p. 245), how the work might have been perceived by its author and contemporary audience. BYDÉN argues that the *Semeioseis* is primarily a “literary project” (p. 288) or else a “formal solution to a material problem” (p. 260). The material problem is the inability or, rather, impossibility to produce *new* philosophical thought (an inability that Metochites theorizes in his *prooimion*) and the formal solution is Metochites’s *Semeioseis*: personal notes and memoranda, that (a) intentionally give the impression of being spontaneous, *i.e.* not intended for publication, (b) have a heavily moral message to convey, and, last but not least, (c) represent an “intellectual self-portrait” (cf. pp. 268 and 288) of their author. It is a literary form that anticipates Montaigne (p. 288) and consciously evokes the work of Plutarch and the style of Synesius, the two literary heroes of Metochites, as, of course, Metochites imagined them. *Semeioseis* are thus more a proposition of a philosophical style (a studied naturality, a “natural” eloquence) and of a philosophical mind, *i.e.* Metochites’s mind, rather than of a philosophical content.

One cannot agree more with BYDÉN’s reading of the *Semeioseis*, a reading which also HULT reflects in her edition, translation, and notes. Indeed, this reading highlights two of what one might consider persistent features of Byzantine philosophy: its rhetoricality and its emphasis on subjectivity. Rhetoricality is not so much the highly rhetorical form that the

² The *Index* of Greek words at the end of the book is a substantial bonus, since the Greek is supplied with a rendering in English; future translators of Byzantine philosophical texts will find both the translation and the *Index* very useful.

³ H.-G. BECK, Theodoros Metochites. Die Krise des byzantinischen Weltbildes im 14. Jahrhundert. Munich 1952.

Byzantines and Metochites, perhaps more than anyone else, attached to their philosophical thought; rather, it is the centrality that Byzantine thinkers afforded to the examination of language and style, *i.e.* their consciousness that language and rhetoric are fundamental in the construction of philosophy. Centuries before Nietzschean philosophy, the Byzantines recognized that aesthetics and truth are cognate categories; Metochites's *Semeioseis* are nothing but a materialization of that recognition.⁴ As for the emphasis on the subject it is an element of Metochites's writings that cannot escape one's notice. Not only did he perceive his work as a picture (*pinax*) of his mind (see pp. 264–265) but he also struggles throughout the essays of this volume to set the parameters for the philosopher's identity.⁵

This stress on rhetoricality and subjectivity that these essays bring to the fore may lead one to reflect further on a more general trend of Byzantine philosophy, namely a spirit of *aporia*, *i.e.* of conscious openness and skeptical attitude, that imbues Metochites's *Semeioseis*. While, for instance, Metochites affirms the importance of philosophical subjectivity (thinking and will, *noēsis* and *boulēsis*) he simultaneously acknowledges their insufficiency when language intervenes (*Semeiosis* 9); he also displays an ambivalent attitude toward pleasure (*Semeiosis* 6.3–4) and, above all, Metochites considers irony to be fundamental for the philosophical enterprise (*Semeiosis* 8).⁶ This aporetic philosophical stance may in fact be the argument of the *aporia* in Metochites's *prooimion*, which BYDÉN examines in his essay. To bring BYDÉN's argument one step further, the *Semeioseis* are perhaps not only a formal solution to a material problem, but also a *material* solution, in as much as they problematize the very relation between form and matter, self and tradition.

However that is, this edition, which is only worthy of praise, is a welcome contribution to the study of a philosophy rarely valued yet full of nuances and pleasant surprises, Byzantine philosophy.

Stratis Papaioannou

⁴ See e.g. how Hermogenes's *On the Method of Force* and Aristotle's *Metaphysics* are discussed side by side in one essay (*Semeiosis* 21: the point of the essay is that neither writer should have written such works because the products fall short of the promises made and expectations created), how Metochites highlights the rhetoricality of Plato's work (*Semeioseis* 24 and 25.1.6–7; cf. John Doxapatres [eleventh century], *Rhetorical Homilies On Aphthonius's Progymnasmata* 116.16f.; ed. RABE, *Prolegomenon Sylloge* 9), or how he acknowledges that everyone is *sophistical*, that everyone performs (*Semeiosis* 4.3.3–4).

⁵ These parameters are a series of interrelated forms of subjectivity: (a) cognitive (there is a recurrent emphasis on the importance of memory [*mnēmē*], the recording of *logismoi*, the treasure house of the *nous*), (b) moral (e.g. freedom, self-mastery, possession of self), and (c) authorial (Metochites insists on the author's will and consistency).

With respect to this, two minor notes on the translation are apposite here. When Metochites claims (5.1.4) that Aristotle is superb in *logismois* and *dianoia*, *logismois* indicates more the contents and processes of thinking rather than "arguments" as HULT translates. Similarly, it seems that in 4.5.2 Metochites asserts that truth *about oneself*, *i.e.* self-knowledge, (and not merely truth in HULT's rendering) is "the most arduous achievement."

⁶ With respect to the gap that separates discourse from thinking and Metochites's openness to pleasure it should be noted that these ideas appear early on in his thought as this is recorded in the *Ethikos* (see § 50 p. 212.21f. and § 25 p. 138.22f.; ed. I. D. POLEMES, Athens 1995).

Börje BYDÉN, Theodore Metochites' *Stoicheiosis Astronomike* and the Study of Natural Philosophy and Mathematics in Early Palaiologan Byzantium (*Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* 66). Göteborg, Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis 2003. XI, 547 S. ISBN 91-7346-459-7.

In this impressive volume, Dr. Bydén (B) offers the first critical edition of the first five chapters of the first book of *Stoicheiosis astronomike* of Theodore Metochites, as well as an extensive discussion of the philosophical arguments contained in this work as well as in other contemporary sources.

The first chapter attempts to answer such perennial questions as *What is Byzantine philosophy?*, *What is Byzantine philosophy like?* and so on. It is an appropriate introduction to a book investigating the philosophical background of the works of Metochites, which have not been examined till now under this perspective.

In the second chapter B. deals with the influence of Aristotle on Metochites. He argues that in most cases Metochites follows the neoplatonic interpretation of the Stagirite, a fact hardly surprising in Byzantium, while on the other hand the Palaiologan scholar does not refrain from criticising him more than was customarily allowed by the philosophical tradition to which he is indebted.

The third chapter examines several texts by contemporary authors dealing with natural philosophy, which throw fresh light upon the development of Metochites' thought. The most important of these is *Phlorentios* of Nikephoros Gregoras. The conclusions of this chapter are similar to those of the previous one. Most authors of the early Palaiologan period, though drawing heavily upon the physical treatises of Aristotle, in most cases do not hesitate to take a negative view of his achievements, arguing that he is inferior to Plato.

The revival of the mathematical sciences in the reign of Andronikos II is dealt with in the fourth chapter. Metochites, like many contemporary scholars, regards mathematical science as a way of approaching God, following the tradition of late antiquity, while, on the other hand, he is willing to draw on the achievements of Islamic science, especially in the field of astronomy. In the discussion of the opinions of Joseph the philosopher (p. 221), who compares mathematical sciences to a ladder leading to the divine, B would have done well to include a reference to the study of S. I. Kourouses, *Tò épistoláριον Γεωργίου Λακαπηνού – Ανδρονίκου Ζαρίδου και ὁ ἰατρὸς ἀκτουάριος Ἰωάννης Ζαχαρίας (Ἄθηνά. Σειρὰ διατριβῶν καὶ μελετημάτων* 21). Athens 1984–1988, 206–231, where this particular theory is examined in detail. I think that a short discussion of chapter 32 of *Logos* 10 and of *Poem* 2 of Metochites, both of which refer to the importance of the study of nature, though they do not make a clear distinction between natural and mathematical sciences, would also be useful (for a short presentation of those texts and a discussion of the influence of Philo Judaeus upon Metochites' cosmological speculations, see my edition of *Logos* 10, Θεόδωρος Μετοχίτης, *Ἠθικός ἢ Περί παιδείας*. Εἰσαγωγή, κριτική ἔκδοση, μετάφραση, σημειώσεις Ἰ. Δ. Πολέμης. Β' ἔκδοση, ἀναθεωρημένη, Athens 2002, 43*–88*). It may be noted that Palamas expressis verbis denies the usefulness of the scientific examination of the world as a way of coming nearer to God in his early works against his opponents.

The division of philosophy is the subject of the fourth chapter. Metochites is heavily indebted to Aristotle for the division of philosophy into a theoretical and a natural branch, as well as to Nicomachus of Gerasa as far as the division of mathematics is concerned. The author also examines the scepticism of Metochites, his theory of recollection and his evaluation of sense perception. One would expect a longer discussion of the influence of Maximus of Tyre upon Metochites. I have attempted to investigate the subject, some years ago, in

my article, Ἡ κατὰ νοῦν ζωή. Μία ἀπόπειρα ἐρμηνείας τῶν δοκιμῶν νά καί υ' τῶν *Γνωμικῶν Σημειώσεων* τοῦ Θεοδώρου Μετοχίτη. *Ἐπιστ. Ἐπετ. Φιλ. Σχολ. Ἀριστ. Πανεπ. Θεσσαλονίκης, Τεῦχος Τμήματος Φιλολογίας* 8 (1999) 185–206, arguing that when Metochites speaks favourably about the otherworldly journeys of Epimenides of Crete and Aristetas of Proconnesus, criticising, on the other hand, those who try to approach God without liberating their soul from their body, he may have in mind contemporary hesychasts, who were not willing to let their mind travel outside their body (such as Nicephoros the Hesychast of Mount Athos). It is noteworthy that Palamas castigates vehemently those contemporaries who dream of such spiritual journeys outside their bodies (*Triads*, Chrestou I, 397, 15–20).

The difficult texts of Metochites and other authors quoted in the footnotes are admirably translated in the main text. On p. 274, n. 25 the phrase of the Greek text ὡς τύχην ἀπίστοι φορῶν αἰὲν μάργως is translated: “as it happens with unfaithful people they carry along blindly forever.” I think that we have in front of us a peculiar (epic) type of the dative of the noun φορᾶ, not of the verb φέρω. See, for example, φορῆσι (Poem 15, 312, Featherstone 50), cf. also παλαρροῖσι (Poem 3, 96, Ševčenko-Featherstone 18), θυέλλῃσι (Poem 14, 188, Featherstone 28), ἀγορῆσι (Poem 15, 103, Featherstone 40). On the same page, n. 25, the phrase of the Greek text τὰ μυστήρια ἔχει σοφά, μὴ διζεύμενοι πως is rendered: “all the wisdom that the mysteries possess, without inquiring.” I think that the subject of the verb ἔχει is God (ὁ ἀναξ), not μυστήρια. A better translation: “not inquiring into the wise mysteries that God possesses.”

Some suggestions concerning the punctuation of the chapters of the *Stoicheiosis astronomike*, masterly edited by B., are offered below:

1, 1, 88–104 With the punctuation adopted (full stop after ἄρα, line 88) the infinitives προσεπικτάσθαι, προστιθέναι (lines 88–89) are left in the air. The full stop must be deleted, since both infinitives are governed by the verb οὐκ εἶχον (line 85), being parallel to the infinitive χρῆσθαι (line 85).

1, 1, 152–154 The full stop after ἐνταῦθα should be deleted. The accusative ὄντα (καί τὴν ἐν τούτοις διατριβὴν ἀνόνητον ὄντα μοι καὶ μάταιον πόνον καὶ πλάνον ὄντως ἀσχολίαν) is paratactically connected to the previous participle ὡς μηδὲν ἔχων ἔπειθ' ὅτι οὐδ' ἐνταῦθα. Metochites does in some cases connect in parataxis an absolute participle in the accusative to another member of the sentence, while one would have expected a genitive absolute (see the introduction of my second edition of *ΗΘΙΚΟΣ*, p. 157*).

1, 1, 358–366 The sentence ὅσος ὁ περὶ ταύτην ζῆλος is the object of the previous verb (τί τις ἄν) ἔρεῖ. Therefore the full stop after ἔρεῖ should be removed.

1, 1, 376–379 ἐδόκει δὴ ... ξυνεῖναι οἱ πάντι τοι πλεῖστον ἔχον σὺν ὀλίγοις, τοῦτο καὶ λόγων τῶν αὐτοῦ πάντα θαυμαστῶν ἀκοῦσθαι. It is clear that σὺν ὀλίγοις τοῦτο is used parenthetically. The comma which divides ὀλίγοις from τοῦτο should be deleted. σὺν ὀλίγοις τοῦτο means: “sharing this privilege with few other people” (i. e. to listen to the admirable speech of the emperor).

1, 1, 453–455 καὶ τοῦτ' ἐδόκει γε οὕτω πᾶσι, κάμοι γ' ἐδόκει τοῦτο πολὺ μάλιστα. τόδ' ἄλλοιον ἦν τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν πρᾶγμα. Τόδ' should be corrected to τὸ δ'. The peculiar Byzantine practice of treating δέ as an enclitic is responsible for this small mistake which occurs quite often in modern editions.

1, 1, 534 The comma after συλλογίζεσθαι should be omitted. The sentence ἃ χρόνοις ... συλλογίζεσθαι is connected to the pronoun ταῦτα (line 534), which recapitulates, so to speak the content of the previous sentence, being in its turn the object of the participle πορίζειν ... φιλοτιμούμενος (line 535), which is left in the air, if we adopt the punctuation of the editor.

1, 1, 558–564 The participle τριψας seems to qualify the verb ποιουμα (line 565). Therefore the comma after the word τέλος (line 563) should be omitted. Καί (line 564) means: “in addition to.”

1, 1, 779–783 μετρίαν ἀντιδιδούς ταύτην τὴν χάριν τῷ δεσπότῃ ... τῆς γ' ἐπιστημονικῆς ταύτης τῶν κατ' ἐμὲ λόγων καὶ τῆς σοφίας ἦντινα ἄρα. ταύτην δὴ τις ἂν μοι θεῖτο προσθήκης καὶ ἐπικτήσεως. With the punctuation adopted the meaning is rather obscure. The adjective ἐπιστημονικῆς is not connected to any noun. The comma, therefore, should be deleted, since the adjective in question qualifies the words προσθήκης καὶ ἐπικτήσεως. The phrase ἦντινα ἄρα ταύτην δὴ τις ἂν μοι θεῖτο is parenthetical.

1, 3, 53 The comma after οὐσίαν is to be deleted. Ταῦτα δὴ πάντα (line 53) summarises the meaning of the preceding nominatives (paragraph 4). The verb of this extremely long sentence is to be found in line 61 (ἀποδείκνυσι).

1, 5, 180–182 εὖ γὰρ δῆλον ὡς εἰ πάντα τῆς ἀνάγκης ταύτης τῶν ἀστέρων ἀπαραιτήτως αἰτιατὰ τὰ γινόμενα πάντως ἀνεμέσητα ὅπως ἄρ' ἔχοι, καὶ οὐ μὴ ποτέ τι κατ' ἀνθρώπους ἐπαινετόν. A comma after γινόμενα should be added, since the sentence beginning with πάντως is the apodosis of the conditional clause coming before it. The editor considers this sentence as conditional (see his paraphrase, on p. 378: “if everything that happens is a morally indifferent effect of astral necessity, *and* there is no cause for blame ... then all virtue and vice will be abolished”). However the sentence ἀρετὴ τε καὶ κακία πᾶσα ἐκποδὼν ἐσείτα (line 186–187) is connected in parataxis (τε) to a sentence coming previously, so it can not be the first apodosis.

The author states modestly that his book neglects the synchronic description of the early Palaiologan philosophy, limiting itself to a diachronic approach to its subject. I would rather disagree. The book is a major contribution not only to the study of Palaiologan philosophy but to an understanding of Byzantine philosophy as a whole.

Ioannis D. Polemis

Theodori Dexii opera omnia edidit Ioannis D. POLEMIS (*Corpus Christianorum – Series Graeca* 55). Turnhout, Brepols – Leuven, University Press 2003. CXXXVI, 390 S. ISBN 2-503-40551-7.

When in 1996 Dr Ioannis Polemis published his doctoral thesis on Theophanes of Nicaea¹ he gave a summary account of the theological controversies that were provoked by the writings of Gregory Palamas in 14th century Byzantium. He then wrote: “The philological study of the texts of this period is a necessary prerequisite for anyone who wishes to study the details of these controversies” (op. cit., p. 15). The present publication gives an admirable example of the sort of work that is essential, and fortunately it fits into a series of publications, such as the edition of Akindynos by Juan Nadal (CCSG 31), which have revolutionised our knowledge of the period. The figure of Theodore Dexios has a special interest because up to now he has been a vaguely known “minor” character, completely overshadowed by the likes of Barlaam, Nikephoras Gregoras, Akindynos and, of course, Palamas himself. But also because the odds were so heavily weighed against his ever stepping into the lime-light. His works have survived in only single manuscripts, and at

¹ I. D. POLEMIS, *Theophanes of Nicaea: His Life and Works* [WBS XX]. Vienna 1996.

least one of these was extremely difficult to decipher. They could be edited only by a scholar endowed with extraordinary patience and ingenuity, plus a very thorough knowledge of Greek.

The volume presented here contains three works, all the extant writings of Theodore (as far as one can judge): the so-called “Appellatio” (ἡ ἔκκλητος [“appeal”] is Dexios’ term for it) which fills 184 pages, two letters (25 and 85 pages long) to friends, and an explanation of Christ’s transfiguration, tentatively dubbed a “treatise” as it appears to be an independent work (15 pages).

The editor displays an unusually objective view of the works to which he has devoted an extraordinary amount of time and energy:

„Dexios is a typical Byzantine theologian of the period of decline. Thoroughly traditionalist and unwilling to go beyond the teachings of the Fathers, he represents a highly conservative spirit, along with many other theologians of the same period, who were quite unable to argue in an original manner and contented themselves with repeating long extracts from older texts, whose meaning they made more obscure than it really was, by offering excessively inventive interpretations, taking into account neither the personality of their respective author, nor their date and milieu.“ (Introduction, p. LXIII)

One must admit that these lengthy discussions of the nature of the light of the Transfiguration – was it created or uncreated? was it identical with Christ? was it something symbolic? – all argued with astonishing venom (so that anyone holding a different view is consigned to the hell of the heretics), seem misguided if not profitless to readers in the 21st century. However, this is the reality of Byzantium, and such discussions pervaded the thought-world stretching from the Emperor (John Kantakouzenos), through the synods of bishops, into the monasteries, and presumably into the whole teaching establishment. This is where one has to look to see how they thought and how they talked.

Dexios is clearly engaged in a struggle on two fronts: the whole of his “ekkletos” is a passionate attack on strictly Palamite teaching, viz. the affirmation (repeated *ad nauseam*) that *uncreated divine energy became light visible to human eyes, and could continue to show itself to certain individuals*, while being somehow an “inferior” divinity: τὸ ἐν τῷ Θαβωρίῳ λάμψαν φῶς, ἄκτιστον καὶ ἐνέργεια οὐσιώδης Θεοῦ App. 18, 56–57; cf. App. 6, 26–31; 16, 11–16; 17, 26–29; 19, 14–17; ... ἄκτιστον τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ ὑφεμένην καὶ διαφέρουσαν ἀπειράκις ἀπειρώς τῆς θείας οὐσίας 21, 3–7, and cf. 23, 23–25; 24, 112–115, 151–155; φῶς ἕτερον δογματίζειν ἄκτιστον, ὁρατὸν καὶ τοῖς σωματικοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ληπτὸν τῶν τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἄκρων καὶ νηπτικῶν 29, 17–19. But much more interesting, to this reader at least, was the battle being fought by Dexios on another front, this time not against the strict Palamites, but against a group of anti-Palamites, those who were prepared to affirm that the light of Tabor was something “created”. Paradoxically Dexios refuses to admit that one can affirm that the light was either uncreated or created. For him such affirmations go beyond anything to be found in previous teaching, and therefore were not appropriate. In so far as he is willing to give a positive account of the light emanating from the body of Christ he would claim that it is “Christ himself, the uncreated and the created” (αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστός, ὁ ἄκτιστος καὶ κτιστός) [Ep. II, 26, 68]; in other words, one cannot distinguish between Christ and his light.

However, points of view that can be resumed in a few lines are expounded by Dexios in torrents of complicated sentences that stretch out over endless pages. One may well be tempted to give up as the polysyllabic phrases succeed one another in sentences that run into 19 lines (App. 27, 64–83), 21 lines (App. 27, 84–105), 22 lines (App. 44, 46–68), 24 lines (App. 39, 35–59), each more complicated than the last. Negatives are piled on negatives

(App. 11, 38–39; 16, 18–19; Ep. II, 11, 73). The editor speaks highly of Dexios' "elegant" style. It is certainly true that one is in touch here with a man who has a complete mastery of Byzantine Greek, and the reader is made aware of the period to which this prose belongs by the editor's brave decision to adopt his author's spellings – running together words that in classical times would have been separated: hence such puzzling apparitions as *τομεχοιτουδε* [App. 69, 8], *τοαποτουδε* [App. 69, 132], *μηστιγε* [App. 31, 8], *τομεχοινυν* [App. 36, 8], *επολγα* [Ep. 1, 57]. Dexios loves to play on words and sounds: *την εισοχην και εξοχην* [App. 29, 12–13], *ο των τοιουτων αρρητων και επιρρητων δογματων πατη* [App. 45, 10–11], *ο τουτου συνηγορος και υπερηγορος* [App. 46, 50], to give just a few examples. He can write with great force, mixing biting sarcasm and irony, particularly in his criticism of the Emperor to whom the whole "appeal" is directed, and drawing liberally on a very wide range of classical authors (Aristophanes, Plato, Homer) and on an even wider range of Patristic authors. The editor's work in tracking down these numberless references is a *tour de force*. However, surely the over-all impression is of an extremely garrulous, repetitious old man? *Τι γαρ ει και συνεχως λεγοιτο ταυτα*; he protests [App. 41, 8–9] ... *δει γαρ τα αυτα πολλακις λεγειν περι των αυτων* [App. 69, 124–125]), and refers to himself as, *ως εν βαθει τῷ γηρα και παρημακότη τῷ χρόνῳ* [App. 61, 54–55].

If the strictly theological interest of these writings is less than their philological, even the latter must give precedence to their historical/sociological relevance. They enable one to form some idea of the complex intellectual substructure underpinning the surface narrative of synodal discussions and patriarchal *regestes*. Not that such writings float unattached above the realities of life: it was a dangerous business to hold different theological views: the threat of punishment – imprisonment or floggings – are in the background (App. 1, 36; 20, 48–49; Ep. I, 17, 15; Ep. II, 3, 120–121, 138–147). This may explain why uncertainty remains about the status of these writings: were they ever "published" in any meaningful sense? The only copies that have come down to us appear to be the author's personal belongings; this would explain his many handwritten corrections to the *ekkletois* (with bits of paper gummed over or added in), and the unfinished state of the second Letter (Ep. II). It remains an open question why Dexios did not add his name, nor indeed a title to the *ekkletois*, although a space has been left for this in the manuscript. There are intriguing references to other writings (App. 8, 2–3 *αρεκεθεντες ος βραχεον εν αλλοις ειρηκαμεν*, and 70, 29–30), but no other sources refer to these. His friends and contacts are rarely named, but they were clearly numerous. And the debates, and disagreements, between them appear to have been violent: *επειρωμην, ὅσον οἷός τ' ἦν, τοῦ κατ' αὐτῶν σφοδροτάτου μίσους ἀφιστῶν* [Ep. I, 3, 22–23]. Very striking, as the editor points out [Introduction LXIV–LXVI], is the blatant nature of the *Kaiserkritik*, Katakouzenos being called *υποκριτής* [App. 49, 102] and accused of assuming unwarranted powers to judge [App. 60, 58–64] and in danger of going to hell [App. 65, 5–7] – though given the uncertain succession of Emperors at this time such an attitude is less surprising. Palamas himself gets short shrift, *ὡς ἰοβόλον ὄφιν* [App. 64, 116], but a great number of key figures are mentioned *en passant*, like Glykas (under the name of Sikidites, Ep. II, 11, 23) and John Italos (the excellent Index of names makes it easy to track him down). Dexios has no time for the "Latins" (mentioned App. 3, 49, but also criticised anonymously for the *Filioque* [App. 1, 52–53]), and takes it for granted that the "Romans" are the inhabitants of Constantinople (App 17, 2; 63, 39; 68, 35).

This reviewer's only regret is that the obvious blemishes in the English of the Introduction were not ironed out beforehand: in general these are minor, and do not make the text unintelligible: p. XIV line 10 down, "what" for "which" [ditto p. XX line 13], and line 7 up, "back" is not needed; similarly p. XXXVIII last line, "up" is not needed; of course prepo-

sitions are notoriously difficult in English [e.g. p. LX line 11 up, read “At” instead of “On”; p. LXXVII note 199, line 1, “to” not needed], as is the use of the definite article [not needed p. LXVI line 12 up]; p. LXI line 4–5 “not nearer defined” would be clearer as “unspecified”. But on occasions the fault is more serious: p. XXV line 14 down, a word is missing, “testimony” perhaps?; p. LVII line 4 up, “advices” incorrect for “instructions”; p. LXXXI line 6 “sticks” for “the sticking”, and line 15 “In revenge”, presumably misled by the French, *En revanche*, when in English “on the other hand” would be correct; p. C, line 10 up, read “been” in place of “be”; p. CV, line 6 up, read “On the contrary” in place of “On the opposite”; p. CXVIII, line 11 up, read “former” in place of “formers”.

A curious point not mentioned by the editor concerns the phrase “inferior to human intelligence”, repeatedly attributed in the Epistles to Barlaam though in different versions: κατώτερον νοήσεως [Ep. I, 10, 16; Ep. II, 11, 60], χείρον νοήσεως [Ep. I, 10, 64, and Tract. I, 48], χείρον καὶ κατώτερον νοήσεως [Ep. II, 3, 42–43]. Dexios claims that a fuller explanation has been given in the *ekklelos* (καθάπερ ἐν τῇ συντεταγμένῃ ἡμῖν ἐκκλήτῳ δηλοῦται πλατύτερον) [Ep. II, 3, 44–45], but it seems to be missing in the only text of the *ekklelos* preserved to us. Perhaps some Latin phrase, e.g. “sub intelligentiam cadit” (to deny that the light of Tabor was “supra” human understanding) lies behind this phrase, which appears unintelligible in Greek.

A final word of praise for the excellent “Summaries” provided by this most conscientious of editors: some fifty pages provide a lucid guide through these complicated paragraphs, which will be appreciated even by those with some knowledge of Greek. And for his Greek text it is clear that the editor has been exceptionally well served by the back-up team of the *Series graeca* of the *Corpus Christianorum*. Appropriately this volume is dedicated to another great Greek scholar, who happens to be editor’s father. It is a major contribution to our knowledge of the thought and language of Byzantium in the fourteenth century.

Joseph A. Munitiz

Fra Giovanni di Fedanzola da Perugia, *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae*. Ms. Casanatense 3876. Edizione U. NICOLINI† – R. NELLI. Traduzione italiana e note S. DE SANDOLI† – E. ALLIATA. English translation by J. BOETTCHER. Coordinamento A. BARTOLI LANGELI – A. NICCACCI (*Studium Biblicum Franciscanum. Collectio Maior* 43). Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press 2003. 187 S., 75 S. Anhang, 2 Pläne.

Mittelalterliche Pilgerbeschreibungen des Heiligen Landes, besonders westlicher Provenienz, sind in reicher Zahl überliefert. Das vorhandene Textmaterial erweitert sich beständig, neben zusätzlichen, zuvor noch nicht wissenschaftlich ausgewerteten Handschriften bekannter Abhandlungen tauchen dabei zuweilen auch gänzlich neue, überhaupt unbekanntes Schriften auf. Zu letzteren ist die dem ersten Drittel des 14. Jahrhundert zuzurechnende *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae* des Franziskaners Giovanni di Fedanzola da Perugia zu zählen, die nun erstmalig der interessierten Öffentlichkeit zugänglich gemacht wurde. Der Text ist durch einen *Codex unicus* überliefert, den in Rom aufbewahrten *Casanatense* 3876. Es handelt sich um eine aus 74 Folios bestehende Pergamenthandschrift des 14. Jahrhunderts, die neben dem Text (1r–66v) einen Index aus der Hand des Autors enthält (67r–74v). Auf Folio 31v zeigt die *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae* eine Skizze von Nazareth, auf Folio 51v eine detailreiche Darstellung der Grabeskirche.

Giovanni di Fedanzola weist sich im Text als ein Angehöriger des Minoritenordens aus, geboren in Perugia, und als *minister Terrae Sanctae*. Aus anderen Quellen ist bekannt, daß er 1327 *inquisitor* in Rom gewesen ist, 1328 in Perugia und in ganz Umbrien. Im gleichen Jahr fuhr er nach Avignon, wo er schon bald die Gunst von Papst Johannes XXII. gewinnen konnte. Anfang der 30er Jahre des 14. Jahrhunderts brach er auf in das Heilige Land, das er intensiv bereiste, dies in Begleitung von lokalen, auch arabischsprachigen Führern und von Bibelgelehrten. Ungewöhnlich war sein langes Verweilen vor Ort, so hat er beispielsweise oftmals den Berg Tabor bestiegen und in den Grotten von Bethlehem die Messe gelesen.

Neben eigenen Beobachtungen hat Fedanzola die Informationen von verschiedenen literarischen Quellen in seinen Text einfließen lassen; besonders wichtig waren ihm das *Onomasticon* des Eusebios von Kaisareia, das in der lateinischen Übersetzung des Hieronymus verwendet wurde, der Brief 108 des Hieronymus, genannt *Vita Paulae*, und die beiden Werke des Flavius Josephus, die *Antiquitates iudaicae* und *De bello iudaico*. Seine Hauptquelle aber war der *Liber secretorum fidelium crucis* des Marino Sanudo, ein umfangreiches Kompendium der Geschichte und der Geographie des Heiligen Landes, das im Jahre 1321 der Kurie in Avignon übergeben worden ist und dort unserem Autor bekannt geworden sein dürfte. Die dem *Liber* beigegebene Karte der *Terra Sancta* enthält ein Koordinatenkreuz, das die genaue Lokalisierung einzelner Ortschaften in der Region erlaubt. Ungeachtet verschiedener Textentlehnungen hat Fedanzola dieses Koordinatenkreuz übernommen und zum Kern seines eigenen Werkes gemacht: er unterteilte das Heilige Land vom Libanon im Norden bis nach Beersheba im Süden, wenig südlich des Toten Meeres, in 83 Quadrate, von der Mittelmeerküste im Westen bis nach Arc und Petra im Osten in 28 Quadrate. Jede Lokalität war damit durch zwei Koordinaten festgelegt und in ihrer Lage genau bestimmt. Der Text der *Descriptio Terrae Sanctae* beginnt nach einer kurzen methodischen Einführung (1r–2r) mit der Beschreibung der Örtlichkeiten im äußersten Osten, um sich dann langsam zur Mittelmeerküste vorzuarbeiten, innerhalb der „Längengradkoordinaten“ erfolgt die Beschreibung von Nord nach Süd (2r–41v). Der zweite Hauptteil der Schrift enthält, wieder mit Bezug zum Koordinatenkreuz, eine Beschreibung des Weges von Nazareth über Jerusalem nach Bethlehem (41v–66v). In beiden Teilen finden sich geistliche und weltliche Themen miteinander kombiniert, neben umfangreichen Hinweisen auf die biblische Tradition, die mit den einzelnen Lokalitäten verbunden wird, enthält der Text auch naturkundliche Beobachtungen (beispielsweise der Bericht über die Krokodile unweit von Kaisareia Maritima, 39v–40r), eigene Überlegungen (neben der häufig verwendeten, innere Distanz zur Überlieferung ausdrückenden *dicitur*-Formel etwa die Erklärung, daß die volkswundlichen Vorstellungen über die Milchgrotte in Bethlehem nicht mit den strengen Bestimmungen des jüdischen Gesetzes in Einklang zu bringen und von daher abzulehnen sind, 65v–66v) sowie zahlreiche Erläuterungen und Korrekturen zu Ortsnamen, Lagen und Entfernungsangaben, die die enge Vertrautheit Fedanzolas mit der bereisten Region zum Ausdruck bringen.

Die hier vorgelegte, ansprechend gearbeitete *Editio princeps* dieses ebenso interessanten wie ungewöhnlichen Pilgertextes enthält neben dem lateinischen Text eine englische und eine italienische Übersetzung (1–124); letztere verweist auf den ausführlichen, in italienischer Sprache gehaltenen Kommentar, der in annähernd 450 Anmerkungen kaum einen Wunsch offen läßt (125–69). Alleine eine Auseinandersetzung mit der zeitgenössischen griechischsprachigen Heilig-Land-Literatur und ihrer so gänzlich anderen Art der Präsentation fehlt, doch ist dies ja nach wie vor ein genereller beklagenswerter Mangel der internationalen Palästina-kunde. Die Edition wird durch eine knappe Bibliographie (170–73), einen

Namens- (174–84) und einen Quellenindex (185–97) abgerundet, als einen besonderen Luxus präsentiert sie sodann in einem 75-seitigen Anhang ein Faksimile der gesamten Handschrift. Wieder einmal haben die so rührigen Franziskaner in Jerusalem ein bedeutendes Buch vorgelegt, das eine intensive Lektüre und Auseinandersetzung verdient.

Andreas Külzer

Io Notaio Nicola de Martoni. Il pellegrinaggio ai Luoghi Santi da Carinola a Gerusalemme 1394–1395 (Paris – Bibliothèque Nationale N. 6521 du Fonds Latin). A cura di Michele PICCIRILLO (*Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Collectio Maior* 42). Jerusalem 2003. VIII, 222 S.

Am 17. Juni 1394 brach der aus dem süditalienischen Carinola stammende Notar Nicola de Martoni von Gaeta aus auf, um in Begleitung mehrerer Gefolgsleute die *Terra Sancta* zu bereisen. Über Malta führte ihn die Route in die Gewässer vor der Peloponnes, dann durch die Ägäis nach Alexandria, das am 25. Juli des Jahres erreicht wurde. Die Reisenden zogen nach Kairo, von dort aus weiter zum Sinai, wo sie am 27. August eintrafen. Nach einer kurzen Zeit des Verweilens zog man über Gaza und Bethlehem nach Jerusalem; Nicola de Martoni folgte hier der „klassischen Besichtigungsrouten“ und besuchte neben den Heiligen Stätten vor Ort auch einige Lokalitäten bis zum Jordan hin, zog dann aber schon nach Jaffa am Mittelmeer (28. Oktober). Gleich vielen byzantinischen Reisenden verzichtete er auf einen Besuch Galiläas, legte dafür aber am Hafen von Beirut an. Von hier aus zogen die Reisenden über Zypern, die kleinasiatische Südküste und die griechischen Gewässer zurück nach Italien, am 27. März 1395 traf Nicola de Martoni dann wieder in Carinola ein. Nur wenige Monate später war der Bericht seiner Erlebnisse vollendet. Die erste Edition dieses *Liber peregrinationis ad Loca Sancta* betitelten Textes, der infolge verschiedener profaner Kapitel wie *De habitu Iudaeorum*, *De vino et fructibus* oder *De habitu mulierum* eher als eine Reisebeschreibung denn als ein Pilgerbericht zu werten ist, erfolgte bereits Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts durch L. Le Grand (*Relation de pèlerinage à Jérusalem de Nicola de Martoni notaire italien [1394–1395]*. *Revue de l'Orient latin* 3 [1895] 577–669). Dank dieser soliden Studie wurde die Reisebeschreibung, die zu den anspruchsvollsten westlichen Gattungsvertretern des 14. Jahrhunderts gehört und beispielsweise auch für Zypern und das südliche Griechenland zahlreiche interessante Informationen tradiert, der wissenschaftlichen Welt bekannt. Die hier enthaltenen Beobachtungen, mehr noch aber die verschiedenen Hinweise, die Nicola de Martoni auf die Präsenz der Franziskaner im Heiligen Land gegeben hat, dürften dazu geführt haben, daß der Text nach gut einhundert Jahren im Rahmen des *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum* einer erneuten Veröffentlichung gewürdigt wurde: das hier anzuzeigende, von M. Piccirillo herausgegebene Buch beginnt mit einer kurzen Einführung „Io Notaio Nicola“ (1–11), unterbrochen von acht nicht in die Seitenzählung eingebundenen Tafeln mit farbigen Abbildungen, danach folgt der in drei Hauptteile unterteilte lateinische Text des *Liber peregrinationis ad Loca Sancta* (1394–1395) samt einer italienischen Übersetzung: I. *A Carinola Jerusalem usque* (14–75), II. *Jerusalem* (76–97), III. *A Jerusalem Carinola usque* (98–169). Es schließen sich einige knappe Erläuterungen an, die freilich kaum über grundlegendste Informationen und mehrere eher willkürlich ausgewählte Literaturangaben hinausgehen (171–85). Nach einem abermaligen teilweise sehr touristisch anmutenden Abbildungsteil von 16 nicht in die Zählung eingebundenen Seiten folgen als eine Art Hintergrundinformation drei kleinere Abhandlungen: „Relazione del pellegrin-

naggio a Gerusalemme di Nicola de Martoni Notaio italiano (1394–95)“, dies eine Übersetzung der entsprechenden, oben genannten französischen Ausführungen von L. Le Grand (185–90), sodann „La navigazione nel Mediterraneo nel XIV secolo“ von F. Cardini (191–209) und „Il Regno di Napoli e la situazione politica nel XIV secolo“ von G. Ligato (210–18). Ein knapper Ortsindex (219–22) beschließt die Abhandlung, die ungeachtet ihrer gediegenen äußeren Gestaltung bedauerlicherweise einige Wünsche offen läßt. Unübersehbar ist das Buch für ein weiteres Publikum geschrieben, das mit der Reisebeschreibung des Nicola de Martoni unterhalten und für die Schönheiten des Heiligen Landes begeistert werden soll. Für ein Publikum freilich, das auch geneigt ist, für diesen eher schlichten Zweck den relativ hoch anmutenden Verkaufspreis von 60 US \$ zu entrichten. Wissenschaftlichen Ansprüchen aber, und dies ist ein ungewöhnliches Urteil für Schriften, die unter der Obhut der Franziskaner in Jerusalem entstanden sind, wissenschaftlichen Ansprüchen vermag das Buch nicht zu genügen, wie schon der schmalbrüstige Kommentarteil vor Augen führt. Wesentlicher aber noch für diese Wertung ist der völlige Verzicht auf die Folioangabe der die Reisebeschreibung überliefernden Pariser Handschrift innerhalb des lateinischen Textes, und dies, obgleich das Manuskript sogar im Titel des Buches aufgeführt ist. Auch einen textkritischen Apparat sucht man vergebens. Dies sind unverständliche Mängel, die die Verwertbarkeit der vorliegenden Abhandlung entscheidend einschränken und den wissenschaftlich motivierten Leser wieder auf die alte Edition von L. Le Grand zurückführen.

Andreas Külzer

Anna ANASTASIADÉ-SYMEONIDÉ, Αντίστροφο Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής. Thessalonike, Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών 2002. κγ', 745 S. ISBN 960-231-097-9.

Das *Rückläufige Wörterbuch der neugriechischen Sprache* ist das Ergebnis eines Projekts, das 1996 seinen Anfang nahm und nach sechs Jahren vollendet wurde. Anna Anastasiade-Symeonide und ihre Mitarbeiterinnen haben das bisher reichste Lexikon der neugriechischen Sprache erstellt, das rund 180.000 Lemmata zählt, darunter viele Neologismen, literarische und gelehrte Wörter und andere, die bisher noch nicht lexikalisiert worden sind. Das Lexikon beinhaltet aber nicht nur Wörter, sondern auch hypolexische und hyperlexische Einheiten. Ein nicht geringes Problem bei der Erstellung der Lemmata bereiteten die Unregelmäßigkeiten der neugriechischen Orthographie, z. B. die Doppelformen (τραίνο-τρένο) und die Lehnwörter (γίββωνας-γίβωνας), die anhand eines einheitlichen, nach den Prinzipien von M. Triandafyllidis erstellten Systems (S. 10⁹) lexikalisiert wurden. Das Lexikon wendet sich in erster Linie an Linguisten, die sich mit der Flexions- und Derivationsmorphologie bzw. der Wortbildung beschäftigen, aber auch an alle, die sich für die Orthographie oder die Dichtung interessieren. Es ist ein unbestritten großer Vorteil des Werkes, dass es auch in elektronischer Form zugänglich ist (www.komvos.edu.gr).

Auf ein Vorwort und eine ausführliche, mit Bibliographie versehene Einleitung, in der die Methodik der Erstellung der Lemmata erläutert wird, folgt das eigentliche Lexikon: die rückläufig alphabetisierten Lemmata mit der Markierung der grammatischen Kategorie. Als Leitfaden der Lexikalisierung gilt das Prinzip, ein Wort nur einmal, in seiner Hauptform, aufzunehmen und nur diejenigen Formen als selbständige Lemmata hinzuzufügen, die nach den grammatischen Regeln nicht erschließbar sind. Die orthographischen Doppelformen bleiben weitgehend außer Betracht.

Eine andere Frage war, was überhaupt aus dem unendlichen Reichtum der Sprache ins Lexikon aufgenommen werden sollte: Hier war es das Ziel, diejenigen Elemente des neugriechischen Wortschatzes aufzunehmen, die von den meisten Sprechern angenommen werden und in neugriechischen Texten mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit vorkommen können. Es ist aber nicht ganz klar, nach welchem Prinzip die hyperlexischen Einheiten aufgenommen wurden und nach welchen Kriterien ihnen die grammatischen Kategorien zugewiesen wurden. Der Ausdruck γίνομαι Λούης (S. 398) trägt z. B. die grammatische Markierung P:OE (Verb: Indikativ Präsens), was allerdings nur das Verb γίνομαι betrifft, nicht aber den ganzen Ausdruck. Der Ausdruck τελώ υπό επιτροπεία (S. 28) hingegen trägt die Markierung Εκφρ (Ausdruck). Ein anderes Beispiel wäre της άρννας το νερό (S. 342), markiert als O:oe (Substantiv, Neutrum Singular) und σκεύος εκλογής (S. 399), markiert als Εκφρ (Ausdruck).

In der Einführung wird festgelegt, dass bei den Lehnwörtern, deren Genus Schwankungen aufweist, beide Genera markiert werden, z. B. πάριωνσον O:0e, oe (Substantiv: Femininum Singular, Neutrum Singular). Das ist aber nicht immer der Fall: φραπέ wird z. B. nur als Maskulinum bezeichnet (O:ae), obwohl dieses Wort meistens als Neutrum gebraucht wird. Im Fall der Verben werden nur Modus und Tempus konsequent bezeichnet, Numerus und Person nur selten, Genus gar nicht. Was die Lexikalisierung der Numeralia anbelangt, können wir feststellen, dass ein Teil fehlt: unter zehn fehlen μηδέν, δύο und επτά/εφτά.

Das Lexikon ist die Modernisierung und Vervollständigung des rückläufigen Wörterbuches von G. KOURMOULIS (Αντίστοιχόν Λεξικόν της Νέας Ελληνικής, Athen 1967), ergänzt durch die Markierung der grammatischen Kategorie nach französischem Vorbild (B. COURTOIS, Dictionnaire grammatical inverse du français, 1990). Was aus dem Lexikon von Kourmoulis nicht übernommen wurde, ist die Statistik: die Häufigkeit der wortschließenden Buchstabenkombinationen (die letzten zwei bzw. drei Buchstaben) wird bei Kourmoulis sowohl bei den Lemmata als auch im Anhang angezeigt und auch mit anderen Sprachen verglichen. Neuerungen sind die Lexikalisierung von hyper- und hypolexischen Einheiten sowie die Markierung der grammatischen Kategorie bei allen Lemmata.

Kurz zusammengefasst: Trotz kleinerer Inkonsequenzen ist das Lexikon von Anna Anastasiadi-Simeonidi mit den Erstlexikalisierungen und den anderen Neuerungen ein sehr nützliches Nachschlagewerk für alle Neogräzisten.

Dora E. Solti

Heimo DOLENZ, Damous-el-Karita. Die österreichisch-tunesischen Ausgrabungen der Jahre 1996 und 1997 im Saalbau und der Memoria des Pilgerheiligtumes Damous-el-Karita in Karthago. Mit Beiträgen von Hans R. Baldus, Doris Feichtinger, Elke Koser, Claudia Kunze, Karin Schmidt, Notburg Schütz, Andrew G. Tindle und Olwen Williams-Thorpe (*Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut Sonder-schriften* 35). Wien, Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut 2001. 253 S., 98 Fig., 142 Abb., 5 Beil. ISBN 3-900305-32-3.

Der vorliegende Band behandelt die Ergebnisse zweier Grabungskampagnen (1996 und 1997), die unter der Ägide des Institut National du Patrimoine, Tunis in der Rotunde („Rotonde souterraine“) und im Saalbau südwestlich der Basilika Damous-el-Karita am Rande des antiken Karthago durchgeführt worden sind.

Dabei handelte es sich in erster Linie um eine „archäologische Nachsuche“ (S. 9), da

die Anlage bereits im Jahr 1912 freigelegt und 1930 teilweise restauriert worden ist, ohne daß ein Grabungsbericht vorgelegt worden wäre. So wird im vorliegenden Werk auch der Altbefund dokumentiert, der die Voraussetzung für die Durchführung neuer, stratigraphischer Sondagen war. Der Band gliedert sich in vier Abschnitte: In Kapitel I (S. 11–19) wird eine Übersicht über den Forschungsstand und die Quellenlage zur Basilika Damous-el-Karita gegeben, in Kapitel II (S. 21–39), für das H. Dolenz, D. Feichtinger und N. Schütz gemeinsam verantwortlich zeichnen, der Baubefund des dreischiffigen Saalbaus um neue Grabungsergebnisse erweitert, während die Ausführungen in Kapitel III (S. 41–104) das Kernstück der Untersuchungen behandeln: den Zentralbau der Memoria, die dem Pilgerheiligtum in justinianischer Zeit hinzugefügt worden ist. Kapitel IV (S. 105–135) enthält Beiträge zum Fundmaterial (Keramik, Marmor-, Glas-, Mosaik-, Stuck-, Inschriftenfragmente) des Gesamtkomplexes sowie zur Ausstattung (Bauplastik, Mosaiken, Wandmalerei) der Rotunde (K. Schmidt und C. Kunze; S. 105–120), zu den Fundmünzen (H. R. Baldus; S. 121–125), erweitert um die Analyse spätantiker Mörtelproben aus Karthago (E. Koser; S. 127–132) sowie um die petrographische Analyse einer Säule aus dem Inneren der Rotunde (O. Williams-Thorpe und A. G. Tindle; S. 133–135 auf Englisch). Eine englische und eine französische Zusammenfassung vervollständigen die Publikation.

Die Basilika Damous-el-Karia (damous arab. ‚Tunnel‘, Karita von *caritas* abgeleitet) liegt am Nordostrand der Colonia Iulia Carthago, an der Ausfallstraße, dem *cardo maximus extraurbanus*, der nach Megara (La Marsa) führte. Ein immer sichtbar gebliebener tonnenüberwölbter Annexbau war vermutlich toponym. Entdeckt und in der Folge ausgegraben wurde die Basilika 1878 von A.-L. Delattre. Deren Freilegung folgte 1930 eine umfassende Instandsetzung der Ruinenanlage. Im Zuge derer wurden aus umherliegendem Material und einem täuschend antiken Mörtel Mauern bis in 1.5 m Höhe aufgeführt: „Der heute noch aufgehende Baubestand der Damous-el-Karita ist als imposantes Skelett zu bezeichnen, ja nicht einmal dies, es ist das über weite Teile erst 1930 wiedererbaute Skelett dieser Kirchenanlage“ (S. 12).

Neue Grabungen im Bereich südlich der Südapsis der Kirche bestätigten die Annahme, nach der die Kirche über einer ab dem 2. Jh. n. Chr. bestehenden Nekropole erbaut wurde, die sich aus dem Privatfriedhof um eine *villa suburbana* entwickelt hatte: In der Sondage (SO) 128 wurden z. T. verputzte Mauern und eine Zisterne angetroffen, die den 1882 auf dem Areal der Basilika freigelegten Fund eines kaiserzeitlichen Venusmosaiks, das eine Wohnbebauung erschließen ließ, ergänzen. Einen *terminus post quem* für die Errichtung der Basilika bietet ein Halbcentenionalis ([Mü 1] Constantius' II; 355/61 n. Chr.), der unter dem Südapsisfundament in einem sonst fundleeren Lehmstratum auf dem Mörtelstrich zwischen zwei Mauern der Vorgängerbebauung gefunden worden ist. Dadurch kann der bisher aus Grabinschriften gewonnene Datierungsansatz der Kirche an das Ende des 4. Jhs. (vgl. L. ENNABLI, Carthage. Une métropole chrétienne du IV^e à la fin du VII^e siècle. Paris 1997) untermauert werden.

Durch die Gegenüberstellung des Befundes aus den Grabungen der Jahre 1996 und 1997 mit den antiken Überlieferungen zur karthagischen *Basilica Fausti* gelingt es dem Autor überzeugend, eine Identifikation derselben mit der Kirche von Damous-el-Karita plausibel zu machen. Argumentationspunkte sind dabei die Existenz einer heidnischen Nekropole unter der Basilika, die mit der Erwähnung der *areae Fausti* in Quellen des 3. und der ersten Hälfte des 4. Jhs. n. Chr. übereinstimmt und auch Mitgliedern der christlichen Gemeinde Karthagos als Begräbnisplatz offenstand, ferner die zahlreichen Bestattungen im Kirchenbereich, die eine Memorialkirche mit *ad sanctos*-Bestattungen charakterisieren, was in einem Schreiben der Synode an Papst Johannes II. 535 n. Chr. in den Worten „*Haec basilica Fau-*

sti apud nos dicitur multis martyrum corporibus insignita“ zum Ausdruck kommt. Das extreme Bauvolumen der elfschiffigen Basilika Damous-el-Karita legt zudem die Vermutung nahe, daß es sich hier um die eine der beiden orthodox gebliebenen Kirchen Karthagos (*Basilicae Fausti und Novarum*) handelt, in denen die tausenden Kriegsgefangenen interniert wurden, die Geiserich nach der Eroberung Roms 455 nach Karthago hatte bringen lassen, darunter auch Valentinians III, Witwe Eudoxia mit ihren Kindern. Da die Damous-el-Karita als einzige der Basiliken Karthagos ein Baptisterium aufweist, war sie wahrscheinlich auch Schauplatz des Wunders, bei dem der blinde Felix durch Benetzung seiner Augen mit dem von Bischof Eugenius gesegneten Weihwasser (Victor de Vita, *Historia persecutionis africanae* II, XVII 48; CSEL VII 43) sein Sehvermögen wiedererlangte.

Die überlieferte Abhaltung von zwei Plenarkonzilien in den Jahren 419 und 421 *in secretario basilicae Fausti* läßt sich mit dem dreischiffigen 1200 m² großen, apsidenlosen Saalbau in Zusammenhang bringen, der sich im Süden der Basilika befindet.

Dieser ist Gegenstand des zweiten Kapitels. 1997 wurden kleinflächige Sondierungen vorgenommen, deren Ziel es war, Aufschlüsse über Grundriß, Bauphasen und Funktion des Gebäudes zu gewinnen. Die Fundmünzen aus dem Planierungshorizont der Errichtungsphase stammen fast ausschließlich aus dem 4. Jh. n. Chr., wobei die Schlußmünze (Mü 21) ein abgegriffener Centenionalis der valentinianischen Dynastie ist, der zwischen 364 und 378 n. Chr. zu datieren ist. Eine Entstehung des Saalbaus in der oben genannten Form nicht vor dem Ende des 4. bzw. am Anfang des 5. Jhs. wird auch durch die vorläufige Auswertung der Keramikfunde nahegelegt. Eine ältere Bebauung war auf dem Areal nicht festzustellen. Nach der justinianischen Rückeroberung Nordafrikas 533 n. Chr. erfuhr der Saalbau eine tiefgreifende Umgestaltung durch die Adaption der östlichen Raumflucht A-J als Totencubacula („Familienmausoleum“), durch den Anbau von Räumen an das westliche Nebenschiff sowie die Errichtung eines Atrium im Norden des Gebäudes mit einem Propylon am Eingang (Bauphase II). Der Durchbruch der Südapsis der Basilika ermöglichte außerdem ab jetzt nicht nur eine Kommunikation zwischen den einzelnen Gebäuden des Pilgerheiligtums, sondern verursachte auch eine Umorientierung der Basilika nach Osten. Zur selben Zeit entstand durch dieselbe Bauhütte die Memoria im Süden der Anlage. Eine dritte Bauphase des Saalbaus in nachjustinianischer Zeit umfaßte eine Anhebung des Bodenniveaus um 1.5 m und eine Erweiterung des Atriumhofes nach Norden. Hier wurde auch ein Sockel errichtet, der ein freistehendes Monument (Kreuz? *Proscenelation*?) getragen haben könnte. Die Bauphasen II und III sind relativchronologisch nicht einzuordnen; das Keramikspektrum aus dem Überlagerungsschutt reicht vom 3. bis ins 7. Jh. n. Chr., allerdings ohne islamische Keramikfunde, die Schlußmünze aus dem Mörtelgrießschutt über den Mosaikbodenfragmenten im Saalbau ist ein 20-Nummien-Stück Kaiser Constans' II., das zwischen 652 und 662 datiert.

Ein architektonisches Unikum ist der zweigeschossige unterirdische Rundbau (sog. ‚Rotonde souterraine‘), der als justinianische Erweiterung der Pilgerstätte entstand. Das Erdgeschoß ist vom Typus eines östlichen Zentralbaumartyriums und als solches zum ersten Mal in Nordafrika vertreten; über zwei Stiegenhäuser erreichte man das Untergeschoß, das die Form einer Hallenkrypta besitzt. Ein halbkreisförmiges Atrium, eine Sigma, ist der Rotunde im Westen vorgelagert und komplettiert das Erscheinungsbild dieses ‚mixtum compositum‘.

Seit seiner Entdeckung durch A.-L. Delattre 1912 wurde der Rundbau mit den unterschiedlichsten Interpretationen belegt: Er wurde als unterirdisches Baptisterium, Mausoleum mit sekundär angesetzten Stiegenhäusern, Mausoleum im Scheitel einer Umgangsbasilika oder als Hagiasma gedeutet. R. Krautheimer war der einzige, der es als Zentralbau-

martyrium ansprach, nicht ohne den Hinweis, daß diese Bauten in Nordafrika ansonsten unbekannt seien.

Bis zu den österreichisch-tunesischen Untersuchungen war die Rotunde trotz Nachgrabungen und Vermessungen nie Gegenstand einer detailgetreuen Dokumentation gewesen.

Bei der 1997 im Ostteil der Rotunde durchgeführten Grabung kamen Reste einer römischen Nekropole ans Tageslicht, deren Bauten vor Errichtung der Memoria geschleift worden waren.

Die Sigma, die zuvor als Teil einer großen Umgangsbasilika gedeutet worden war (A. LÉZINE, *Architecture romaine d'Afrique*, Tunis 1963, 83), konnte im Zuge der Bauuntersuchung 1996 als halbkreisförmige, aus der Achse des Zentralbaus verschobene Portikus bestätigt werden, die gleichzeitig mit der Rotunde errichtet worden war. Als Zeitpunkt ist der Umbau (Bauphase II) des Saalbaus mit dem *terminus post quem* von 523 n. Chr. heranzuziehen, da die Südmauer M 103 des Saalbaus mit der Westmauer M 19 der Sigma bindet. Obwohl hauptsächlich Schuttmassen aus den Grabungen von 1912 entfernt wurden, war die Planierschicht zwischen den Mauern M 103 und M 17 ungestört und enthielt Keramik aus der zweiten Hälfte des 6. Jhs. n. Chr. sowie ein 5-Nummienstück des Mauricius Tiberius (Mü 29), das für den Umbau (Bauphase II) der Sigma einen *terminus post quem* von 584/87 n. Chr. angibt. Die Sigma diente nicht nur als Prunkfassade der Memoria, sondern fungierte auch als Sammelplatz der Pilgerströme, die von hier in die unterirdische Hallenkrypta geleitet werden sollten. Ein unmittelbarer Vorläufer war das halbkreisförmige Atrium am Nordende der Basilika von Damous-el-Karita, als solches ein spätestens auf die mittlere Kaiserzeit zurückgehender Bautypus zur Gestaltung öffentlicher Plätze und Sakralbauten, gerade in Nordafrika. In Kombination mit einem Zentralbau östlicher Prägung geht die Sigma vermutlich auf einen konstantinopolitanischen Bautypus des 5. Jh. n. Chr. in der Konzeption ‚Straße-Sigma-Zentralbau‘ (S. 64) zurück, wobei der Lausospalast nördlich des Hippodroms die meisten Übereinstimmungen aufweist.

Anders als bei der Sigma waren bei den beiden Stiegenhäusern, die in die Hallenkrypta führten, keine antiken Umbau- oder Restaurierungsmaßnahmen festzustellen. Der mit Caementitium überkuppelte Raum mit kreisförmigem Grundriß besaß einen Radius von 4.6 m, die 16 0.3 m tiefen Nischen nicht mitgerechnet. Den dazwischenliegenden Wandflächen waren 16 Säulen attischer Ordnung vorgeblendet, deren obere Abschlüsse Zweizonenkapitelle aus prokonnesischem Marmor mit Tierprotomen bildeten, die konstantinopolitanische Importe sind. Das Fragment eines blau-goldenen Glasmosaiks auf einem Schalungsrohr der Kuppel, das 1996 im Grabungsschutt der Krypta gefunden worden ist, zeugt von einer prächtigen Ausstattung, an den Wänden fand sich weißer Verputz. Die Böden waren, wie auch die Podeste der Stiegenhäuser, mit Tessellaten geschmückt. Die kreisförmige Steinplattensetzung inmitten des Kryptabodens, die Anlaß zur Deutung des Baus als Baptisterium gegeben hatte (A. DELATTRE, *Fouilles de Damous el Karita. Comptes Rendues Séances Acad. Inscript.* 1912, 476; S. BOYADJIEV, *La Rotonde Souterraine de Damous-el-Karita à Carthage à la lumière de nouvelles données*, in: *Atti del IX Congresso internazionale di archeologia cristiana II*, Roma 1978, 124), ist als Stylobat eines Ziboriums zu deuten, zumal jegliche wasserführende Installationen in der Rotunde fehlen. Vielmehr wird es sich um eine Vorrichtung zur Ausstellung einer Reliquie oder eines Kenotaph gehandelt haben, die durch Ausstattungsmaterialien und Lichtführung der Hallenkrypta für die Pilger inszeniert wurden. In den Worten des Autors wurde hier eine künstliche Grotte (*Spelaion*) geschaffen, die als „mystisch konzipierte Erlebniswelt“ eine Inszenierung für die Gläubigen bot. Die Datierung der Krypta ins späte 5. bzw. frühe 6. Jh. n. Chr. geht aus der Fundkeramik aus dem Ringmauerfundament der Nische C sowie aus dem Fundamentmör-

tel der Nische B hervor. Bauplastik und architekturgeschichtliche Einordnung sprechen jedenfalls für eine Entstehung nach der justinianischen Wiedereroberung Nordafrikas.

Die Rekonstruktion des oberirdischen Teiles der Memoria muß aufgrund des massiven nachantiken Steinraubes spekulativ bleiben (S. 85); fest steht, daß nur dieser Gebäudeteil – anders als die Hallenkrypta – Ende des 6. bzw. Anfang des 7. Jhs. einen grundlegenden Umbau erfuhr. Aus der justinianischen Errichtungszeit stammt ein annähernd quadratischer Baukörper. Beim Umbau wurde ihm ein ringförmiges Ambulatorium eingeschrieben, an der Ostseite eine Apsis mit Fenstern geschaffen. Als vergleichbare architektonische Lösungen bieten sich Zentralbauten des Ostens an; die Funktion des Oberbaus der Hallenkrypta bestand wohl in der Ansichtigkeit der im Zentrum des unterirdischen Raumes ausgestellten Reliquie für möglichst viele Gläubige durch ein Opaion in der Kuppel der Krypta.

Hinsichtlich der Mauerbautechnik und Qualität der Ausführung können Unter- und Erdgeschoß der Memoria klar voneinander getrennt werden: Während die Mauern der Rotunde aus sorgfältig errichtetem *opus quadratum* bestehen, sind das tragende Mauerwerk des quadratischen Umfassungsbaus sowie die Ringmauer der oberen Gebäudeteile durch in unregelmäßigen Abständen zwischen Bruchsteinmauerwerk eingefügte Orthostaten gegliedert (*opus africanum*), bei beiden Techniken wurden z. T. Spolien verwendet. Erst beim Anbau der Annexräume an das Erdgeschoß in Bauphase II wurden Mauern in *opus pseudospicatum* errichtet, die sorgfältig an die bestehenden *opus quadratum*-Mauern gefügt wurden.

Besonders der dekorative Aufwand und die auf Zirkulation von Besucherströmen abzielende Planung der Rotunde machen deutlich, daß mit ihrer Errichtung nach der justinianischen Wiedereroberung Nordafrikas das seit dem ausgehenden 4. bzw. beginnenden 5. Jh. bestehende Pilgerheiligtum von Damous-el-Karita einen wesentlichen Impuls erfuhr. Die Baumaßnahmen fügen sich in das Bild der Aufwertung und Neubelebung alter christlicher Pilgerstätten im Sinne der justinianischen Kirchenbaupolitik ebenso wie in das der „byzantinischen Renaissance“ Karthagos, im Zuge derer kaum Neubauten errichtet, sondern bestehende Sakralanlagen erneuert und erweitert wurden. Der Neubau der Memoria verrät den Einfluß östlicher Konstruktionsprinzipien, der den „westlich geprägten Typenschatz der karthagisch-christlichen Sakrallandschaft“ (S. 103) wesentlich bereicherte. In diesem Zusammenhang ist die Vermutung des Autors, daß die Memoria zur Verehrung der Reliquien eines aus der östlichen Reichshälfte stammenden Heiligen gedient hatte, besonders im Hinblick auf die erwünschte Orientalisierung der örtlichen Heiligenverehrung, höchst plausibel. Von Interesse ist der in diesem Zusammenhang geäußerte Vorschlag, es habe sich bei der Rotunde um das Martyrium des Hl. Julian von Antiochia gehandelt, der in Nordafrika einige Verehrungsplätze besaß und dessen Martyrium der Hl. Gregor von Agrigent in der zweiten Hälfte des 7. Jhs. in Karthago besuchte.

Der ausführliche archäologisch-bauhistorische Teil des vorliegenden Werkes wird durch die Analyse der beweglichen Funde und des Ausstattungsmaterials des Komplexes in Kapitel IV in idealer Weise ergänzt. Die katalogartige Aufschlüsselung und knappe Auswertung ermöglichen dem Leser ein präzises Nachschlagen parallel zur Textlektüre. Die naturwissenschaftlichen Ausführungen zu den Mörtelproben aus der Rotunde und der petrologischen Herkunftsbestimmung runden den Eindruck dieses Werkes ab, das nicht nur durch die vorbildliche Strukturierung und klare Präsentation komplexer baulicher Zusammenhänge und grabungswissenschaftlicher Maßnahmen besticht, wobei dem Autor seine darstellerische Begabung zugute kommt. Vorliegender Band wird der religions- und kunstgeschichtlich bedeutenden Stellung des Pilgerheiligtums von Damous-el-Karita und im besonderen seiner Memoria in höchstem Maße gerecht.

Veronika Scheibelreiter

Corpus of the Byzantine Wall-Paintings of Greece under the direction of Manolis CHATZIDAKIS. The Island of Kythera, Manolis CHATZIDAKIS – Ioanna BITHA, translated by David TURNER and David HARDY. Athen, Academy of Athens, Research Centre for Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art (under the auspices of the Union Académique Internationale) 2003. 332 S. mit 342 Photos (größtenteils in Farbe), 72 Plänen und 31 Zeichnungen. 4°. ISBN 960-404-029-4.

A chapter on architecture mentions that most of the ca. 40 churches included in this corpus are single-aisled, covered with a barrel-vault. Later structures, e.g. a second aisle and a narthex, were added in most of them. A variation of this single-aisled church, hardly found elsewhere, has a dome and is called “Kythera type.” There are four examples of cross-in-square domed churches. Triple-apsed sanctuaries are encountered in all the above types of churches, and double-apsed sanctuaries even in single-aisled churches.

The iconographic programme of the single-aisled barrel-vaulted churches reveals a peculiarity by placing the bust of the saint to whom the church is dedicated in the half-dome of the apse, instead of Christ or the Virgin; this has been considered as a pre-iconoclastic feature appearing in martyria. Among the co-officiating bishops in the half-cylinder of the apse, usually painted with well-known church fathers, one also encounters less important and rarely depicted ones, e.g. Leo of Catania; their appearance is explained by donor preferences and local custom. Another peculiarity is that bishops are occasionally depicted in frontal instead of three-quarters view in this part of the sanctuary even in the 13th century (the three-quarters view was established in Byzantium after the eleventh century). All these exceptions are also found outside Kythera. The two of the four cross-in-square domed churches preserve only a part of the initial decoration and only speculations can be made for their original iconographic programme. One of the Kythera-type churches (no. 12) has a large dome with three concentric zones below the figure of the Christ Pantokrator; the widest of them shows standing prophets and the narrower ones are painted with busts of angels, apostles and other saints in medallions.

The chapter titled *The Corpus of the Churches* is naturally the largest one. The churches are numbered 1–37 and are strangely listed, not chronologically or topographically, but in alphabetical order according to the saint’s name; but even this order of sequence is disturbed in this English translation of the original edition in Greek, as a result of which the churches dedicated to St. Demetrius come after those of St. George. For every church a ground plan is drawn, on which also the various building phases are recorded. A perspective plan shows the preserved wall-paintings; the various layers are denoted differently, with the darkest corresponding to the oldest layer. A few illustrations from every church are reproduced, mostly in colour. The captions to the illustrations denote the part of the church in which the paintings appear, the phase to which they belong, and the title of the subject, but no date is mentioned; one must search in the relevant text to find it. It will be more practical if the date will be included in the captions to the illustrations in the next publications of the Corpus.

The text for every church includes various rubrics. In the rubric *The Building*, the architectural type, dimensions, masonry, state of preservation, restoration work and the date are given. The rubric *The Wall-Paintings* is naturally the largest one: The various layers are recorded, as well as the state of preservation and the years in which conservation works took place. The iconographic programme is separately recorded for every layer of paintings,

according to the various parts of the church, i.e., sanctuary, templon, nave, and narthex, each one divided into its minor parts. Next to the Byzantine paintings, dating between ca. 1000 A.D. and the 15th century, the Post-byzantine ones are also mentioned here. The dedicatory inscriptions are transcribed, and the date of the paintings is given for every layer. A bibliography is given for every church and bibliographical abbreviations on pp. 47–49. A general and an iconographical index are included, while the history of the island is written by Chryssa Maltezou in an appendix under the title *From Byzantine to Venetian Kythera*. Addenda and corrigenda to the Greek edition are mentioned on p. 46.

One may mention the following rare iconographical subjects, although not all of them are in a good state of preservation: Christ Calming the Storm (church no. 2), Mid-Pentecost (no. 3), the Mission of the Apostles (nos. 2–3), scenes from the Life of St. John the Baptist (no. 18), the Melismos (nos. 6, 10 and 16), the Man of Sorrows (*Akra tapeinosis*) (no. 6), Christ *Antiphonites* (no. 2), Christ the Just Judge (*Ho Dikaios Krites*) (no. 37), the Virgin *Akatamachetos* (no. 2), the Virgin [*Kardio*]/*vastazousa* (nos. 3 and 21), the Virgin *Kyriotissa* (no. 3), the saints Martyrios (no. 2), Notarios (no. 18), Theodosios the Coenobiarch (no. 36), the local saint Theodore of Kythera (nos. 29 and 36), the female saints Agape, Elpis, Euphemia (no. 36), Kallinike (no. 15) and Theodote (no. 1), the Jerusalem Cross (no. 2), and Donor portraits (see index on p. 329).

Most of the paintings show a provincial style, similar to that found in Mani, Crete and other provinces. Of interest are certainly the remnants of the paintings dated to ca. 1000 in the church of St Andrew at Livadi (church no. 2, figs. 1 and 6–13), and the better than average quality paintings dated to the 13th century in the same church.

The realization of this high-quality publication presupposes a vast amount of money, judging by the large number of persons who worked for this corpus and the several expeditions to the island, which took place since 1982, all of them mentioned in the introduction by the two authors. One should like to see similar efforts for more important Byzantine monuments, like those at Mistra.

Ioannis Spatharakis

Christopher WALTER, *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition*. Aldershot, Ashgate 2003. XVI, 317 S., 71 Abb. ISBN 1-84014-694-X.

In this richly documented book, the fruit of over three decades of study, Christopher Walter surveys the role played by military saints in the culture of Byzantium. It should perhaps have been more accurately titled “The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Tradition and Art,” rather than “Art and Tradition,” because the author includes some saints of whom no representations are known in Byzantine art (e.g. St. Athanasius of Clysma, p. 247; St. Eusignius, p. 251), and he devotes a number of pages (e.g. pp. 94, 148–9, 163) to discussions of the historicity of individual saints, an issue of more relevance to hagiographers than to historians of art. Nevertheless, art historians and hagiographers alike will find Christopher Walter’s book a mine of information, valuable especially for its careful consideration of the views of earlier scholars, some of whom he critiques with a wry, but gentle humour (for example, his observation on p. 150: “Sometimes it seems that those who study these *Passions* [of the martyrs] are almost as inventive as the hagiographers themselves”).

The first chapter of the book summarizes the Old Testament and New Testament antecedents to the development of the Byzantine concept of military saints, before moving on to a general account of the origins of the cult of the martyrs. Then follows a discussion

of the attitudes towards the military on the part of patristic writers, both before and after Constantine. The final section of this chapter, on "the contribution of popular piety to the conception of the warrior saint," includes a discussion of amulets and of "Holy Riders" such as Solomon as a source for Byzantine rider saints; however, there is no treatment of the portrayals of Christian warriors on early Byzantine clothing.

The next three chapters constitute a catalogue of Byzantine soldier saints, with successive "entries" devoted to each. In every entry the author considers the literary and the artistic portrayals of the saint, the spread of his cult, and his function in Byzantine society. The catalogue opens with the two Theodores, Tiron and Stratelates. The author concludes that Theodore Tiron is first recorded in the late fourth century, while Theodore Stratelates is first attested in the early tenth-century *Laudatio* of Nicetas of Paphlagonia. The latter saint came to prominence in the tenth century by aiding John I Tzimisces in battle against the Scythians. In this entry the author introduces the issue of "twinning", a problem that he returns to several times in the book.

A long entry follows on St. Demetrius of Thessaloniki, which considers the saint's cult primarily in its military aspects, and his later adoption among the Slavs. The author concludes that Demetrius "was venerated as a martyr, rather than as a warrior saint, until the end of the ninth century," but from the thirteenth century onwards he acquired a more military character as a protector of cities and churches, which contributed to his expansion among the Slavs.

Next come entries on Saints Procopius, Mercurius, and George, including a brief consideration of the biographical cycles of St. George, already catalogued in the doctoral thesis of Temily MARK-WEINER (*Narrative Cycles of the Life of St. George in Byzantine Art*, New York 1977). The subsequent pages, on Saints Sergius and Bacchus, point out that in comparison to St. George and the two Theodores, these saints became relatively less popular in Byzantine art after iconoclasm, although they were comparatively well represented before. This entry also gives the author an opportunity to critique John Boswell's use of Byzantine portrayals of Saints Sergius and Bacchus in his book *The Marriage of Likeness. Same-Sex Unions in Pre-Modern Europe* (London 1995).

The parade continues with St. Eustathius, with particular reference to his vision of Christ's image caught between the antlers of a stag and to his martyrdom in a brazen bull, and with St. Kyrion and the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia, who are discussed somewhat briefly. Among the other entries on the major military saints may be noted the discussion of St. Menas, which disentangles the iconography of St. Menas of Egypt, who had his shrine at Abu Mena, and St. Menas Kallikelados. In post-iconoclastic art, there was a distinct portrait type for each major saint, but the author shows that the Byzantine artists themselves occasionally got them confused. The entry on St. Artemios shows that, even though his healing shrine at Constantinople had ceased to function by the twelfth century, he acquired a new lease of life as one of the echelon of warrior saints. Finally, in the entry on St. Martin of Tours, of whom only one portrait survives in all of Byzantine art, in the *Menologium* of Basil II, the author touches briefly on the differences between the Byzantine and the Western conceptions of warrior saints.

There are numerous entries on less important warrior saints, such as the cynocephalus St. Christopher and St. Polyuctus, who, in spite of his splendid church in Constantinople, was infrequently depicted in Byzantine art and never acquired an established portrait type.

In his concluding chapter, the author sets out to answer the question: "What is a Byzantine warrior saint?" After discussing the increasing introduction of religious practices

into the Byzantine army in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and the program of the Pigeon house at Çavuşin which associates images of the Forty Martyrs with John Tzimisces and his general Melia, the author concludes that the special function of the warrior saints at this time was to lead the Byzantines to victory. Later, this function was modified, as the heavenly soldiers were called upon to provide protection from the Turkish conquerors of Byzantium; their role became apotropaic rather than offensive.

Throughout the book, certain themes recur: the “great respect for soldiers” which the author sees as “an important factor in the development of the cult of warrior saints”; the importance of Old Testament antecedents for the militarism of the Byzantines, who saw themselves as the chosen successors to the Israelites; and the progressive militarization of the soldier saints, who at first tended to be shown in civilian dress, but then after the tenth century increasingly acquired military costumes and weaponry. One of the main purposes of the book is to provide an explanation for the creation by the Byzantines of an echelon of soldier saints in military costume, who took their place along with other categories of saints, such as bishops, monks, or doctors, in the programs of Byzantine churches. The author explains the progressive militarization of the Byzantine warrior saints in terms of historical developments – they were needed as leaders and allies in battle during the years of military expansion in the tenth century, and as protectors against the enemies of Byzantium in the years of its decline. But it could be maintained that the Byzantines had always needed protection from their foreign enemies, both before and after the tenth century. Another explanation for the more general practice of costuming soldier saints as soldiers after the tenth century could be semiotic. The military attire was part of the general system which enabled the Byzantines, after the tenth century, to distinguish between the portraits of individual saints. The range of variables among facial features, as depicted by Byzantine artists, was relatively limited, consisting essentially of the shape of the head and the styles of the hair and beard. Consequently, the first step in categorizing the saints was to distinguish them by costume. In this way, saints with very similar facial features, such as George and Panteleimon, could readily be distinguished by their costumes and attributes, one as a soldier, and the other as a doctor. Thus, the phenomenon of the militarization of the portraits of Byzantine warrior saints could be linked not so much to military tendencies in Byzantine society, but rather to an increasing desire on the part of Byzantine viewers to be able to recognise the individual saints to whom they prayed.

In addition to the role of the warrior saints as protectors against the enemies of Byzantium, the author also rightly draws attention to their function in the after life, as protectors of souls. For example, he observes of the Forty Martyrs of Sebasteia: “it was believed that they could help the deceased to be received clemently when they presented themselves for judgement.” It is also possible, however, that the soldier saints could have been enlisted as protectors of the deceased’s mortal remains and of the tomb that contained them from desecration, especially when, as in the case of the Parekklesion of the Kariye Camii, the painted warriors flank the graves (see R. OUSTERHOUT, *The Art of the Kariye Camii*, London 2002, 78). In such contexts, the frescoes of military saints could have played a role in churches similar to the one played in the secular sphere by the carvings of sword-wielding warriors who guard the locks on some Byzantine caskets.

Whatever the different interpretations that may be drawn from the evidence, there is no doubt that Christopher Walter has provided a treasury of insights and information. His book will provide an indispensable point of departure for all future discussions of the role and significance of warrior saints both in iconography and in Byzantine culture in general.

Henry Maguire

Barbara ZIMMERMANN, *Die Wiener Genesis im Rahmen der antiken Buchmalerei. Ikonographie, Darstellung, Illustrationsverfahren und Aussageintention (Spätantike – frühes Christentum – Byzanz. Kunst im ersten Jahrtausend. Reihe B: Studien und Perspektiven 13)*. Wiesbaden, Reichert 2003. VIII, 253 S., 8 Farbtaf., 64 Schwarzweißtaf. ISBN 3-89500-319-0.

This important and useful study is derived, with extensive reworking, from the author's doctoral dissertation (1996). It is clearly and carefully written, and the volume is generally well produced.¹ Its title and subtitle indicate the ambitious nature of the undertaking. The study is divided into two unequal parts. Part A (pp. 1–53) is a survey of 'antike Buchmalerei' (the term 'antike' is problematic – see below). Part B (pp. 54–236) focuses on the Vienna Genesis itself, with at its heart a miniature-by-miniature discussion of the manuscript's forty-eight surviving pages (24 folios) on pp. 68–185, accompanied by ill. 1–48 (the first eight of these are full pages of the manuscript in colour; the remainder reproduce only the lower half of the page with the miniature in black and white).

Z. begins (pp. 1–7) by briefly setting out the history of the study of early book illumination, with particular emphasis on the contribution of K. WEITZMANN and some of his methodological tenets (e.g. 'picture criticism'), as well as some of the critiques of his conclusions and methods (including those by this reviewer). The following survey is divided into short sections, and the evidence for 'ancient' book illumination is briefly presented. Some scientific texts of various sorts definitely had images in the pre-codex era as witnessed by a few survivals and some literary evidence. Late antique and medieval copies of such texts preserved some aspects of such images, while adding new elements. It is important to recognise (p. 24) that all illustrated 'scientific' manuscript codices of late antiquity are luxury books ('Prachthandschriften'). Z. observes that K. WEITZMANN considered the addition of human figures and backgrounds, effectively turning diagrams into miniatures, to have been a byzantine/medieval development, but according to Z. this process might already have begun in late antiquity, in connection with the rise of the codex (p. 25). Z. does not observe, however, that K. WEITZMANN did not recognise 'Spätantike' (whether as concept or period) in his theoretical work, and that his notion of 'antike' should be understood as referring to 'ancient' or 'classical' ideas and artefacts (i.e. products of classical antiquity; see also his study: *Ancient Book Illumination*, Cambridge Mass. 1959).

A short chapter (pp. 26–34) then surveys illustrated literary works of non-biblical content. This brings together famous manuscripts (Vatican Vergil, Roman Vergil, Ambrosiana Iliad), with non-manuscript sources, such as the Homeric beakers and Tabula Odyssea. Here the work of A. GEYER is especially useful to Z.² Rather than hypothesising lost textual models in roll form already supplied with images for these cycles, Z. seeks explanations specific to the different witnesses, noting, for example, text/image inconsistencies that find an explanation in the nature of the image in the book in codex form.

Two short chapters (pp. 35–50) survey the illustrated biblical material, and some possible medieval descendants. The extent to which the selection of non-manuscript material

¹ But it is surprising that images of the Rossano Gospels are rephotographed from MUÑOZ [not MUNOZ: pp. 252–3], *Codice Purpureo*. There are other surprising errors, e.g. read GAMILLSCHEG (not 'GAMILLSCHEGG' p. V), Lieselotte (not 'Liselotte') KÖTZSCHE, p. II.

² *Die Genese narrativer Buchillustration. Der Miniaturenzyklus zur Aeneis im Vergilius Vaticanus*. Frankfurt/Main 1989.

is dominated by WEITZMANN's work, and his theory of pictorial recensions, is apparent: Z. considers the Synagogue at Dura, St Peter's and St Paul's, S. Maria Maggiore (all at Rome), the Samson floor at Misis, the David plates, and the Via Latina catacomb. In the survey of biblical manuscripts the elasticity of Z.'s concept of the chronology of 'Spätantike' is indicated by the inclusion of the Patmos Job (MS 171), and the Codex Amiatinus (before 716). If the Codex Amiatinus is (chronologically) a work of late antiquity, so also must be, for example, the Lindisfarne Gospels. At best this confuses our conception of the term. In general in this section Z. makes little effort to go beyond the survey of R. SÖRRIES.³

In the section on medieval manuscripts derived from a possible late antique archetype, Z. includes the Tournon Bibles, the Octateuchs, Joshua rotulus, and Bible of Niketas. The inclusion of the Bible of Niketas is surprising: the codicological and palaeographical arguments against supposing a lost model dated 535 for these manuscripts have not been contradicted, so far as I am aware.⁴ Meantime work on both the Octateuchs and the Joshua Roll continues.⁵

A brief chapter (pp. 51–53) summarises the results of the survey. The proposal that there existed in 'die Antike' illustrated rotuli with narrative images is not supported by either archaeological or literary evidence. It is not possible to follow WEITZMANN in reconstructing a gradual development from a diagrammatic image attached to its text ('papyrus style') to a textless framed full-page miniature. There could have been illustrated rotuli in late antiquity (cf. Misis, Joshua rotulus). The picture cycles of late-antique manuscripts had neither predecessors nor followers (in their own period) so that the notion of pictorial recensions in late antiquity is not borne out. Pictorial recensions later became a feature of carolingian and byzantine book production. The variety of systems of illustration in late antiquity is an indication of the novelty of narrative book illumination.

Turning to the Vienna Genesis itself, Z. prefaces her detailed study of the images with a survey of the literature, and brief analyses of the material state of the manuscript, the question of text and image, the much debated number of artists, and the context of the Vienna Genesis among late antique purple codices. It is a surprising misapprehension that she includes the Cotton Genesis amongst the 'codices purpurei' (p. 66).

The discussion of each of the forty-eight images follows a similar repeated pattern. The text of the page in question is cited in the translation by O. MAZAL (Kommentar zur Wiener Genesis, Frankfurt/Main 1983), and any peculiarities are noted ('Text'). The image is described ('Bild'). The various interpretations are discussed ('Deutungen'). Iconographic parallels are considered ('Vergleiche'). Finally the material is drawn together under the heading 'Resultate'. The recent study of K. WEITZMANN and M. BERNABÒ with its miniature-by-miniature discussion of the Octateuchs (The Byzantine Octateuchs, Illustrations in the Manuscripts of the Septuagint 2. 2 vols. Princeton 1999) helps to focus the discussion of possible extra-biblical sources. The approach of K. KOGMAN-APPEL is also helpful (Bible II-

³ Christlich-antike Buchmalerei im Überblick, 2 vols. Wiesbaden 1993.

⁴ See J. LOWDEN, An Alternative Interpretation of the Manuscripts of Niketas. *Byz* 53 (1983) 559–74.

⁵ See, for example, O. KRESTEN, Biblisches Geschehen und byzantinische Kunst. Der Josua-Rotulus der Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana (Cod. Vat. Palat. gr. 431) und die illuminierten byzantinischen Okateuche. Vortrag am 4. Februar 2002 in der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (www.badw.de/VortraegeReden/Kresten/Kresten). J. LOWDEN, Oktateuchillustration, *RbK* (forthcoming).

illustration and the Jewish Tradition, in J. WILLIAMS (ed.), *Imaging the Early Medieval Bible*. University Park 1999, 61–96). This dense and closely argued section demands the sort of detailed analysis not possible in a review.

The outcome of the miniature-by-miniature discussion is then evaluated at length and in detail (pp. 186–219). Z. identifies four important conclusions. The Vienna Genesis is isolated; its images are narrative in character; some elements not related to the biblical text are also found in other Genesis recensions; in general the images are closely related to the manuscript's excerpted text. The editing of the text and its illustration concentrates on key words and scenes. The proposal that extra-biblical elements in the images are to be explained by reference to illustrated exegetical texts, rabbinic or other, is methodologically false, and overlooks the narrative character of the miniatures. Only for the dense Joseph narrative (where the text is much less abbreviated and frequently runs from one page to the next, rather than forming a discrete one-page unit) is the possibility of an illustrated non-biblical *Historia Iosephi*, or perhaps an illustrated manuscript of homilies of Ephraim Syrus, not to be excluded (pp. 194–5). In general the images are constructed from visual formulae, of which those for speech or conversation are the most notable. Z. proposes an important role for modelbooks (pp. 200–1), but this seems to me unnecessary.⁶ A wide range of compositional formulae are employed, with varying layouts. The nearest compositional parallel is found not among late antique manuscripts but in the nave mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore.

The question of the number of artists is reconsidered (pp. 220–3), and the 'at least eleven' of O. MAZAL, is reduced to 'at most six'. It is unfortunate, however, in a discussion of attribution in which codicological structure plays a key role, that the images in quire 7 (i.e. pict. 21–28) are here cited five times as 'pict. 20–28' (pp. 222–3). From artistic hands the author moves on to the question of production (pp. 224–30). Z. surveys evidence for scription, scribes and 'miniaturists' in the period. Supposing that the Vienna Genesis is a product of the same atelier as the Rossano Gospels, she interestingly compares the relationship between them to that between the nave and triumphal arch mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore.

Finally Z. returns in a short conclusion (pp. 231–6) to the question of pictorial narrative. She here retreats from the idea that an illustrated Joseph text was a direct model for the Vienna Genesis, preferring the concept of 'influence'. Continuous pictorial narrative, characteristic of the Vienna Genesis, was not derived from lost picture rolls. Narrative illustration in late antiquity was not limited to the medium of illuminated manuscripts.

The author's most important contribution is to attempt to explain the miniatures of the Vienna Genesis not in terms of an assembly of pictorial elements copied from lost sources – biblical, extra-biblical, rabbinical, and so forth – but as a sixth-century response to the demands and possibilities of a specific commission with a particular mise-en-page and a specially edited text.⁷ It may come as a surprise to those not familiar with the field,

⁶ I considered the question of artists' knowledge of visual formulae in J. LOWDEN, 'The Transmission of "Visual Knowledge" Through Illuminated Manuscripts: Approaches and Conjectures', in: *Literacy, Education, and Manuscript Transmission in Byzantium and Beyond*, *The Medieval Mediterranean* 42, eds. Catherine HOLMES and Judith WARING, Leiden 2002, 59–80, ills. 1–13.

⁷ Cf. LOWDEN, *Octateuchs*. 'The first task ... must be to see the miniatures in relation to their adjacent texts' (p. 110). 'Analysis of the relation between the illustrations and the adjacent texts in both the [Joshua] Roll and Octateuchs was found to be crucial' (p. 115).

but there is still much basic work of this sort to be done even on a topic as much studied as the Vienna Genesis. Z's study is thus a major and welcome contribution to the early history of book illumination.

John Lowden

Panayotis L. VOCOTOPOULOS, *Byzantine Illuminated Manuscripts of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem*. Translated from the Greek by Deborah M. WHITEHOUSE. Athen – Jerusalem, Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem 2002. 197 S. mit 90 Farbtaf. 4°. ISBN 960-87160-1-2.

This splendid book presents 33, i.e. the most important illuminated manuscripts from the various libraries belonging to the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem, in which ca. 1900 manuscripts are kept. The author, an expert in, among other fields, Byzantine illuminated manuscripts, sketches in his introduction the history of the Patriarchate from its establishment in 451, after a decree of the 4th Ecumenical Synod, to the present day. He also addresses, next to specialist, students and a wide readership by including a glossary and explaining which kind of manuscripts were illustrated in Byzantium. At the same time he informs us which of these kinds have survived in the Patriarchate.

The catalogue which follows the introduction is arranged according to the content of the manuscripts. The New Testament manuscripts (among which Tetraevangelia, Lectionaries and a Praxapostolos and Apocalypse manuscript) are followed by those of the Old Testament (Psalms and a Book of Job). Various manuscripts come next, to wit, a Liturgical scroll, Homilies of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, a Synaxarion for the months September to February, the story of Barlaam and Ioasaph and a unique illustrated Grammar manuscript. The manuscripts in the first two, large rubrics are arranged chronologically. Each entry of manuscripts contains a description, the provenance, bibliography and commentary. The best miniatures of each manuscript have been chosen and reproduced in superb colours, as a rule in the actual size.

The oldest illuminated manuscript published here is the Lectionary Megali Panagia 1, dated 1060 A.D. It is painted in a good provincial style with a miniature showing the donor at the feet of the Virgin as intercessor, and another one depicting the four evangelists standing in an unusual iconography (Figs. 1–2). The 12th-century Tetraevangelion Taphou 56, is decorated with portraits of the four evangelists, also in a provincial style, which are of iconographic interest because Peter and Paul are shown dictating the gospels to Mark and Luke (Fig. 8).

Of a much better artistic quality is the writing evangelist Luke in the Praxapostolos and Apocalypse manuscript Taphou 38 (Fig. 15). Luke and St. Paul, the latter in the Icon Museum at Recklinghausen, are painted on inserted folia in this 11th-century manuscript. Vokotopoulos follows a date for the miniatures in the late 12th century, but I should date them to the middle of the 11th century on the basis of the fine style seen, e.g., in the garments. The tiny Tetraevangelion Taphou 60, painted with four evangelist portraits, Canon Tables and other aniconic decoration in a fine mid-11th-century style, is dated by the author of this book to the beginning of the thirteenth century (Figs. 20–23). He followed advice on the script, which I, as an art historian, would never do. Quite impressive are the figures of the standing apostles James, Peter and Jude in their monumentality, painted in the New Testament Taphou 37 in the Paleologan style of the middle of the thirteenth century

(Figs. 24–25). They are correctly compared by the author to the figures painted in Sopotani, the quality of which, however, is much higher.

The Psalter Taphou 53 with its 34 small illustrations was dated in the past on the basis of the calculation of the indiction for the year 1053 A.D. on fol. 227^{vo}, but Vokotopoulos, following the doubts of Lake and Dufrenne, ascribes to it a date in the first half of the twelfth century (Fig. 29). The 'aristocratic' Psalter Taphou 51, one of the several manuscripts mutilated by Uspenskij, contains beautiful headpieces and a miniature showing the Repentance of David, painted in the second half of the 13th century (Figs. 32–33). It clearly reflects the style and iconography of the 10th-century Paris Psalter from the Macedonian Renaissance.

The Book of Job, Taphou 5, is prolifically illustrated with 116 miniatures in the beginning of the 14th century (Figs. 79–95). The captions to the illustrations are accompanied here by the relevant passages from the Book of Job and a short description of the miniature, while the captions to the previous illustrations of Vokotopoulos' book mention only the signature of the manuscript, without even a short title of the picture.

Stavrou 109 is the finest among the few liturgical scrolls preserved. It contains the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and was painted in Constantinople in ca. 1070 A.D., possibly for a church dedicated to St. George; this saint unexpectedly appears in the headpiece next to the authors of liturgies, St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil of Caesarea. It is embellished with an exquisite plaited border for the text and tiny miniatures showing scenes and saints on the margins; they are of great interest from the stylistic and iconographic point of view. The author devoted 16 plates to this splendid manuscript and accompanied them with adequate commentary (Figs. 43–58).

Another masterpiece in the library of the Patriarchate is Taphou 14, one of the most prolifically illustrated manuscripts of the 16 liturgical homilies of St. Gregory of Nazianzus. It contains 93 miniatures, painted in the fine style of the second half of the 11th century and revealing feast scenes and other unusual subjects. To the latter belong scenes of rural and sea activities of the people; they decorate to the letter the end of the Homily on the New Sunday (Thomas' Sunday), when St. Gregory poetically speaks of the Spring (Figs. 62–64). The Homily on the Nativity is attributed to John of Euboea and is enriched with relevant apocryphal stories; the latter are illustrated with the sanctuary of Athena, King Cyrus, the journey of the Magi, and scenes from the Old Testament book of the Judges (Figs. 67–78). The mythological references in four of St. Gregory's Homilies are explained by Pseudo-Nonnos and decorated with scenes like Actaeon, Chiron teaching Achilles how to shoot with a bow, King Midas, Kronos swallowing his children, the birth of Dionysos from Zeus' thigh, the oracle of Dodona, and the worship of Pan and that of Egyptian gods (Figs. 80–86).

Worthy of mentioning is the manuscript Taphou 52, a Grammar attributed to Theodore Prodromos and decorated with beautiful headpieces and initials possibly for the *sebastokratorissa* Irene Comnena in the middle of the 12th century (Figs. 89–90).

In conclusion, this book is professionally written and supplied with adequate commentary and bibliography, and is prolifically illustrated in a manner in which one would wish to see in publications of more manuscript collections.

Ioannis Spatharakis

Georgios DEMETROKALLES, Γεράκι. Οἱ τοιχογραφίες τῶν ναῶν τοῦ κάστρου – Géraiki (Laconie). Les peintures murales des églises de Castro. Athen 2001. 197 S. m. 362 Abb.

G. Demetrokalles, der vor kurzem gestorben ist, präsentiert in dieser Monographie die Wandmalereien der neun Kirchen, die sich in der mittelalterlichen Festung (Kastron) von Geraki befinden. Das Buch gilt als Fortsetzung seiner früheren Studie, geschrieben gemeinsam mit N. ΜΟΥΤΣΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Γεράκι. Οἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ οἰκισμοῦ. Thessalonike 1981. Es enthält einen Forschungsüberblick (S. 9–10), die Studie der neun Kirchen der Festung (S. 11–181), Schlussfolgerungen (S. 182–188), einen ikonographischen Index (S. 190–2) und ausgewählte Bibliographie (S. 193–6).

D. bespricht jede Kirche einzeln, gibt die entsprechende Literatur an, erwähnt die vom Denkmalschutzamt übernommenen Renovierungen oder Restaurierungen und verbessert die bisher publizierten architektonischen Pläne. Das Verdienst der Arbeit liegt in der Gesamtpräsentation der Monumente mit ihren hochqualitativen und bisher wenig erforschten Kunstschatzen, aber auch in der detaillierten architektonischen, ikonographischen und stilistischen Analyse jeder Kirche und der umfangreichen Literatur, der D. allerdings kritisch gegenüber steht. Zur Behandlung der Monumente sei einiges angemerkt:

Bei der Besprechung der Paraskeve-Kirche (S. 20–40) vertritt D. die Meinung (S. 32 und 39), dass das Gesicht der hl. Paraskeve (Abb. 55 oben links) jenem der Gottesmutter (Abb. 222 rechts) in der Nische der Eleousa-Kirche (1431) ähnelt, und verwendet dieses Element als chronologischen Ansatz. Unseres Erachtens haben die beiden Gesichter nur wenige Ähnlichkeiten. Das Gesicht der hl. Paraskeve ist viel runder als das der Gottesmutter, ihre Augenbrauen sind viel höher und breiter, ihre Nasenflügel sind dreieckig im Gegensatz zu jenen der Gottesmutter, die Lippen sind fester und breiter, und die Gesamtgestalt weist nicht einen ähnlich dramatischen Charakter auf wie jene der Gottesmutter – um nur auf Merkmale des Gesichtes und nicht auch auf die markanten Unterschiede des Kopftuchs einzugehen.

Bei der Georgskirche (S. 42–84) sind die Bemerkungen des Autors über die spätere Zufügung des Narthex und des Südschiffes anhand des Mauerwerkes wertvoll. Um diese Bemerkungen nachvollziehen zu können, stehen die entsprechenden Photos dem Leser leider nicht zur Verfügung. Ebenso fehlt die Anmerkung 116 aus dem Haupttext. Die Erzengel-Ikone aus der Angeloktiste-Kirche in Kiti, Zypern (S. 62 Anm. 91), wird der neueren Forschung¹ nach nicht mehr dem 14., sondern dem 18. Jh. zugeordnet.

Besonders wichtig für die Identifizierung des Stifters ist die Entzifferung des westlichen Wappens, dargestellt auf dem Grabmonument (und nicht, wie falsch bezeichnet, *Proskynetarion*), dem Fresko des hl. Georg und dem Relief oberhalb des Kircheneinganges, von dem der Verfasser meint, es der Familie de Nivelet (13. Jh.) zurechnen zu können (S. 47, 82). In einem vor kurzem publizierten Artikel von Asp. Loube-Kize² wurde anhand von Vergleichsmaterial aus Rhodos das besagte Wappen identifiziert; so scheint der Stifter ein Mitglied der Familie der Johanniter d'Alfonso (ca. 1378–9) zu sein. Aufgrund dieses Artikels wären

¹ K. GERASIMOU – K. ΠΑΠΑΙΟΑΚΕΙΜ – Χρ. ΣΠΑΝΟΥ, Ἡ κατὰ Κίτιον ἀγιογραφικὴ τέχνη. Larnaka 2002, 228–9, r. 64; A. FOULIAS, Die Kirche Panagia Angeloktisti in Kiti bei Larnaka. Nicosia 2004, 34, Abb. 6.

² A. LOUBE-KIZE, Τὸ γλυπτὸ «προσκυνητᾶρι» στὸ ναὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Γεωργίου τοῦ Κάστρου στὸ Γεράκι. ΔΧΑΕ Δ'ΚΕ' (2004) 111–126.

die Fresken der „fränkischen“ Phase nicht dem 13. Jh., sondern der zweiten Hälfte des 14. Jh.s zuzuordnen. Darüber hinaus scheint die spätere Zufügung des dritten Kirchenschiffes und des Narthex nicht im 13. (laut D., S. 84), sondern in der ersten Hälfte des 15. Jh.s stattgefunden zu haben.

Interessant ist auch der achtstrahlige Stern innerhalb eines Halbmondes als Dekoration der inneren Seite des Schildes des hl. Georg. Ähnlich ist die Dekoration der Darstellung des hl. Georg in der Gottesmutterkirche in Asinou³, Zypern, sowie auf dem Schild des hl. Demetrios in der Kirche des hl. Antonios in Kellia⁴, Zypern. Allerdings verlangt die Verwendung dieses Symbols in den sieben peloponnesischen Fresken, die D. anführt, sowie in den Beispielen auf Zypern nach einer detaillierten Forschung. Dadurch könnte man klären, inwieweit dieses Motiv eine peloponnesische ikonographische Besonderheit ist und wie es in Zusammenhang mit den intensiven Beziehungen Zyperns mit der Peloponnes⁵ im 15. Jahrhundert interpretiert werden kann.

Sehr interessant ist unter den Skulpturen der kunsthistorisch bedeutenden Eleousa-Kirche (S. 100–138) der Kopf eines Tieres, welcher die Nische oberhalb des Einganges der Kirche dekoriert. Leider erwähnt der Autor seine ursprüngliche Verwendung nicht. Der Kopf könnte ursprünglich sowohl als Konsole⁶, die den Nischenrahmen trug, als auch als Wasserspeier gedient haben. Dagegen scheint das ähnliche Kopf-Relief in der Paraskave-Kirche in Geraki (S. 37–9, Abb. 64–5) ausschließlich Schmuckfunktion gehabt zu haben.

Zur Darstellung des stehenden hl. Nikolaus (S. 127, Abb. 255) seien noch die Beispiele in den Kirchen des hl. Nikolaus von Kyritzes (17. Jh.) und Theologinas (17. Jh.)⁷ in Kastoria sowie des hl. Nikephoros (17. Jh.) auf Tenos⁸ hinzuzufügen.

Ikonographische Besonderheiten bemerkt man in der Elias-Kirche von Geraki (S. 139–152). Darunter sei die seltene Darstellung der Metastasis des Johannes Theologos erwähnt. Das Thema ist bereits seit dem 9. Jh. (Cod. Par.gr. 510)⁹ bekannt, also viel früher als das erste vom Autor angegebene Beispiel aus dem 11. Jh. (S. 149, Anm. 35). Zusätzlich zu den von D. angeführten Beispielen wären noch viele zu erwähnen¹⁰, darunter das Fresko in der Theologos-Kirche¹¹ in Mavriotissa, Kastoria. In seiner detaillierten Analyse lässt der Ver-

³ A. and J. STYLIANOU, A Cross inside a Crescent on the Shield of St. George Wall-Painting in the Church of Panagia Phorbiotissa Asinou, Cyprus. *Κυπριακαὶ Σπονδαὶ* 46 (1982) 133–140, Abb. 1.

⁴ K. KYRRHIS, Ἡ ἡμισέληνος ὡς μὴ ἰσλαμικὸ σύμβολο. *Βυζαντινὸς Δόμος* 7 (1993/4) 120, 139, 140–1.

⁵ A. and J. STYLIANOU, The Painted Churches of Cyprus. Nicosia 1997, 38.

⁶ M. ŠUPUT, Architectural Decoration of King Milutin's Church, in: Hilandar Monastery (ed. G. Subotić). Belgrade 1998, 153–8, Abb. auf S. 156, 157.

⁷ M. PAISIDOU, Οἱ τοιχογραφίες τοῦ 17^{ου} αἰῶνα στοὺς ναοὺς τῆς Καστοριάς. Athen 2002, 196, Abb. 8, 78.

⁸ G. DIMITROKALLIS, Παραδοσιακὴ ναοδομία στὴν Τήνο. Athen 2004, 120, Abb. 341.

⁹ H. OMONT, Miniatures des plus anciens manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Nationale. Paris 1929, 14, Taf. XXII.

¹⁰ I. SPATHARAKIS – E. KLINKENBERG, The Pictorial Cycle of the Life of St. John the Evangelist in Crete. *BZ* 89 (1996) 420–440; J. SPATHARAKIS, Τεχνοτροπικὲς παρατηρήσεις στὶς τοιχογραφίες τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου στὸ Σελλί Ρεθύμνης. *Ἀριάδνη* 1 (1983) 61–75.

¹¹ S. PELEKANIDES, Καστορία I. Βυζαντινὰ τοιχογραφία. Πίνακες [*Μακεδονικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη* 17]. Thessalonike 1953, Taf. 216a.

fasser die Frage nach den Gründen offen, die den Maler zur Darstellung dieses seltenen Themas bewegt haben könnten. Unseres Erachtens ist es nicht zufällig, dass die Metastasis des Johannes in der Kirche des Propheten Elias abgebildet wurde, dessen irdisches Leben in ähnlicher Weise, d.h. durch seine Himmelfahrt, endete. Es wäre sogar nicht auszuschließen, dass sich ursprünglich die Himmelfahrt des Elias in der Nähe dieser Darstellung befand, jedoch heute nicht mehr erkennbar ist. Zu den Ähnlichkeiten zwischen den Fresken der Elias- und der Eleousa-Kirche, die D. angibt, seien noch die auffallenden Ähnlichkeiten der breiten Gesichtszüge (Abb. 253a–b, 260 und Abb. 270) sowie eine markante schwarze Linie als Kontur des Gesichtes (Abb. 227, 242, 247, 254 und Abb. 277, 279, 280) hinzuzufügen. Jedoch unterscheiden sich die Fresken der beiden Kirchen in den kleinen eingeschnitzten Halbkreisbögen an dem Thron der Gottesmutter in der Eleousa-Kirche (Abb. 224), die in der Elias-Kirche durch Spitzbögen (Abb. 272–3) ersetzt sind. Ähnlich stehen auch die Kirchenväter (Abb. 275–6) in der Elias-Kirche unter leichten Spitzbögen.

Schließlich begegnet man einem mit (pseudo)kufischen Buchstaben geschmückten Thron wie in der Theophaneia-Kirche nicht nur in Lakonien und Kythera (S. 156, Anm. 12), sondern auch in Zypern (z.B. Panagia Arakos¹²).

Generell möchten wir zu der sonst ausgezeichneten Studie festhalten, dass bedauerlicherweise jegliche architektonischen Pläne fehlen, obwohl solche Pläne angefertigt und vom Verfasser selbst korrigiert wurden. Obwohl es, laut Autor, auf Grund der Mitarbeit von mehreren Personen aus rechtlichen Gründen nicht möglich war (S. 10, Anm. 20), hätte man trotzdem eine Lösung anstreben sollen, damit die architektonische Präsentation der Monumente vollständig wird. Diese Pläne wären umso wichtiger, wenn man sieht, wie viele Fehler anderen Architekten bei den Plänen dieser Kirchen unterlaufen sind, die vom Verfasser jedes Mal erwähnt und korrigiert werden (S. 12, 20, 92, 109, 140). Neben diesen Plänen wären axonometrische Darstellungen sehr wichtig, um einen besseren Überblick über die Verteilung des ikonographischen Programms jeder Kirche zu gewinnen.

Darüber hinaus vermisst man auch Farbphotos der Fresken, die ebenfalls angefertigt (S. 10, A. 18), aber in der Publikation nicht verwendet wurden, obwohl der Verfasser auf die Farben der Fresken immer wieder zurückkommt (z.B. S. 160). Farbbilder sind unseres Erachtens in kunsthistorischen Studien von besonderer Bedeutung, da sie neben anderen Merkmalen zur chronologischen Ansetzung der Fresken beitragen können. Jedenfalls sind mit wenigen Ausnahmen alle Schwarzweiß-Photos der Edition (z.B. Abb. 67, 174, 250, 283) von hoher Qualität. Als Druckfehler ist wohl zu betrachten, dass, obwohl die Beschriftungen der Bilder nummeriert sind, die Nummern auf den Photos selbst in der Regel fehlen, was den Leser, besonders wenn sich auf einer Seite mehrere Bilder befinden (S. 76–7, 94–5, 105–6, 158), irritiert. Interessant ist die Bemerkung des Verfassers (S. 36) über die Verantwortung der Restauratoren, die oft die beschädigten Fresken ohne Erfolg ergänzen, und zwar ohne ihre Ergänzungen photographisch zu dokumentieren.

¹² Pseudokufische gestickte Buchstaben befinden sich auf einem Tuch auf dem Thron Mariens: D. and J. WINFIELD, *The Church of Panaghia tou Arakos at Lagoudhera, Cyprus*. Washington DC. 2003, Taf. 5. In der Apostelkirche (12. Jh.) in Pera Chorio Nessou, Zypern sieht man in der Darstellung der Apostelkommunion pseudokufische Inschriften auf der Außenseite eines Kirchengerätes: A. H. S. MEGAW – E. I. W. HAWKINS, *The Church of the Holy Apostles at Pera Chorio Cyprus and its Frescoes*. *DOP* 16 (1962) 279–348 und hierzu 300–7, Abb. 23; A. BORKAS, *Άγιοι Απόστολοι Πέτρος και Παῦλος στο Πέρα Χωριό Νήσου*. Pera Chorio 2004, Abb. auf S. 44.

Da der Verfasser reiche historische Informationen bietet, wären neben dem ikonographischen Index auch ein Personen-, Sach- und Ortsregister wünschenswert gewesen. Ein Abkürzungsverzeichnis der Bibliographie würde die oftmalige Wiederholung von langen Titeln in den Anmerkungen überflüssig machen. Da der griechische Titel der Studie auch ins Französische übersetzt wurde, hätte man zumindest eine französische Zusammenfassung der Schlussfolgerungen erwartet.

Wie D. selber bemerkt (S. 182), ist nun die Publikation der 15 Kirchen der Siedlung und der Festung von Geraki abgeschlossen. Es bleiben aber noch zumindest 20 mit Fresken ausgestattete Kirchen in der Umgebung von Geraki, die das Bild der Malerei dieser Region vervollständigen könnten. Allerdings wird man die Gesamtheit dieser Kirchen erst dann völlig bewerten können, wenn das Denkmalschutzamt ihre Restaurierung und Reinigung abgeschlossen hat. Wünschenswert wird dann die Herausgabe eines mit Farbabbildungen der Kunstschatze versehenen Corpus der ca. 35 Kirchen der Region sein, deren Ausstattung wahrscheinlich auf die Tätigkeit einer lokalen Malerschule mit Ausstrahlung auf eine breitere Region zurückgeführt werden kann.

Charalampos G. Chotzakoglou

Annie et Jean-Pierre MAHÉ, *L'Arménie à l'épreuve des siècles (Découvertes Gallimard 464)*. Paris 2005. 160 S., zahlr. Abb., teilweise in Farbe. ISBN 2-07-031409-X.

Obwohl als Kleinformat konzipiert, reich, ja überreich mit aussagekräftigen, gut erklärten Bildern versehen, ist das Bändchen als „großer Wurf“ zu würdigen, der dem Gesamtphänomen „Armenien“ bzw. „Armenier“ gerecht wird und auf Grund seiner hohen Qualität ein *Vademecum* der Armenier werden könnte. Präzise und prägnant, auf hohem stilistischen Niveau, wird ein Gemälde entworfen, das vom Beginn der „Proto-Armenier“, jener indogermanischen Gruppe, die im Zuge der Wanderungen thrako-phrygischer Stämme aus dem Balkan nach Kleinasien im späten 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. bis an den Euphrat vordrang und 1155 mit den Assyrern zusammenstieß (die sie „Mušker“ nannten), bis in die unmittelbare Gegenwart reicht. Natürlich ist auch der andere „Stammvater“ der Armenier, die hurritischen Stämme der Naïri, die das Reich Urartu gründeten, das bis zum Beginn des 6. Jh. v. Chr. blühte, gebührend gewürdigt; vielleicht spielte auch das geheimnisvolle Reich „Hayaša“ eine gewisse Rolle, die bisher allerdings kaum erforscht wurde.

Für den Byzantinisten sind die Abschnitte von S. 33–77 von besonderem Interesse, von der Christianisierung Armeniens im frühen 4. Jh. bis zum Untergang des kleinarmenischen Königreiches in Kilikien im 14. Jh. Während der Verlag auf der Rückseite des Umschlages noch der traditionellen Datierung der Taufe des großarmenischen Königs Trdat/Tiridates, nämlich 301, seinen Tribut zollt, findet sich im Innern (S. 36) natürlich die historisch einzig vertretbare Datierung 314 (oder allenfalls knapp danach): „À son retour de Césarée de Cappadoce (sc. Grégoire l'Illuminateur), en 314, ... il baptise Tiridate, ...“. Damit wurde Armenien zum ersten christlichen Staat, auch wenn es, wie später in Byzanz, noch lange dauern sollte, bis die neue Religion die meisten Lebensbereiche eines Großteils der Bevölkerung durchdrungen hatte. Aber dann wurde das Christentum in seiner spezifischen Prägung (als Nationalkirche) zu einem Eckpfeiler der nationalen Identität, die mit hohem Einsatz gegen jeden Feind verteidigt wurde.

Trotz aller Knappheit werden die wesentlichen Daten der Geschichte, Kultur und Gesellschaft, einschließlich der künstlerischen Entwicklung, eindrucksvoll dargelegt und dem

Leser nahe gebracht, wobei die Autoren der Bedingtheit der Situation zwischen übermächtigen Nachbarn gebührend Rechnung tragen. Entsprechend objektiv und nüchtern werden auch die tatsächlichen Machtverhältnisse im Reich der Bagratiden (und dann auch der Areruni) wiedergegeben – bei der Bewertung der byzantinischen Herrschaft über die meisten armenischen Provinzen im 11. Jh. würden wir allerdings die Akzente etwas anders setzen.

Dem wichtigen, folgeschweren Einschnitt der Schaffung einer autochthonen Schrift („vers 405“) und den dann schnell aufblühenden literarischen Aktivitäten wird mit vollem Recht großes Gewicht beigemessen. Auch die literarische und künstlerische Entwicklung in Kilikien sowie die Probleme späterer Zeiten bis zu einer gewissen geistigen Wiedergeburt ab dem 17. Jh. finden ihren Niederschlag.

Der historische Faden wird dann weitergesponnen, über die Jahrhunderte unter osmanischer (teilweise auch iranischer bzw. russischer) Herrschaft bis in die Republiken, die – auf erheblich kleinerem Territorium als dem „historischen Armenien“ – im 20. Jh. gegründet wurden. Hervorzuheben ist die vorbildliche Objektivität, mit der der grauenhafte Genozid dargestellt wird, aber auch gewisse Hintergründe und besondere Umstände, die hinter dieser Politik standen.

Im Anschluss an den Hauptteil werden einige wichtige Dokumente und Schlüsselstellen in Übersetzung geboten. Eine kurze Zeittafel und eine sehr kleine bibliographische Auswahl (mit einigen wenigen englischen neben sonst ausschließlich französischen Titeln) runden den schönen Band ab. Er würde es verdienen, bald in andere Sprachen übersetzt zu werden.

Werner Seibt