Besprechungen

Gilbert DAGRON (†) – Bernard FLUSIN (eds.), Constantin VII Porphyrogénète. Le livre des Cérémonies (*CFHB* 52/1–5). Paris: Association des Amis du Centre d'Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance 2020. 6 volumes, 3000 pp. ISBN 978-2916716701.

1. General remarks

Editing such an important work as *De Cerimoniis* (*De Cer.*) is a *herculea labos* that compares with the task of an editor of the *Iliad*. In both cases, the establishment of a stemma is impossible (obviously for different reasons), but whereas editing the *Iliad* is a matter of choosing what the editors consider to be the best reading among multiple variants transmitted and even canonised by a millenary exegetical tradition, the editors of *De Cer.* have no choices to make, for the text is preserved in a single manuscript (Lipsiensis Rep. I Fº. 17 of the 10th century), nor can they rely on scholia or Byzantine commentaries on the text that could help them in this lonely task. Only an incomplete parallel version, preserved in two palimpsests, comes to their aid. Accordingly, the editors are facing, without any previous guide, a large number of decisions in order to make sense out of a compilation of heterogeneous texts of very different nature and scope, of different authors and periods, responding to various stages of publication and written according to uncertain orthographical rules and a fluid grammar; a compilation that is not the random result of an arbitrary collection of texts, but represents the effort of a Byzantine editor to provide order and structure to the disparate sources on the imperial ceremonies at his disposal, with the purpose of creating some kind of *vademecum* for future rulers. The constant tension between the original sources and the editors or copyists who tried to integrate them into a whole permeates this bulky work that represents one of the most important legacies of the Roman imperial past but also a big challenge for scholars: the rewriting of the original texts, copying of lists and drafts, composition of new chapters presented along with their sources, commentaries and remarks on the previous passages (with the ἴστεον ὅτι [isteon hoti] clauses)… all this is combined in a single work to the dismay of the modern editor.

It can be stated without any doubt that the highly qualified members of the French team fully succeed in performing this task, which will remain a philological milestone in the field of the Greek philology, a *monumentum aere perennius* setting the standard for editions to come, providing future editors with the appropriate tools for facing similar choices and illuminating Greek philologists of every period. We are witnessing here not the birth, but the culmination of a new philology that has to do not just with textual criticism, but also with codicology, the layout of the page, the hierarchy of the information and the diachrony of ever-expanding compilations; a philology that sets as its main aim not the mere edition, but the interpretation of the text and its genesis. Three sections of the introduction (III–V, pp. 91*–138*) that deal with the 'genèse' of the different chapters of the Books I–II of *De Cer.* can in fact be considered one of the most stimulating parts of the whole study.

All these aspects have determined the editorial labour of the editors, led by the late Gilbert Dagron and his collaborator Bernard Flusin, who have been able not only to address most of the problems posed by this imposing work, but also to coordinate the members of the team so perfectly that the six physical volumes (divided into five *tomes*, for *tome* IV consists of two parts) appear to speak with one single voice, as the different chapters and sections are perfectly coordinated and the cross-references never fail to orientate the user and guide him/her through the intricate wilderness of the chapters of *De Cer.* This is a reason why we will generally speak of 'editors' in our review and will not refer, except for particular cases, to the individual responsibility of a single scholar. However, the leading role played by Bernard Flusin in the final phase of the edition must be stressed here. As the main contributors to the volume we must also name (in alphabetical order), René Bondoux, Denis Feissel, Jean-Pierre Grélois, Michel Stavrou and Constantine Zuckerman.

Volume I contains a very detailed introduction (pp. 1*–192*). It first deals exhaustively with the biography and literary production of the emperor (section I, pp. 3*–48*), and makes important contributions to both. Especially useful is the *tableau chronologique* with the main dates of Constantine VII's life (pp. 14*–15*) as well as the connection of the literary activity of the emperor with his other antiquarian and artistic interests, including manuscripts contemporary to the emperor and linked with the inclinations of the court (pp. 37*–42*). Research is undertaken on the dating of the works patronised or written by the emperor, always taking into account the latest possible event mentioned in them. Basil Parakoimomenos is presented as the possible editor of the compilation of *De Cer.* for he appears responsible for the inclusion of chapters I.105–106 dating to the reign of Nicephorus Phokas (pp. 43*–47*). In addition to the arguments advanced by O. KRESTEN, Sprachliche und inhaltliche Beobachtungen zu Kapitel I 96 des sogenannten Zeremonienbuches. *BZ* 93 (2000) 474–489, esp. 474, the editors should have mentioned here the contribution of M. FEATHERSTONE, Basil the Nothos as Compiler: the *De Cerimoniis* and *Theophanes Continuatus*, in: Textual Transmission in Byzantium: between Textual Criticism and Quellenforschung, ed. J. Signes Codoñer – I. Pérez Martín. Turnhout 2014, 353–372.

The second section of the introduction deals specifically with the text of *De Cer.* (section II, pp. 49*–62*) and first undertakes a precise review of the most important contributions devoted to the structure of the work. It then comments the main problems related to the structure of the work, paying special attention to its contents and the long treatises transmitted with it at the beginning and end of the Lipsiensis; to the pinakes or tables of content of the two volumes; and to the problems associated with the division into chapters (a very important and documented summary is presented on pp. 78*–80*). In the last part of this section (pp. 82*–90*) the editors suggest a time span from 945 to 949 for the different sections of Books I and II, thus conceiving the project as substantially finished during Constantine's life. This is an important conclusion, based on a minute analysis and a precise knowledge of the content of the whole work, and will surely constitute matter of discussion in the future.

In the next sections III–V (pp. 91*–137*) the introduction enters into a detailed analysis of the origin and constitution of the different sections of the two books of the work. The conclusions are accompanied by detailed tables of all the chapters, where a dating is provided for each of them and compared with that suggested by J. B. BURY, The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. *The English Historical Review* 22 (1907) 209–227, 417–439.

Then follows section VI, "Introduction philologique" (pp. 139*–186*), where the manuscripts, the Lipsiensis and the two palimpsest manuscripts (Chalcensis and Vatopedi), are described (a thorough online description of the Lipsiensis by Friedericke Berger is also provided on the website manuscripta-mediaevalia.de. The Leipziger Universitäts-Bibliothek has a complete digital reproduction of the manuscript on its web page in the section "Digitale Sammlungen/Mittelalterliche Handschriften"). There, a common archetype for them is suggested and the indirect transmission of some parts is also considered. After a short review of the existing editions of the text and some of its parts, the final section (pp. 178*–186*) deals with the "principes de l'édition et de la traduction" and address some important orthographical and grammatical issues that should be taken into consideration by future editors of medieval texts. A sage decision is to apply different editorial standards to the excerpts of Peter the Patrician contained in I.93–104 and II.53, as they fundamentally reproduce without changes the original text dating to the 6th century.

The rest of volume I (pp. 1–34) as well as volumes II and III contain the edition of Books I and II of *De Cer.* with a single apparatus criticus. It is accompanied by a French translation that is not only reliable and trustworthy, but fluid. The solution envisaged for the abundant technical terms used in the work is not to translate those that are impossible to render in French with accuracy but to print them in cursive or with a small lozenge and refer for their meaning to the final *Glossaire* of volume V, where each term is explained by a detailed digression: this also constitutes an essential contribution to Byzantine lexicography, for the short descriptions given to the terms in Trapp's dictionary are not comparable with the lengthy explanations each lemma receives in the glossary. For minor problems in the interpretation of the text, short notes in French to the translation (that continue in the odd pages below the apparatus criticus of the Greek text) offer a brief explanation and often refer to the corresponding bibliography.

Volume IV (in two *tomes* but with continuous page numbers) contains a thorough commentary of the chapters, which are frequently grouped together because of their affinity. It is not a commentary on single passages, but an ongoing discussion of the content, structure or sources of the corresponding chapters, in which the different members of the team took part according to their interests and expertise. Vol. IV.1 (Book I) is entirely written by Bernard Flusin, whereas all the members of the team participated in the confection of vol. IV.2 (Book II). The amount of detail in the exposition of the single chapters cannot be overemphasised.

Volume V (*Glossaire. Index. Notes sur la langue*) contains at the beginning reproductions of some pages of the Lipsiensis and the *scriptura superior* of the two palimpsest manuscripts, as well as some maps and drawings of the main buildings of the capital where the ceremonies took place (pp. 1–18). Then follows the already mentioned praiseworthy *Glossaire*, mainly written by Gilbert Dagron but reviewed by Michel Stavrou, (pp. 21–123) and a brief section devoted to the main grammatical features of the Greek by Bernard Flusin (*Notes sur la langue du* De cerimoniis, pp. 125–147). The main part of the volume comprises the various indices prepared by Michel Stavrou (pp. 149–392): index of proper names, of place names and ethnonyms, of Greek words, of institutions, titles and offices, of festivities and ceremonies and of Latin names. Again, the great utility of these lists for future research needs no emphasis. The volume closes with the bibliography (pp. 393–447).

It would be pointless to check the edition to detect minor errors, for that would only be a display of *vanitas* on the part of the reviewer. I agree with the review by Anthony KALDELLIS [published in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2021.04.27] on the general absence of typos and errors and the meticulousness of the editors. It is rather the duty of future scholars to take this new edition as the basis of their research. I am convinced that multiple studies will be produced in a short time which will only confirm the importance of the present edition and its enormous contribution to the development of Byzantine studies.

However, it is perhaps of interest to comment on some general issues concerning the structure of *De Cer.* The reading of the edition and of the comments of the editors has raised some questions that are perhaps worth debating with the academic community, for this might contribute to a better understanding of the goals and confection of the compilation. It goes without saying that the comments that follow would have never occurred to me without the attentive digestion of the present edition, so that they are to be understood as a small homage to the feast of scholarship displayed in it. I will focus on just three points, under different headings, but closely interconnected: the pinax, the chapters and the extent of the work.

2 . T h e   P i n a x

Two separate pinakes or chapter indices of the two books of *De Cerimoniis* have come down to us. Of the first pinax, for Book I, only some titles of the final chapters 84–106 are

preserved. Chapters 101–106 are partly legible in the upper side recto of an initial parchment flyleaf of the Lipsiensis (numbered today as f. I but with a 5 still visible in the upper right corner of the recto). This same recto of the folio preserves at the bottom, with reversed letters, part of the text of chapters 96–100 by a transfer of the ink from the verso of a lost previous folio. There was in fact a double transfer, for bits of text of chapters 84–100 are still legible, with letters written in the usual direction from left to right, on the inner side of the cover board facing the flyleaf, as if they were a reflection of the previous reflection of the lost folio on the parchment.

The second pinax has been transmitted in the manuscript before the beginning of Book II and can be compared, although fragmentarily, with the text of the palimpsest manuscripts. There are some discrepancies between the text of the pinakes and the titles of the chapters as they appear in the main text and the editors also make a short study of them on pp. 78*–80* ("maladresses et erreurs dans la numération des chapitres"), referring also to particular problems at different points (for instance at vol. IV p. 639 for chapters II.17, 18 and 42 that are preserved in the pinax and not in the text of the Lipsiensis through the loss of some folia). However, the titles and the order of the chapters are basically coincidental in the pinakes and in the main text. The discrepancies are thus explained through various circumstances mainly as copying errors. For the editors the fact that the palimpsest contains an almost identical list of chapters to that in the Lipsiensis is enough evidence to conclude that the pinakes are essentially copied not only from the archetype of the work, but even from the original:

> Le fait qu'elle [la table du livre II] soit transmise par les deux témoins du texte montre qu'elle remonte à l'archetype et sans doute, pour l'essentiel, comme celle du Livre I, à l'original. On peut donc exclure que, dans L, elle ait été composé en plusieurs temps (vol. IV, p. 639).

This assertion is not based on a detailed discussion of the problem, as is usual in most of the parts of the commentary. In fact, the alternative hypothesis, put forward by Michael Featherstone in a very convincing paper [M. FEATHERSTONE, Preliminary Remarks on the Leipzig Manuscript of De Cerimoniis. *BZ* 95 (2002) 457–479, here particularly 464–466], is dismissed as "très peu vraisamblable" in a footnote without further discussion of the arguments involved. However, the possibility that the pinax was created during the compilation of the Lipsiensis and the palimpsest cannot be ruled out and is in fact more than likely if we consider similar cases, for instance the pinax of the Marcianus gr. 450 which transmits the text of Photius' *Bibliotheke* and was made simultaneously with the compilation of summaries and excerpta which constitutes the structure of this work, as was proved by F. RONCONI, L'automne du patriarche. Photios, la *Bibliothèque* et le Venezia, Bibl. Naz. Marc., gr. 450, in: Textual Transmission in Byzantium: between Textual Criticism and Quellenforschung, ed. J. Signes Codoñer – I. Pérez Martín. Turnhout 2014, 93–130 and in F. RONCONI, Il Moveable Feast del Patriarca. Note e ipotesi sulla genesi della Bibliotheca di Fozio, in: Nel segno del testo. Edizioni, materiali e studi per

Oronzo Pecere, ed. L. Del Corso – F. De Vivo – A. Stramaglia. Florence 2015, 203–238. The concept of "apografo mobile" coined by Ronconi could have been very productive in considering the present case of the text of *De Ceremoniis,* especially as Featherstone observed in the redaction of the pinax of Book II as transmitted in the Lipsiensis some changes of alignment and even of ductus which point to different phases of composition of the index, although in this case they were produced by a single hand. These are similar to phenomena observed by Ronconi in the redaction of the pinax of the Marcianus, and would have deserved a closer scrutiny. Some arguments in favour of a confection of the pinax parallel to the copy of the text can be advanced:

1) The pinax of Book I ends in the Lipsiensis with the first few lines on the recto of a folio which was left blank on the rest of the recto side and on the verso. The chapters on military expeditions start on a new quire on f. 1r, and the preface to Book I starts on f. 21v, that is, the verso of the second folio of the central bifolio of the quaternion. The pinax of Book II ends on f. 174r. The last lines of this side are left blank as well as the whole of f. 174v. The preface of Book II starts at the very beginning of f. 175r, in the same quire. In sum, the pinakes were not copied in separate quires added later to the text but in the initial folia of the work. Apparently, a roughly estimated number of folia were left blank for copying the pinakes but, as is to be expected, the estimation was not exact and some blank space remained. If both pinakes had been copied from the archetype or even the "original", there would probably be no blank folios after them. The pinax of Book II in the palimpsest was copied on the three first folios of a quaternion and ended on the verso of the third, leaving eight lines blank. The beginning of Book II was probably copied on the recto of the following folio which corresponded to the central binion of the quaternion, but this binion is unfortunately lost, so that we cannot conclude anything with certainty on the evidence we have. We follow here the reconstruction of the original disposition of the text according to M. FEATHERSTONE – J. GRUSKOVA – O. KRESTEN, Studien zu den Palimpsestfragmenten des sogenannten 'Zeremonienbuches' II (in print), section III.C. I warmly thank the authors for allowing me to consult their study, which was also at the disposal of the French editors.

2) The coincidences between the pinakes of Book II in the Lipsiensis and the mother copy of the two palimpsests (Chalcensis and Vatopedi) do not necessarily point to two mechanical and independent copies from a common archetype as is apparently the case for the main text, according to both the French editors and to Featherstone, Gruskova and Kresten, who studied the palimpsests. These scholars, however, argue that the two copies were produced "in a short period" (M. FEATHERSTONE – J. GRUSKOVA – O. KRESTEN, Studien zu den Palimpsestfragmenten des sogenannten 'Zeremonienbuches'. I Prolegomena. *BZ* 98 [2006] 423–430, here 426: "L [Lipsiensis] und C/V [Chalke and Vatopedi, the palimpsests] flossen (wohl in geringem zeitlichen Abstand) unabhängig voneinander aus ein und derselben Vorlage"), and even suggest that both were commanded by the same person (Basil Parakoimomenos in their hypothesis), who destined one for the Imperial Library and the other for his personal use as a private copy (See FEATHERSTONE – GRUS-

κοva – Kresten, Studien zu den Palimpsestfragmenten des sogenannten 'Zeremonienbuches' II, section V ["Zusammenfassung"] and now O. Kresten, Σπαράγματα διαφορά zur Überlieferung von *De administrando imperio*. in *Φιλόδωρος εὐμενείας. Miscellanea di studi in ricordo di mons. Paul Canart*, ed. M. D'Agostino – L. Pieralli, Vatican City 2021, 357–390, here 383–384). If this holds to be true, we would have to do with a close cooperation among the copyists of the two versions who may have produced their copies simultaneously in the palace and have worked as a small team. Certainly teamwork is something novel in our studies and confronts us with a higher number of variables, but this is exactly what lies behind the composition of Book VI of *Theophanes Continuatus* (as Michael Featherstone and I will try to prove in the prolegomena to our edition, to appear soon in the *CFHB*) and in the production of the *excerpta historica* by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, as revealed by A. Nemeth, The Excerpta Constantiniana and the Byzantine appropriation of the past. Cambridge 2018. The fact that the Lipsiensis and the mother copy of the palimpsests were each written by a different hand, responsible for the whole text of both manuscripts (Featherstone – Gruskova – Kresten, Studien zu den Palimpsestfragmenten des sogenannten 'Zeremonienbuches'. I Prolegomena 425), does not mean that the two copyists worked independently of each other. That their archetype was still a dossier of quires and documents, already ordered and arranged for copy but not yet bound as a book, is perhaps indicated by occasional references to quires in the text of *De cerimoniis*, for instance in II.45, ll. 122–123, where it is said that some information was preserved εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ τετραδίου (eis tēn archēn tou tetradiou, vol. I, p. 72* and vol. IV, pp. 839–842). Some errors in the references confirm changes in the order of the copying of the documents (vol. I, pp. 101*–102*). If this is the case, the confection of the pinax could have been undertaken during the writing of these twin copies, either simultaneously (if some kind of "pecia system" was conceived) or from one master copy. Accordingly, the possibility that the pinax of the Lipsiensis could have been the model for the twin copy of the mother copy of the palimpsests, or vice versa, should also be explored on a teamwork basis. There are in fact striking coincidences in the pinakes of both versions in the final part of the pinax to Book II preserved in the palimpsests (chapters 43–55), for they both include titles of the sections as separate chapters (particularly the reference to the acclamations of the Sards in II.43 in Pinax l. 105), although the fact that the chapter numbers written in red ink are not legible in the palimpsest makes it impossible to compare the sequence numbers in the two versions. The fact that the last chapter, 56, of the palimpsest does not appear in the Lipsiensis where, instead, the *Life of Alexander* and the *Physiologus* are listed as chapters 56 and 57, would perhaps speak against the idea of close coordination of the two copies, although Featherstone – Gruskova – Kresten, Studien zu den Palimpsestfragmenten des sogenannten 'Zeremonienbuches' II, section V, find an explanation for the differences in the fact that the mother copy of the palimpsests could have been intended for the private use of the Parakoimomenos, who might not have been interested in these two works. However, at the same time, this difference is a caveat against the sup-

position that these copies of the pinax of Book II were also completely identical in chapters 1–42, the pinax entries of which are not preserved in the palimpsests.

3) Some of the most evident errors of the Lipsiensis in the numbering of the chapters and even in the identification of the titles of the chapters should have been easily corrected if we suppose that the pinax was mechanically copied from an original, but this is not the case. On the contrary, some of the errors were not removed for they were the primary result of the ongoing and gradual composition of the pinax. Thus, the pinax of Book II appears to end in the last line on f. 172v, under the title of chapter II.15. Then f. 173r begins with the remarkably long list of the following sections of this same chapter (15) in the Lipsiensis, which here, however, is numbered 16. Then, after the list of these sections, the number 16 appears again to mark the extant chapter 16 in the Lipsiensis. All this points undoubtedly, as already remarked by Featherstone, Preliminary Remarks, to an index in progress and not to a mechanical copy from an original, for in this case the error would have been easily detected and corrected. The marking of some subsections of the pinax with an asterisk (for a section of II.40) or a cross (for a section of II.42) also points to errors in producing the list of the chapters: some titles of sections were copied with the intention of giving them a number as a chapter, but when the copyist made a later check and discovered his error, he tried to differentiate these titles from the chapter titles by using different random signs. Finally, and most importantly, the pinax seems to have been created with frequent disregard to the nature of the different sections or chapters of the work, probably caused by mistakes in the copying and marking of the titles in the main text, as already observed by the editors on pp. 78*–80*. This would be better explained if the archetype of both manuscripts was in fact the original, where the differences between chapters, sections and titles of the documents included were not always clear. This leads us to further reflections in the next section.

3. Chapters, titles of documents, sections

As noted by the editors in pp. 78*–80*, on a number of occasions the titles of the chapters are misplaced (for instance in I.39 and II.45 "le chapitre commence en fait avant son titre"), whole independent sections have no title or the titles of the documents copied within one chapter are erroneously rendered as chapter titles. This would appear clear evidence of the difficulty of creating independent chapters to be listed in the pinax out of a heterogeneous mass of documents and protocols of different size and conception, written in various periods by different persons. But beyond this, there is a further problem which the editors have not addressed directly and which appears in other compilatory works of this kind: the categorisation of the contents. Used as we are to modern indexes, where all entries which are given a number are supposed to have the same value, we apply this same conception, probably wrongly, to the Byzantine *syllogai*. Our point of departure is on many occasions, as in the present case, the numbered entries of the pinakes which were, however, created not by the author who conceived the compilation, but by the scribes who copied it and whose only purpose was to produce a guide for the reader. They did their

best to reproduce the main contents of the book, but in so doing they did not always understand the difference between the elaborate chapters and the original documents which were used as sources, a point already stressed by the pioneering study by Bury mentioned above (see Vol. 1 pp. 51*–56* for a short rendering of it) and likewise made evident in the also abovementioned study of the Marcianus manuscript of the *Bibliotheke* by Filippo Ronconi, who clearly distinguishes between the summaries and the excerpts among the different "codices" which make up Photius' work.

In our case we could say that not all the titles of the so-called chapters must be understood as introducing a separate section on a given topic. One can obviously consider that it is not the title, but the content of the various texts or documents that allows us to distinguish between the different nature of the texts compiled in *De Cer*. No one would contradict this. However, titles provide a first approach to the corresponding texts they introduce and their formulation, highly standardised, is a first indication of what the redactors had in mind.

The phrase ὅσα δεῖ παραφυλάττειν (hosa dei paraphylattein) introduces a good number of chapters and can be safely considered as a clear mark by the authors of the compilation that a new chapter begins (see chapters I.1, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45.47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 78, 80, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 96, 97, 98, 99; II.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 51). Now, this same phrase or a variant thereon appears in seven further passages within particular chapters, preceded by a cross, but the author of the pinax does not mark these sections as proper chapters for reasons we cannot ascertain, although negligence would appear likely (see chapters I.36, ll.147–148; I.55, ll.46–47; I.78, l.407 [ὅσα δεῖ τελεῖν/hosa dei telein], ll. 487–88 [ὅσα δεῖ τελεῖσθαι/hosa dei teleisthai], l.544, l.734; I.79, l.160–161 [ὅσα δεῖ τελεῖσθαι/hosa dei teleisthai]).

The same applies to the titles containing περί (peri) which are written with the purpose of giving information about the *content* of chapters which do not necessarily contain prescriptions to be observed (παραφυλάττειν [paraphylattein]) (see chapters I.22, 76, 81, 82, 95 [in this case we have, however, rather to do with the title of a section, see below]; II.26, 28, 30, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43; II.53, 55, 55bis). This sort of περί (peri)-title was nuclear for the structure of Constantine's *De administrando imperio* (*DAI*), as I remarked some time ago in J. SIGNES CODOÑER, Los eslavos en las fuentes bizantinas de los siglos IX–X: el 'De administrando imperio' de Constantino Porfirogéneto, *Ilu* 13 (2004) 115–131, here 126–127. In a more recent study, A.S. SHCHAVELEV, Treatise De Administrando Imperio by Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus: Date of the Paris. gr. 2009 Copy, Years of Compiling of the Original Codex, and a Hypothesis about the Number of Authors. *Studia Ceranea* 9 (2019) 681–704, esp. 691 ff. seems to agree with the relevance of the phrasing of these chapter titles, combined with the paragraphs introduced by ἰστέον ὅτι (isteon hoti), in order to establish the process of composition of the treatise. However, despite being a clear mark of new chapter, again, as in the case of the phrase ὅσα δεῖ παραφυλάττειν (hosa dei

paraphyllatein), the περί (peri)-title appears within a particular chapter in sixteen more instances that the author of the pinax failed to record as proper chapters in the table (see chapters I.77, l.94; I.78, ll.48, 634–635, 655, 692, 718, 752, 759, 765; I.80, ll.100, 120; II.15, ll.78–82 [numbered correctly as chapter II.16 in the pinax, although the present chapter II.16 also has this number, as we saw above], 336, 447–449; II.49, l. 66).

Finally, there is a series of titles introduced by ὅπως/πῶς (hopōs/pōs) in the central part of Book II (see chapters II.27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 [combined with περί/peri]) which also appears to have been conceived for introducing separate chapters. Only one expression with πῶς (pōs) was not identified as a chapter title by the author of the pinax in chapter II.47, ll.66–67.

Aside from these stereotyped titles, a handful of others are found in the index which the copyists seem to have turned into chapter titles although they were originally intended only as titles typifying the kind of document included in a particular chapter: ἀκτολογία (aktologia, I.51); ἄκτα (akta, I.4, 5, 6, 88; II.48); ἔκθεσις (ekthesis, I.84); εὐφημία (euphēmia, I.85, 86, but see also chapter II.43, ll.165–168, 197); ὑπόμνημα ἐν συντόμῳ (hypomnēma en syntomō, II.42). Perhaps ἀναγόρευσις (anagoreusis, I.100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105; II.17) also belongs to this class. It was clearly an arbitrary decision to make these labels chapter titles, whereas many other documents simply retain their titles within their corresponding chapters.

More confusion is created by the fact that some passages of *De Cer*. are conceived not just as titles but as introductory remarks to a section of the work, embracing several chapters. This is a procedure already followed by the *DAI* of Constantine VII, where the proem details the five different sections or parts of the treatise, each part consisting of several chapters. Short sentences inside the work, acting as internal introductions to each part, remind the reader of the plan followed in the exposition (see C. SODE, Untersuchungen zu De administrando imperio Kaiser Konstantins VII. Porphyrogennetos. *Poikila Byzantina* 13 [1994] 147–260, esp. 154–178, and K. BELKE – P. SOUSTAL, Die Byzantiner und ihre Nachbarn. Die De administrando imperio genannte Lehrschrift des Kaisers Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos für seinen Sohn Romanos. Vienna 1995, 46–58).

One such case in *De Cer*. has been commented on by the editors. This is the sentence περὶ τῶν κατὰ διαφόρους καιροὺς συμβάντων γενέσθαι (peri tōn kata diaphorous kairous symbantōn genesthai) which appears before the proper title of chapter II.26 (περὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς συνηθείας τῆς τελουμένης ἐν τῇ Μεγάλῃ Ἐκκλησίᾳ [peri tēs palaias synētheias tēs teloumenēs en tē Megalē Ekklēsia]) and in fact serves to introduce the historical section of chapters II.26–39, all of them beginning with περί (peri) or ὅπως (hopōs) and dealing with events of different periods (see the remarks of the editors vol. I, p. 131* and vol. III, p. 198 note 1). However, the editors failed to remark that this sentence is very similar to the one which introduces the fourth section of the *DAI*, both in the general proem and in the internal introduction to the section. The parallels are marked in bold:

περὶ τῶν κατὰ **διαφόρους καιροὺς συμβάντων** γενέσθαι (**peri tōn** kata **diaphorous kairous symbantōn** genesthai). *De Cer.* II.26, l. 1

περὶ τῶν ἔν τινι **καιρῷ** μεταξὺ Ῥωμαίων καὶ **διαφόρων** ἐθνῶν **συμβεβηκότων** (**peri tōn** en tini **kairō** metaxy Rōmaiōn kai **diaphorōn** ethnōn **symbebēkotōn**). *DAI*, pr. 22–23.

τί δὲ καὶ **περὶ τῶν** ἔν τισι **καιροῖς** μεταξὺ Ῥωμαίων καὶ **διαφόρων** ἐθνῶν **συμβεβηκότων** (ti de kai **peri tōn** en tisis **kairois** metaxy Rōmaiōn kai **diaphorōn** ethnōn **symbebēkotōn**); *DAI* 46.166–167.

This circumstance would suggest that the extant title of chapter I.95 was also initially conceived as introducing a section:

περὶ διαφορᾶς στρατειῶν, καὶ πόθεν αὗται δίδονται, καὶ τί ἁρμόζει ἑκάστῳ σκρινίῳ, ὅσα εὑρεῖν ἠδυνήθημεν.
On the differences of offices, whence are they given, what corresponds to each office, what we were able to find.

This ambitious programme was not fulfilled, for the chapter that follows deals only with a single office, which explains the final remark of the title, that this was all "that we were able to find" (see below for a similar statement from the emperor in treatise C on military expeditions). However, the formulation with the initial περί (peri) and the interrogatives πόθεν (pothen) and τί (ti) resemble closely the preserved title of the treatise *De thematibus*:

Φιλοπόνημα Κωνσταντίνου βασιλέως υἱοῦ Λέοντος **περὶ** τῶν θεμάτων τῶν ἀνηκόντων τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν Ῥωμαίων, **πόθεν** ἔσχον τὰς ὀνομασίας **καὶ τί** σημαίνουσιν αἱ τούτων προσηγορίαι καὶ ὅτι τὰ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀρχαΐζουσι τὰ δὲ νέαν ἐκτήσαντο τὴν προσηγορίαν (Philoponēma Kōnstantinou basileōs yiou Leontos **peri** tōn thematōn tōn anēkontōn tē basileia tōn Rōmaiōn, **pothen** eschon tas onomasias **kai ti** sēmainousin hai toutōn prosēgoriai kai hoti ta men autōn archaïzousi ta de nean ektēsanto tēn prosēgorian).

This parallel, not noticed by the editors (vol. IV pp. 499–500), may be interpreted as a mark of Constantine's atelier, if not evidence that the emperor himself was behind the plan of the work, although his wishes were not fulfilled, as also happened with in *DAI*, the fourth section of which consists only of the short chapters 47–48 dealing with Cyprus, despite the ambitious plan devised in the internal introduction quoted above, announcing that the following section will deal with the "relations between the Romans and certain peoples at various times". The editors justly remark that "il semble que ce titre ait été conçu avant que les excerpteurs n'aient terminé leur travail de sélection" (vol. IV, p. 500).

Finally, the closing sentence of the proem of Book I may be understood as programmatic:

λεκτέον περὶ ἑκάστης τάξεως, ὅπως τε καὶ καθ' ὃν ὀφείλει τρόπον ἐκτελεῖσθαι καὶ συμπεραίνεσθαι

(lekteon peri hekastēs taxeōs, opōs te kai kath' on opheilei tropon ekteleisthai kai symperainesthai).

The editors remark that this last sentence is joined to the end of the proem without any particle, a fact they consider "surprenant" (vol. I, p. 4, note 11), but they fail to see that the reason for this is that this sentence, constructed with a verbal adjective in -τέος (-teos) similar to the ἰστέον ὅτι (isteon hoti) clauses, does not belong to the proem, but is in fact the beginning of the internal introduction to the initial chapters of Book I, including at least chapters I.1–9 before the lacuna. Again the formulation resembles the description of the content of first section of the *DAI* as put forward in its proem (coincidences in bold):

πρῶτα μὲν ποῖον ἔθνος **κατὰ** τί μὲν **ὠφελῆσαι** δύναται Ῥωμαίους, **κατὰ** τί δὲ βλάψαι, καὶ ποῖον καὶ **πῶς ἕκαστον** τούτων καὶ παρὰ ποίου δύναται ἔθνους καὶ πολεμεῖσθαι καὶ ὑποτάσσεσθαι (prōta men poion ethnos **kata** ti men **ōphelēsai** dynatai Rōmaious, **kata** ti de blapsai, kai poion kai **pōs hekaston** toutōn kai para poiou dynatai ethnous kai polemeisthai kai hypotassesthai). *DAI*, proem, ll. 14–17.

As we see, we find a series of set phrases in *De Cer.* that are very similar to others found in other Constantinian works and could have served as introductory remarks to different sections of the compilation. These sentences deserve our attention for they may reflect the editorial plan at certain points, along with other elements, such as the mise en page of the text (so, for instance, the editors notice on vol. I, p. 72* that the subsections of II.40–56 are marked by the layout of the page). Most of them could have been turned into chapter titles, but a few remained outside the chapter system of the work and are evidence of the complex process of compilation of *De Cer.* This two-level ordering of the contents of the book, perhaps inspired in the working method used for contemporary law compilations such as the *Basilika* (with books, titles and chapters) would perhaps help us to understand better the genesis of the work. (Some of the chapter titles of the *Basilika* have a similar phrasing, see for instance the titles of Bas. 4.27: **περὶ** διαλύσεων, **καὶ πότε** ἔξεστι διαλύεσθαι **καὶ πότε** οὐκ ἔξεστι, **καὶ ποῖαι** τῶν διαλύσεων οὐ κρατοῦσιν [**peri** dialyseōn, **kai pote** exesti dialyesthai **kai pote** ouk exesti, **kai poiai** tōn dialyseōn ou kratousin]; and Bas. 5.9: **περὶ** ἐκκλήτου, **καὶ τίνες** δύνανται ἐκκαλεῖσθαι, **καὶ ποῖαι** τῶν ἀποφάσεων οὐχ ὑπόκεινται ἐκκλήτῳ, **καὶ περὶ** διαφόρων προθεσμιῶν τῆς ἐκκλήτου, **καὶ ὅτι** τρίτον τις οὐκ ἐκκαλεῖται [**peri** ekklētou, **kai tines** dynantai ekkaleisthai, **kai poiai** tōn apophaseōn ouch hypokeintai ekklētō, **kai peri** diaphorōn prothesmiōn tēs ekklētou, **kai hoti** triton tis ouk ekkaleitai]. There are also scholia in the Bas. introduced with ἰστέον ὅτι [isteon hoti], although very few in number [several dozen].)

4. Extent of the treatise.
The foregoing remarks on the titles and the pinax will help us now to address a third aspect of the nature of the *De Cer.* which appears crucial for understanding its composition. I refer here to the extent of the treatise. Understandably, the

editors have excluded from the new edition, for practical reasons, certain treatises transmitted in the Lipsiensis which have already been published by modern scholars in accordance with the high standards needed for modern research. This concerns several treatises of varying length preserved both at the beginning and at the end of the text of *De Cer.* and listed as such in the new edition, but whose belonging to the work is the subject of debate:

1) Three treatises on military expeditions which are copied before Book I. These were edited in J. HALDON, Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions (*CFHB* 28). Vienna 1990, as a separate work in the *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, that is, the same series in which the present edition is published. Therefore, it appeared inconvenient to re-edit the text again in the same collection.

2) The *Kletorologion* of Philotheos included in chapters II.52–53 and edited by N. OIKONOMIDES, Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles. Paris 1972.

3) The *Ekthesis* of the hierarchy of the bishops of the ecumenical sees by Epiphanios of Salamis, which deals only with the sees dependant on Constantinople, included in chapter II.54 and edited by J. DARROUZÈS, Notitiae episcopatuum Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae. Paris 1981, 203–213.

To these we should also add two further works mentioned in the pinax of the Lipsiensis but not transmitted in the manuscript:

4) The *Life of Alexander*, mentioned as chapter II.56 in the pinax of the Lipsiensis.

5) The *Physiologus,* mentioned as chapter II.57 in the pinax of the Lipsiensis.

These two last entries are clearly different from the rest and the editors are certainly right in considering their inclusion in the pinax as circumstantial (vol. I, pp. 81*–82*), although this decision has no impact whatsoever on the edition because the two treatises are not transmitted in the manuscript. The case of the *Kletorologion* (no. 2) and the *Ekthesis* (no. 3) is different: The editors note their graphic isolation in the manuscript from the preceding chapters, but also the many links that connect them with *De Cer*; furthermore, they edit the two chapters II.55 and 55bis following them (vol. I, pp. 72*–75*). They therefore conclude that they belonged to the work and it is only for practical reasons that they did not edit them in the new edition.

The three texts on military expeditions (no. 1) are however considered not to form part of the work and it is worth considering this case in some detail. The main argument here is that these texts were copied before the proem of *De Cer.* which supposedly introduces the work (vol. I, p. 80*: "Les traités militaires ne font pas partie du *De Cerimoniis,* dont ils sont nettement separés"). However, the text is copied in the same quaternion, as we have already noticed, and the third treatise has a lengthy proem by the emperor himself which is somehow in the spirit of the compilation. In fact, the editors declare that "l'on peut se demander si la préface du traité C,

particulièrement solennelle, n'a pas rendu inutile, dans l'esprit de Constantin VII, une nouvelle dédicace à son fils en tête du *De cerimoniis*". This may go in the right direction, but unfortunately the editors do not investigate further the close links between the treatises and the rest of the *De Cer.* Some considerations can be advanced in this respect.

To begin with, the text of these three treatises was certainly copied *before* the proem of Book I of *De Cer.*, but *after* the pinax of this same Book I. This pinax, as we have seen, is now lost except for a few words belonging to the final chapters, but the probability is high that it actually mentioned the three treatises and included them somehow in Book I. Since the pinax of Book II has the title πίναξ σὺν θεῷ τοῦ δευτέρου βιβλίου (pinax syn theō tou deuterou bibliou), we should expect that the pinax of Book I was originally entitled πίναξ σὺν θεῷ τοῦ πρώτου βιβλίου (pinax syn theō tou prōtou bibliou).

To be sure, it is not a good start for the compilation to begin with a short ὑπόθεσις (hypothesis) of ca. 15 lines in Haldon's edition preserving a bare list of the *aplekta* and imperial marching camps (treatise A). This text represents some cursory notes taken by Constantine VII and placed inappropriately before the more substantial treatises B and C. Treatise B is perhaps an excerpt of a treatise by Leo Katakylas (if not by the emperor himself, as argued by C. ZUCKERMANN, Campaign blueprints of an emperor who never campaigned in person: Constantine VII's treatises on imperial expeditions and *De Cer.* II.45 [with special regard to the thema of Charpezikion], in: Constantinople réelle et imaginaire, autour de l'œuvre de Gilbert Dagron, *TM* 22.1 [2018] 341–382) which inspired the composition of the final text, treatise C, a work certainly written by the emperor himself and introduced by a rhetorical and informative proem. As treatise C is the main text, it should have preceded treatises A and B, but this reverse order here is not unique, and similar anomalies can be found in the chapters of *De Cer.* Consider for instance chapter II.45, where some complementary entries introduced by ἴστεον ὅτι (isteon hoti) clauses are copied before the title of the chapter itself (II.45, ll.40–43), thus confusing the copyist who forgot to write the number 45 for the chapter (vol. III, p. 314). The procedure followed by the copyist in copying the original συλλογή (syllogē) produced these oddities, which, like the sequence of the chapters, does not adequately reflect the original project of the emperor.

Another possibility is that the copy of the three military treatises at the beginning of the compilation was an afterthought and could have been caused by confusion concerning the order for copying the documents contained in the bulky dossier of *De Cer.* It in fact appears strange that the text of *De Cer.* starts on f. 21v of the manuscript, that is, on the verso of the fifth folio of a quaternion, the third quaternion of the manuscript if we exclude the lost gathering which contained the pinax to Book I. If this was supposed to be the start of the work, why would the copyist have left blank the foregoing folios in this quaternion? The fact that the pinax of Book I ends on the recto of the fifth folio of a quaternion may perhaps indicate that the verso of this same quaternion was initially intended for copying the beginning of *De Cer.* But why then did the copyist note down the pinax in a separate quaternion instead of, as intended, on the first folia of the

quaternion in which he started copying the text of *De Cer.*? If this was not in fact a mistake (?), perhaps the copyist simply changed his mind after he had copied a few folia of *De Cer.*, or received new instructions from his patron, who perhaps did not like his layout.

In any case, the copyist would appear to have been uncertain about the final extent of a pinax that was being produced simultaneously with the copying of the texts of this vast compilation, and therefore he decided in the end to copy it in a separate quaternion. He then filled the initial blank folia of the quaternion containing the text of *De Cer.* with the final section of the three military treatises which he had begun copying and had filled two quaternions which he attached at the beginning of the codex. The text of these treatises ends now in the third quaternion of the Lipsiensis, at the very bottom of f. 21r, where the letters are compressed and abbreviations increase in the last lines. Perhaps further related parts were skipped (see immediately below for the related chapters II.44–45). All this is obviously speculative and based on a series of assumptions, but it could point in the right direction in order to explain why the three treatises on military expeditions were copied between the pinax and the beginning of Book I of *De Cer.*, for no satisfactory explanation has been found until now.

(EXCURSUS: Whether the gathering of the pinax was originally a quaternion or not is difficult to assess. As the last folio of the pinax, the flyleaf today numbered I, was initially numbered 5 in the upper right corner of the recto [where the pinax ended], the editors argue that it was a binion + flyleaf or a ternion [vol. I, pp. 141*, 145*, 188*], for a quaternion would have left blank at least 7 pages [ff. 5v–8v of the quaternion] which would not make sense if the pinax was copied directly from the archetype, for the text of *De cer.* should have started immediately after the pinax. In my opinion, we should not rule out the possibility that the pinax was initially copied on a quaternion, whose final blank folia were cut off when the book received its present binding, as we see that ff. 1r and 2r of the first preserved quaternion still have the numbers 6 and 7 in the upper right corner of the recto. That f. I was not a flyleaf is argued by FEATHERSTONE, Preliminary Remarks 458: "The front flyleaf, of parchment, is the second folio of a bifolium which is attached to the board along the inside margin by the crumpled stump of the first folio, but which had earlier been pasted flat on the inside of the front board. A small piece from its outer margin, torn off when it was detached, is still stuck to the leather binding wrapped round the outer edge of the board." For more details about the transfer of ink see ibid. 467–468, note 6 and his article M. FEATHERSTONE, Further Remarks on *De Cerimoniis*. *BZ* 97 [2004] 113–121, not considered by the editors in their short discussion of the pinax on pp. 187*–188*)

On the other hand, there are evident connections between these treatises and *De Cer.*, particularly with chapters II.44–45 which deal with expeditions in Crete and Lombardy. The editors affirm on p. 73* that "certains de ces dossiers, comme ceux des expéditions militaires [i.e. II.44–45], ont peu de rapport avec le reste de l'ouvrage", as they do not consider our military treatises to be a part of the compilation, in which

case the pertinence of these chapters could be seen from a different perspective. It is relevant that the very particular use of the preposition διά (dia) + genitive in the internal headings of treatise C, with the meaning "for" (similar to modern Greek γιά (gia); this use is not recorded in the "notes sur la langue du *De Cerimoniis*" in vol. V, pp. 142–143) appears again in the internal headings of chapters II.44–45 but is absent from the rest of the work. See also the expression τὰ μέλλοντα ταξειδεῦσαι ἐν Κρήτῃ (ta mellonta taxeideusai en Krētē) of II.45, l.50 which appears in the title of treatise B (μέλλοντος ταξιδεύειν [mellontos taxideuein]) and, in a similar form, also in the first heading of treatise C (μέλλοντος φοσσατεῦσαι [mellontos phossateusai]).

The expression ὅσα δεῖ γίνεσθαι (hosa dei ginesthai), which appears twice in treatise C, ll.6–7 and 665–884, is used only once in *De Cer.*, in II.19, a chapter whose content is very close to the treatise on military expeditions in that it deals with the triumph celebrated in the Forum after a victory on the battlefield (the parallel is noted by the editors in vol. I, pp. 33*–34*). Also II.20 deals with a triumph, although the present title has the more usual phrasing ὅσα δεῖ παραφυλάττειν (hosa dei paraphyllatein). In fact, the editors remark the relation of these two chapters to treatise C in vol. IV.2, pp. 705–712.

Moreover, Denis Feissel supports the idea that a part of treatise C edited by Haldon was an excerpt from the work of Peter the Patrician (vol. I, p. 67*), further excerpts from whom were preserved in I.93–104. He concludes that this circumstance proves that the excerpts "font partie des matériaux collectés par Constantin VII en vue d'élaborer son propre cérémonial", but he does not go a step further to include the treatises in the same project as the two books of *De Cer.*

Finally, we must consider a statement by the emperor in treatise C of Haldon (p. 94, l. 25) where he tells us that only later and with difficulty (ὀψὲ καὶ μόλις [opse kai molis]) "we were able to find" (εὑρεῖν ἠδυνήθημεν/heurein ēdynēthēmen) a treatise (ὑπόμνημα/hypomnēma) on the topic in the monastery of Sigriane. This resembles closely the abovementioned note in the title of chapter I.95 (ὅσα εὑρεῖν ἠδυνήθημεν/hosa heurein ēdynēthēmen) and both would reveal the involvement of the emperor in the editorial task.

It can obviously be argued that all these features shared by the military treatises and some chapters of *De Cer.* prove nothing but the common origin of the sources used in these works, ultimately coming from the dossier of texts gathered by Emperor Constantine in the imperial library. Similar connections could be found between *De administrando imperio* and *De cerimoniis* which would not prove that we have to do here with a single work. This is obviously a matter for further discussion, but I still think that the unexpected position of the three military treatises at the beginning of the Lipsiensis (and their probable inclusion in the pinax of Book I) speaks for their belonging to the *De Cer.* and, in any case, is not the result of a conscious choice by the emperor (or, alternatively, by Basilios Parakoimomenos), but an accident of the copying. Nevertheless, the question of the limits of "works"—as well as of the hierarchy of chapters and sections—should perhaps be considered on a new basis, not determined by modern mentality under the influence of the

fixed limits of printed books. The various antiquarian treatises of Constantine Porphyrogenitus were perhaps not conceived as independent works, but were rather instalments or λόγοι (logoi, each with its corresponding proem) of a single ambitious project, issued thus serially for practical reasons, after each λόγος (logos) was completed—some of them even, as is the case of *De Cer.*, after Constantine's death. This would explain the different dates suggested by the editors for Book I and II. I recently proposed a similar approach to Procopius' editorial work in J. SIGNES CODOÑER, One History… in Several Instalments. Dating and Genre in Procopius' Works. *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Neoellenici* 54 (2017) [2018] 3–26.

Juan Signes Codoñer
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Departamento de Filología Clásica
Edificio A, Ciudad Universitaria, 28040 Madrid
jsignes@ucm.es

Annemarie KAUFMANN-HEINIMANN – Max MARTIN, Die Apostelkanne und das Tafelsilber im Hortfund von 1628. Trierer Silberschätze des 5. Jahrhunderts (*Trierer Zeitschrift*, Beiheft 35). Trier: Reichert 2017. 333 S. ISBN 978-3-944371-06-1.

Das vorliegende Buch behandelt zwei herausragende spätantike Silberfunde aus dem spätrömischen Stadtquartier am Moselufer in Trier in all ihren Facetten: Die 1992 durch Zufall aufgefundene Silberkanne mit christlichem Dekor und den heute verlorenen Trierer Silberschatz von 1628, die beide außergewöhnliche Beispiele des spätrömischen Tafelgeschirrs darstellen. Aufgeboten werden hier sämtliche dem heutigen ‚state of the art' der Forschung entsprechenden Informationen zu den Objekten, sowohl auf stilistischer und ikonographischer Ebene als auch – basierend auf einer interdisziplinären Zusammenarbeit – in archäometallurgischer, herstellungstechnischer und materialanalytischer Hinsicht. Dies vermittelt nicht nur einen detaillierten Blick auf die hier vorgestellten Objekte, sondern ist auch eine ausgezeichnete Basis und ein weiterer essentieller Baustein hinsichtlich unseres Wissens zu spätantikem Tafelsilber.

Im ersten Beitrag von Sabine Faust (S. 9–14) wird ein kurzer Überblick über die Ausgrabungen im römischen Quartier an der Feldstraße in Trier gegeben, inklusive den einzelnen Befund- und Fundsituationen der für dieses Buch relevanten Objekte. Anschließend daran finden sich Auszüge aus den Originalaufzeichnungen zur Auffindung der Silberkanne von Heinz Cüppers aus dem Jahre 1992.

Eine genaue Dokumentation zur Ausgrabungssituation von 1992 an der Feldstraße in Trier gibt Hartwig Löhr im nachfolgenden Kapitel (S. 15–20), womit der Leser einen guten Einstieg für die nachfolgenden Ausführungen erhält.

Besonders wertvoll und hilfreich für den Leser ist die anschließende detaillierte Bilddokumentation der Silberkanne, die zugleich auch die Einleitung für die nachfolgenden Erläuterungen darstellt (S. 22–43). Gegenübergestellt finden sich hier jeweils großformatige Farbabbildungen und die dazugehörigen Zeichnungen mit einer genauen Beschriftung der Einzelteile des Gefäßes und seinem Dekor sowie Detailansichten sämtlicher Verzierungen auf dem Gefäßkörper. Dies ist für das Verständnis und die Benützung des Buches unerlässlich und ist in ausgezeichneter Form repräsentiert.

Im Anschluss befasst sich Annemarie Kaufmann-Heinimann mit dem ersten bzw. eigentlichen Schwerpunkt des vorliegenden Buches, nämlich der 1992 entdeckten Trierer Silberkanne selbst (S. 45–127). Der Beitrag beginnt mit einer Beschreibung der Kanne in all ihren einzelnen Bestandteilen sowie der darauf abgebildeten Ornamente und Figuren, ausgezeichnet veranschaulicht durch detaillierte Abbildungen. Im anschließenden ausführlichen Kommentar wird Bezug auf Form und Verzierung der Kanne genommen: Das Trierer Gefäß wird unter Bezugnahme auf relevante Vergleiche wie den Hort von Traprain Law (GB) oder auch den Seuso-Schatzfund typologisch eingeordnet. Dazu werden Typen aufgrund von ca. 60 Parallelen des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts erstellt (Typen A–F), die in ihren Merkmalen genauer besprochen und miteinander verglichen werden. Dies betrifft nicht nur die Form, sondern auch die Einzelteile, aus der sich die Kanne zusammensetzt wie Henkel, Mündungsattaschen, Deckel und die Daumen- und Fingerrast sowie deren herstellungstechnischen Merkmale. Sehr umfangreich gestaltet sich auch das Kapitel über die Verzierung der Kanne: Jedes Einzelmotiv wird herausgegriffen und anhand von Vergleichen unter Einbeziehung der verschiedenen Verzierungstechniken ikonographisch und stilistisch aufs Genaueste analysiert: So werden beispielsweise die Ornamente auf den Niellofeldern der Trierer Kanne vergleichbaren nielloverzierten silbernen Gefäßen aber auch anderen Objektträgern wie den Zwiebelknopffibeln mit Niellodekor gegenübergestellt; gleiches gilt auch für die Reliefarbeiten. Sehr hilfreich für den Leser sind in diesem Zusammenhang die zusätzlichen Tabellen, die einen visuellen Vergleich mit den unterschiedlichen Parallelen erlauben.

Sehr ausführlich behandelt wird auch der figürliche Bildschmuck auf der Trierer Kanne. Basierend auf typologischen, ikonographischen und stilistischen Details werden zu den Aposteldarstellungen auf der Kanne Parallelen wie die Bildprogramme auf den Apostelsarkophagen oder auch Darstellungen auf anderen Materialgattungen der Kleinkunst herangezogen, um zu einer schlüssigen Deutung der auf der Trierer Silberkanne gezeigten Figuren zu gelangen, von denen keine Beischriften vorhanden sind. Identifizierbar aufgrund spezifischer Merkmale sind einzig die Apostelfürsten Petrus und Paulus, die sich vor allem durch die Darstellungen auf den frühchristlichen Sarkophagen festlegen lassen. Stilistische Besonderheiten der Trierer Figuren verglichen mit Merkmalen auf Elfenbeintafeln aus London und Paris führen A. Kaufmann-Heinimann in überzeugender Weise zu dem Schluss, dass zwar keine gemeinsame Werkstatttradition vorliegt, aber den Handwerkern bzw. Künstlern wohl die gleichen Vorlagen zur Verfügung gestanden haben müssen, wobei die Autorin die Herkunft der Trierer Kanne in einer westlichen Werkstatt des frühen 5. Jahrhunderts vermutet.

Ein weiterer Punkt betrifft die Frage nach der ursprünglichen Funktion der Silberkanne. Mit Hilfe von bildlichen und schriftlichen Quellen, aber auch aufgrund des speziellen

christlichen Bildschmucks der Kanne wird anhand von Vergleichsbeispielen auf unterschiedlichen Trägern und Materialien und hier vor allem der Feinkeramik überprüft, inwieweit sich Aussagen zu silbernem Tafelgeschirr der Spätantike im Allgemeinen und aufgrund der christlichen Darstellungen zum liturgischen Bereich im Besonderen herstellen lassen, und nachvollziehbar diskutiert.

Schließlich wird erörtert, ob die Apostelkanne ursprünglich nicht Teil des heute verlorenen Trierer Schatzfunds von 1628 gewesen sein könnte, da sie der gleichen Zeitstellung, nämlich der ersten Hälfte des 5. Jahrhunderts, angehört und Kannen im Inventar des Silberschatzes fehlen. Außerdem ist die Silberkanne nicht das einzige Objekt mit christlichem Dekor, da sich im Schatzfund zwei vergoldete Schalen mit nimbierten Figuren befanden. Diese Umstände lassen durchaus berechtigt auf einen Zusammenhang schließen, auch wenn eine eindeutige Zuweisung offenbleiben muss.

Äußerst hilfreich ist der an diese Analysen angehängte Katalog zu spätantiken Silberkannen des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts, die typologisch gegliedert und in einen zeitlichen Horizont eingebettet werden. Zusätzlich werden Benennungen bestimmter Motive festgelegt, die eine vereinfachte Lesung ermöglichen. Dass alle im Katalog aufscheinenden Vergleichsobjekte tatsächlich auch abgebildet sind, ist dabei eine große Hilfe. Damit erhalten die Leser*innen einen ausgezeichneten Überblick über das bisher bekannte Material und dessen chronologischen Einordnung und können den angestellten Vergleichen mit dem Ausgangsstück, der Apostelkanne, leicht folgen.

Im Beitrag von Ludwig Eiden zur Restaurierung und Herstellungstechnik der Trierer Silberkanne (S. 129–157) wird nach einer kurzen Beschreibung des Erhaltungszustands vor allem auf die Restaurierung der einzelnen Kannenteile eingegangen, dokumentiert anhand zahlreicher Abbildungen des ursprünglichen Zustands im Vergleich zu den vorgenommenen Restaurierungsschritten sowie Röntgenaufnahmen relevanter Details. Angeschlossen daran sind detaillierte Ausführungen zur Herstellungstechnologie; dies betrifft das Gefäß als Ganzes sowie seine Einzelteile, aber auch die unterschiedlichen Verzierungstechniken, die an der Gefäßoberfläche angewandt wurden, wie Niello, Punzierungen und Vergoldung. Offenbar war der Kannenkörper selbst aus einem Stück getrieben. Die abwechselnd konvexen und konkaven Flächen des achtseitigen Kannenkörpers sind alternierend mit Niello und punzierten Feldern gestaltet und einzelne Zonen, wie beispielsweise die acht abgebildeten Figuren sowie die vier Lämmer, wurden vergoldet. Die Abfolge der einzelnen Arbeitsschritte gestaltete sich ursprünglich demnach folgendermaßen: Nach der Verzierung mit Niello sowie dem Entfernen des überschüssigen Niellos wurden die Darstellungen mit drei verschiedenen Punzen (Schrotpunze, Punktpunze und Formpunze) bearbeitet. Im letzten Arbeitsschritt erfolgten die Feuervergoldung sowie die Politur. Außerdem ergab die Untersuchung aufgrund der einzelnen Abnutzungsspuren eine durchaus längere Verwendungszeit der Kanne.

Im Anschluss an die Untersuchung des Kannenkörpers erfolgt eine Analyse der einzelnen Anbauteile wie Deckel, Henkel, Mündungsring, Deckelscharnier, Daumen- und Fingerrast.

Ein eigenes Unterkapitel widmet L. Eiden der Rekonstruktion des Fertigungsprozesses: Ausgehend von den herstellungstechnologischen Untersuchungen an der Trierer Kanne erfolgt ein Vergleich mit anderen in derselben Technik hergestellten zeitgleichen Gefäßen. Es wird aber auch Bezug genommen auf die schriftlichen Quellen wie Theophilus Presbyter und Benvenuto Cellini sowie auf die Beobachtungen an erhaltenen Halbfabrikaten. Die nachfolgend dargestellten einzelnen Arbeitsschritte erläutern den Herstellungsprozess eines Gefäßes vom Rohling zu einer treibfähigen Scheibe und weiter zum eigentlichen Treibvorgang und die daran anschließenden vorbereiteten Arbeiten des Künstlers für die einzelnen Verzierungstechniken – wiederum sehr gut nachvollziehbar für den Leser durch die beigefügten Abbildungen.

Wie auch der Autor schreibt, wäre es durchaus wünschenswert, vergleichbare Objekte einer ähnlich detaillierten Untersuchung der herstellungstechnologischen Aspekte zu unterziehen, um durch mehr Informationen beispielsweise anhand der identifizierten verwendeten Punzen, Rückschlüsse auf eine bestimmte Werkstatt oder einen Werkstattkreis zu erhalten, die nach dem jetzigen Erkenntnisstand noch nicht möglich sind.

Sehr ausführlich gestaltet sich auch die Besprechung von Susanne Greiff zu den chemisch-analytischen Untersuchungen (S. 158–170), die zunächst in einem kurzen Überblick die angewendete Methode durch die zerstörungsfreie Mikro-Röntgenfluoreszenzanlage (μ-RFA) und ihre Vorteile für den vorliegenden Fall beschreibt. Die Fragestellungen richten sich in erster Linie an die Zusammensetzung der Silberlegierungen der Kanne und die Nielloeinlagen. Von beiden wurden an verschiedenen Messstellen quantitative Analysen durchgeführt: Diese sind durch beigefügte Abbildungen, Tabellen und einen Begleittext dokumentiert. Die unterschiedlichen Metallanteile sind in binären XY-Diagrammen veranschaulicht. Nachfolgend wird das Vorhandensein der einzelnen Legierungsbestandteile wie Kupfer, Gold und Blei erklärt. Ein eigener Punkt widmet sich dem Verfahren der Kuppelation mit den Anteilen von Wismut und Zinn.

Beschrieben werden weiters zunächst die unterschiedlichen Herstellungen einzelner Niellotypen, veranschaulicht durch relevante Beispiele und eingebettet in eine chronologische Entwicklung. Davon ausgehend wird im Anschluss auf die spezifischen Nielloeinlagen der Trierer Silberkanne Bezug genommen.

Die chemischen Elemente der Vergoldung des Gefäßes wurden hingegen qualitativ bestimmt, da bei einer quantitativen Untersuchung der relativ dünnen Vergoldungsschicht mit dem angewandten Verfahren ein Teil des Untergrunds mitanalysiert werden würde. Ziel war dabei den Quecksilberanteil nachzuweisen mit dem Ergebnis, dass es sich um eine Feuervergoldung handelt, die vor der Niellierung durchgeführt worden war.

Eine weitere Untersuchung an der Kanne betrifft das Weichlot aus der Füllung der unteren Henkelattasche, analysiert von Roland Schwab (S. 171–173), durch Bestimmung der Bleiisotopenverhältnisse mit einem Multikollektor-Massenspektrometer sowie die chemische Zusammensetzung des Lots mithilfe einer energiedispersiven Röntgenfluores-

zenzanalyse (EDRFA). Die Isotopenverhältnisse des untersuchten Gefäßes sind, eingebettet in die bekanntesten Bleilagerstätten der römischen Kaiserzeit, in einem Diagramm zusammengefasst. Aufgrund der identischen Entsprechungen der Bleiisotopenverhältnisse des Lotes am Trierer Gefäß mit Bleifunden aus Trier selbst aus dem 3. und 4. Jahrhundert, die wiederum Übereinstimmungen mit Lagerstätten in der Eifel haben, gelangt R. Schwab in überzeugender Weise zu dem Schluss, dass das Blei wohl aus der Eifel stammen dürfte und es sich damit um ein lokales Produkt gehandelt hat.

Aufbauend auf den Beitrag von Annemarie Kaufmann-Heinimann beschäftigt sich schließlich B a r b a r a N i e m e y - e r mit den zuvor dargelegten typologischen Kriterien der spätrömischen Silberkannen des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts in Bezug auf ihre Darstellungen auf Medien wie Wandmalereien, Mosaiken, Sarkophagen und Grabmonumenten, Elfenbeintafeln, auf Silberkannen selbst oder in der Buchmalerei sowie ihre Erwähnung in schriftlichen Quellen (S. 175–210). Dazu wurde ein sehr hilfreicher Katalog erstellt, gegliedert nach den zuvor festgelegten Kannentypen A–F. Ein eigenes Unterkapitel widmet sich den Vorläufern, nämlich den früheren Kannendarstellungen des 2. und 3. Jahrhunderts, mit dem Ziel, eine Weiterentwicklung bestimmter Formen oder einzelner Gefäßteile darzulegen.

Anschließend wird ein Vergleich zwischen den dargestellten Kannen und den tatsächlich erhaltenen Typen angestrebt, veranschaulicht durch Diagramme und geordnet nach den einzelnen Typen sowie ihrer chronologischen Abfolge. Dazu werden einzelne typologische Merkmale wie Standfüße, Ausgüsse, Griffe oder Deckel herausgegriffen und ihre Ähnlichkeiten zu den Idealtypen überprüft, auch wenn Barbara Niemeyer festhält, dass häufig eine genaue Zuweisung ausbleiben muss, da bei den meisten Darstellungen Charakteristika mehrerer unterschiedlicher Kannentypen aufeinandertreffen und es zu einer Vermischung kommt, die vom Idealtyp oft recht weit entfernt sind. Behandelt wird weiters die Verteilung der Kannentypen nach ihren Fundregionen und ihrer zeitlichen Einordnung.

Aufgrund ihrer Ausführungen gelangt Barbara Niemeyer zu Recht zu dem Schluss, dass zwar bei den in realiter existierenden Kannen durchaus eine Entwicklung in ihren Gefäßformen und Verzierungen nachweisbar ist, die eine typologische und chronologische Zuweisung ermöglichen, diese jedoch bei den Kannendarstellungen nicht unbedingt nachvollziehbar ist, da man sich bei den abgebildeten Gefäßen offenbar nicht an den zeittypischen Originalen orientiert hat.

Der zweite Teil des Buchs von M a x M a r t i n widmet sich dem Trierer Schatzfund von 1628 (S. 213–284), einem der bedeutendsten Ensembles spätantiken Silbergeschirrs im Kontext des Tafelsilbers des 5. Jahrhunderts: Zunächst werden Fundgeschichte und Forschungsstand kurz zusammengefasst. Darauf folgt eine Darstellung und Transkription des 1628 – also noch vor dem Einschmelzen – erstellten Inventars des Hortfunds von W. Binsfeld nach mehreren Quellen des 17. Jahrhunderts, die die einzigen Grundlagen zu diesem herausragenden Schatzfund bilden. Anhand dieses Inventars werden die ursprünglich vorhandenen Objektgruppen mit ca. 50 Gegenständen in einem Kurzkatalog von M. Martin rekonstruiert und vergleichbaren Ensembles des 4. und 5.

Jahrhunderts gegenübergestellt. Die im Inventar von 1628 aufgeführten Objekte umfassen Auftragsplatten (TR 1–10), Tafelzubehör (TR 11–14), Ess- und Beigeschirr (TR 15–36), eine Toilettenbox mit Inhalt (TR 37–41), Geschirrteile und Kleingefäße (?) (TR 42–46) sowie einen Faltstuhl (TR 47) und zwei Teller mit frühchristlichen Darstellungen (TR 48 und 49).

Um zu einer relativ- aber auch absolut-chronologischen Einordnung des Trierer Schatzfunds zu gelangen, setzt Max Martin auf eine Einbettung in das bekannte Repertoire des spätantiken Tafelsilbers, und hier besonders auf geschlossene Geschirrensembles, und beschäftigt sich auch mit Gegenständen, die nicht im Schatzfund von Trier vorhanden waren, wie Teile des Essbestecks, diverse Gefäßformen, aber auch mit verschiedenen Hacksilberhorten. Die zeitliche Einordnung durch den Vergleich von Gewicht, Größe, Form und Dekoration mit vergleichbaren Silberschatzfunden u.a. Kaiseraugst, Esquilin, Mildenhall, Karthago oder dem Seuso-Schatz wird durchaus nachvollziehbar diskutiert. Ein gelungener Nebeneffekt dieser Ausführungen ist ein ausgezeichneter Überblick über die allgemeine Entwicklung des spätrömischen Silbergeschirrs und seine Einzelteile, übersichtlich dargestellt in Diagramm Abb. 30.

Des Weiteren untersucht M. Martin Umfang und Wert des Services. Im Zuge dessen werden mithilfe von Schriftquellen Überlegungen angestellt zu dem tatsächlichen Kaufpreis eines Services und in weiterer Folge in Relation zu den bekannten Äquivalenten aus Gold gesetzt. Diskutiert werden ebenfalls die überlieferten Inschriften auf den einzelnen Gefäßen des Trierer Schatzfunds und die möglichen Besitzer mit schriftlich überlieferten Namen verglichen und in nachvollziehbarer Weise erörtert.

Zur Vervollständigung des vorliegenden Themas erfolgt schließlich eine historische Einbettung des Schatzfunds anhand einer kurzen Darstellung der Geschichte der Stadt Trier in spätrömischer Zeit mit einem Schwerpunkt auf ihre Produktionszentren.

Die angehängten Exkurse (S. 139–243 und S. 268) beschäftigen sich einerseits mit spätantiken Silbergefäßen mit christlichem Kontext und deren Funktion, andererseits mit der Beziehung zwischen dem Wert des Hortfunds und dem Anlass seiner Verbergung.

Neben den herausragenden Publikationen vor allem der letzten Jahre zu den großen Schatzfunden von Kaiseraugst (Der spätrömische Silberschatz von Kaiseraugst – Die neuen Funde. Silber im Spannungsfeld von Geschichte, Politik und Gesellschaft der Spätantike, hrsg. M. A. Guggisberg [*Forschungen in Augst* 34]. August 2003) oder auch Mildenhall (R. HOBBS, The Mildenhall Treasure: Late Roman Silver Plate from East Anglia [*British Museum Research Publications* 200]. London 2016). ist dieses Buch nun ein weiterer essentieller Baustein, um unser Wissen zu Aussehen und Umfang eines spätantiken Tafelservices zu erweitern.

Der Band deckt alle nur erdenklichen Bereiche der modernen Forschung ab – angefangen von der Auffindung der Objekte und ihrem archäologischen Kontext, der genauen ikonographischen und stilistischen Analyse der Gefäße bis hin zur Herstellungstechnik und den zugehörigen Materialanalysen. Somit entsteht ein umfassendes Bild nicht nur der hier vorgestellten Gegenstände, sondern – auch dank der

Einbettung in ihren relevanten chronologischen Rahmen – des gesamten bekannten silbernen Tafelgeschirrs im 4. und 5. Jahrhundert.

Andrea M. Pülz
Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut
Franz Klein-Gasse 1, A-1190 Wien
andrea.puelz@oeaw.ac.at

Michael Psellus, Epistulae. Volumen 1 und 2, edidit Stratis PAPAIOANNOU (*Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*, BT 2030). Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter 2019. CLXXXV+1207 S. ISBN: 978-3110622010.

Michael Psellos (1018–1076), einer der bedeutendsten Vertreter des byzantinischen intellektuellen und literarischen Lebens, hat eine seiner überragenden Persönlichkeit entsprechend große Anzahl von Briefen hinterlassen. Bisher war dieses Corpus, das, was den Umfang betrifft, Vergleichbares lediglich in der Briefsammlung des Theodoros Stoudites aufzuweisen hat, nur in verschiedenen Teileditionen zugänglich. Im Jahre 2019 hat Stratis Papaioannou, einer der besten Kenner des kaum überschaubaren Psellos'schen Werkes, eine alle Briefe umfassende Edition in der hochangesehenen Teubner-Reihe vorgelegt. Musste man bisher verschiedene Teileditionen benutzen (insbesondere die verdienstvollen Ausgaben von Konstantinos Sathas, S, sowie von Eduard Kurtz und Franz Drexl, K-D), sind nunmehr alle Briefe in einer Edition vereint (von nun ab mit der Sigle Π versehen).

Eine ausführliche Einleitung erklärt die Vorgeschichte der heute erhaltenen Briefe. Die überaus verwickelte Überlieferungslage ist damit zu erklären, dass die vom Autor selbst angelegte(n) ursprüngliche(n) Sammlung(en) sowie Sammlungen der Adressaten miteinander kontaminiert wurden. Erkennen lässt sich heute noch, dass diese Sammlungen teilweise chronologisch angeordnet waren. Da sich die chronologische Reihenfolge jedoch für die Gesamtheit der Briefe nicht mehr rekonstruieren lässt, ebenso wenig wie die vielleicht vorhandene(n) Sammlung(en) von Psellos, entschied sich der Editor, die Briefe nach Adressaten zu ordnen (siehe Prolegomena S. CXLIX–CL). Die vorliegende Ausgabe beginnt mit (a) den Briefen, deren Adressat namentlich genannt wird, darauf folgen (b) Briefe an anonyme Adressaten (d.h. etwa die an einen ungenannten kritēs/Richter gerichteten Briefe) sowie (c) titellose Briefe. Den Abschluss bilden (d) Briefexzerpte, überarbeitete Briefe und Briefe anderer, mit dem Psellos'schen Corpus verbundener Autoren. Insgesamt sind dies 556 Texte. Zum Inhalt dieser Briefe sowie der Identität der Adressaten bietet der reichhaltige, von Michael JEFFREYS und Marc D. LAUXTERMANN herausgegebene Band, The Letters of Psellos. Cultural Networks and Historical Realities. Oxford 2017, umfassende Informationen, auch wenn Papaioannou im Vorspann zu den einzelnen Briefgruppen oder Briefen mitunter zu abweichenden Datierungen oder Identifikationen gelangt. Für all jene, für die Psellos'

Originaltexte schwer zu entschlüsseln sind, stellen die von Michael Jeffreys erstellten Zusammenfassungen des Inhalts eine unschätzbare Interpretationshilfe dar.

In der Edition wurden bewusst auch Texte berücksichtigt, die entweder nicht von Psellos stammen oder einer anderen Kategorie Text angehören als derjenigen des Briefes (zumindest nach modernem Verständnis – darunter Reden und Essays). Hierbei wurden unter den als „Likely non-letters" charakterisierten Stücken diejenigen übergangen, die bereits in einer rezenten guten Edition vorliegen (Prolegomena S. XLIV–LI und CXLVI–IX). Obwohl diese Auswahlkriterien auf den ersten Blick willkürlich erscheinen mögen, zeugen sie von einer vernünftigen und am Machbaren orientierten Herangehensweise des Editors.

In der Beschreibung der Handschriften – eine faszinierende Studie an sich! – geht Papaioannou insbesondere auf folgende Fragen ein (Prolegomena S. LVII): Um was für eine Art von Briefsammlung handelt es sich bei jeder einzelnen Handschrift (sofern man jeweils tatsächlich von einer Sammlung sprechen kann)? In welcher Beziehung stehen Psellos' Briefe zum Rest der Handschrift? Wer war der Ersteller/Redaktor der jeweiligen Sammlung? Auf welches Original gehen die jeweiligen Abschriften zurück? Wie verhält sich die Güte des überlieferten Textes gegenüber den anderen Handschriften? Diese Darstellung bietet so ein anschauliches Bild der Rezeption und Verbreitung von Psellos' Briefen. Hervorzuheben ist, dass weit mehr als die Hälfte der Briefe (nämlich 376) lediglich in einer einzigen Handschrift überliefert sind. Papaioannou spricht diesbezüglich treffend von „fragiler Überlieferung" und von „fragiler Literatur". Offensichtlich spielte der Zufall eine entscheidende Rolle dafür, was an Psellos' Briefen erhalten blieb. In den Fußnoten sind viele aufschlussreiche Informationen enthalten, die oft weit über das Kernthema hinausgehen. Interessant ist, dass in den Handschriften teilweise die Briefe gemeinsam mit Texten etwa von Synesios oder Philo von Alexandria überliefert sind, Autoren, die von Psellos' geschätzt und häufig zitiert wurden. Solche Handschriften dürften den Inhalt von Psellos' Bibliothek widerspiegeln. Möglich ist weiter, dass einzelne Briefe in (von Psellos' selbst?) überarbeiteter Form zirkulierten (siehe etwa Fußnote 61), was bestimmte Abweichungen in der Überlieferung erklären würde (wie dies etwa auch bei Demetrios Kydones der Fall ist, dessen autographe Korrekturen an den eigenen Briefen erhalten sind). Ebenfalls interessant ist das bei machen Texten auftretende Phänomen, das Papaioannou als „Dekonkretisierung" des Inhalts der Briefe bezeichnet (Prolegomena S. LX), wobei konkrete Angaben zu Adressat und den Entstehungsumständen des Briefes vom Kopisten/Redaktor entfernt werden und sich diese Briefe in der Folge zu zeitlosen Musterbriefen entwickeln.

Die gelegentlichen Widersprüche, die sich aufgrund der komplizierten Überlieferungslage, aber auch wegen der langjährigen Entstehungsgeschichte der Edition innerhalb der Edition ergaben (so musste etwa die Zählung der Briefe in einem frühen Stadium fixiert werden, ohne dass spätere Revisionen möglich gewesen wären), werden von Papaioannou allesamt schonungslos angesprochen (S. CLI ff.). [Zu ergänzen wäre, dass im Apparatus fontium bei Binnenverweisen bisweilen die alten Versionen des Textes stehengeblieben sind (vgl. z.B. Π170.67 app. mit der korrigierten

Version Π169.23 oder ἀγένητον [agenēton] Π306.40–41 app. im Zitat aus Π400.21–23, dort aber richtig, korrigiert gegenüber K-D).] Gerade bei einem so umfangreichen, sich über Jahrzehnte erstreckenden editorischen Projekt wäre mehr Beistand seitens des Verlages in Form eines abschließenden Lektorats wünschenswert gewesen. Dadurch hätten etwa Abweichungen der Seitenzahlen im Inhaltsverzeichnis (ab S. 1073 bis 1200, anstatt 1202, sind die Angaben um zwei Seiten verrutscht) oder die nicht seltenen Tippfehler vermieden werden können (sie betreffen vor allem Hauchzeichen und Akzente, siehe etwa: falscher Spiritus ἕξεις [exeis] Π54.25, οἶον [oion] Π87.41, αῖρε [aire] Π111.215, οὗτος [outos] Π173.22, οὗ [ou] Π202.174, ἧττον [ētton] Π269.57 und 309.11, ᾦ [ō] Π269.13 - Gravis statt Akut ἤδη [ēdē] Π50.13, χαλινὸν·[chalinon] Π88.26, γὰρ ποτε [gar pote] Π89.107, πρός σέ [pros se] Π175.15, ἀλλά σε (alla se, richtig ἀλλὰ σὲ) Π175.29, δὲ μοι [de moi] Π192.37, καὶ με [kai me] Π306.9, γὰρ εἰμι [gar eimi] Π306.40, μὴ που [mē pou] Π318.9 - Akut statt Gravis τά βιβλία [ta biblia] Π76.23, θυγατρί τοῦτο [thygatri touto] Π124.43, Καί τίνι [Kai tini] Π276.1, σύ προσθήκας [sy prosthēkas] Π296.14, τυχόν οὐκ [tychon ouk] Π307.14, βασιλεύς καὶ [basileus kai] Π389.8, ὅς δῆτα [os dēta] Π124.85, ἤ μᾶλλον [ē mallon] Π124.69, ἤ περί [ē peri] Π303.5 - Zirkumflex statt Gravis σᾶ (σὰ τὰ χρυσᾶ) [sa ta chrysa] Π279.8 bzw. Akut statt Zirkumflex σὴς (σῆς) [sēs] Π301.2. - fehlender Akzent in θηρία τινα [thēria tina] Π47.1, οἶον ἐστι [oion esti] Π103.88, ποιεῖται μοι [poietai moi] Π111.46, τιμιότητος σου [timiotētos sou] Π294.13, ἄντικρυς ἐστι (ἐστὶ in Hs P) [antikrys esti] Π280.59, προνοίᾳ τινι [pronoia tini] Π466.1. Weitere Tippfehler wurden bereits von Papaioannou festgestellt und digital zugänglich gemacht: https://www.academia.edu/45356240/Papaioannou_Psellus_Epistulae_Errata_et_corrigenda_List).

Eine herausragende Stärke der vorliegenden Edition ist der ausführliche Apparatus fontium, similium et testimoniorum. Zitate sowie weitere Belege derselben oder der für Psellos typischen Junkturen im übrigen umfangreichen Werk des Autors werden nicht nur ausgewiesen, sondern in voller Länge wiedergegeben. Die literarischen und philosophischen Einflüsse, die auf Psellos wirkten, gehen aus dem derart ausführlich gestalteten Quellenapparat deutlich hervor. Man siehe dazu auch den Index locorum am Ende der Edition: ganze drei Seiten mit Zitaten aus Gregorios von Nazianz, je zwei Seiten für Platon, Proklos und Synesios (neben fünf Seiten Sprichwörter). Anhand der minutiös herausgearbeiteten Anklänge und Anspielungen wird Psellos' dichtes literarisches Beziehungsgeflecht veranschaulicht. Mehr zu Psellos' Verhältnis zu diesen Lieblingsautoren erfährt der interessierte Leser in Papaioannous Studie über Psellos als Rhetor und Autor. [Michael Psellos. Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium. Cambridge 2013. Μιχαὴλ Ψελλός. Ἡ ῥητορικὴ καὶ ὁ λογοτέχνης στὸ Βυζάντιο/Michaēl Psellos. Hē rhētorikē kai ho logotechnēs sto Byzantio. Hērakleio 2021.] Obwohl dieser ausgedehnte Apparatus fontium zweifellos überaus benutzerfreundlich ist, könnte man die Bereitstellung von langen Parallelen aus dem Briefkorpus selbst als Luxus bezeichnen. Das Vor- oder Zurückblättern (oft in unmittelbarer Nähe) wäre dem Leser durchaus zuzumuten gewesen. Z.B. zu Π76.45 zehn Zeilen aus Π62, zu Π78.7 sieben Zeilen aus

Π67. Ebenso deckt sich etwa der Apparat zu Π118.37–48 mit demjenigen zu Π61.4-6. Die Belege zu der wohl auf Synesios zurückgehenden Anrede τριπόθητος κεφαλή (tripothētos kephalē) sind sicherlich aufschlussreich. Jedoch wäre es wohl nicht notwendig gewesen die sechs Zeilen Belege jedes Mal, wenn diese Anrede verwendet wird (immerhin weitere neun Mal), abermals anzuführen; der Verweis auf die erste Stelle hätte genügt.

Psellos' Anspielungen und Zitate sind so vielfältig, dass sie unmöglich erschöpfend dokumentiert werden können. Zum Beispiel wäre zu Π69.14–15 (αἱμωδιάσουσιν οἱ γομφίοι, ὥσπερ δίκας ἀποτιννύντες τῆς ἀπλήστου τροφῆς [aimōdiasousin oi gomphioi, ōsper dikas apotinnyntes tēs aplēstou trophēs] zu ergänzen Jer. 31.29–30 (Οἱ πατέρες ἔφαγον ὄμφακα καὶ οἱ ὀδόντες τῶν τέκνων ἡμωδίασαν, ἀλλ' ἢ ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀποθανεῖται καὶ τοῦ φαγόντος τὸν ὄμφακα αἱμωδιάσουσιν οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ [„Die Väter haben saure Trauben gegessen und den Söhnen werden die Zähne stumpf. Nein, jeder stirbt nur für seine eigene Schuld; nur dem, der die sauren Trauben isst, werden die Zähne stumpf."]). Hinweisen könnte man ebenfalls auf die Phrase πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ (pollou ge ka die, „Weit gefehlt!"), die Psellos überaus häufig verwendet (laut TLG 65-mal im gesamten Werk, davon 17-mal in den Briefen). Unter den Klassikern kommt sie häufig bei Demosthenes (39-mal) und dann bei Kyrillos von Alexandria (79-mal) vor. Unter den späteren, byzantinischen Autoren verwendet sie niemand so oft wie Psellos.

Der vielschichtige Inhalt der Briefe reicht von der persönlichen Stellungnahme des Autors, was sein Verhältnis zur antiken Philosophie betrifft (besonders Π202), über die Vermittlung von Posten in der kaiserlichen Verwaltung an Freunde und Bekannte bis zu den Freuden der Jagd, denen sich Psellos' wohlhabende Korrespondenten hingeben, und vielem anderen mehr. Einige kurze Bemerkungen dazu: Wie in Byzanz allgemein üblich, werden Briefe von Geschenken begleitet, vor allem von Essbarem, Obst oder Fisch; daher ist oft von Gerüchen und Geschmäckern die Rede, und Nahrungsmittelmetaphern („Du, Brot des Lebens", „Du, mein geistiger Weinstock") sind häufig (z.B. in den Briefen an Kaiser Konstantinos Dukas Π80–86). In einigen Briefen an Ioannes Dukas spielen Trüffel als Geschenk eine besondere Rolle, die wiederum mit eindrucksvollen Metaphern verbunden sind.

Durch die Anordnung nach Adressat wird die individuell unterschiedliche „sprachliche Behandlung" der Adressaten durch Psellos deutlich. Die 36 Briefe an Ioannes Dukas stellen die größte Gruppe dar. Stilistisch sind sie literarisch verspielt und locker. Eine weitere große Gruppe sind die 17 an Ioannes Mauropus gerichteten Briefe. Im Vergleich dieser beiden Briefreihen ist deutlich der unterschiedliche Ton zu erkennen. Während die Briefe an den Bruder des Kaisers trotz ihrer Verspieltheit zwar durchaus voll Reverenz, aber auch Schmeichelei sind, kommt in den literarisch und philosophisch höherstehenden Schreiben an den verehrten ehemaligen Lehrer Hochachtung gepaart mit Vertrautheit zum Ausdruck.

Psellos äußert sich wiederholt zum stilistischen Niveau der Briefe. Er erwarte nicht von jedem attizistisches Schreiben, sagt er (Π5.47–51). Seine eigenen Briefe sind gelegent-

lich einfach, um mit dem Adressaten auf derselben Ebene zu stehen, so zum Beispiel Π384 an einen Mönch. Ebenfalls sprachlich-stilistisch einfach sind die für den Kaiser verfassten Briefe an Robert Guiscard. Allgemein ist Psellos eben nicht ein starrer Attizist, er handhabt Sprache flexibel, nicht nur in Abhängigkeit vom Adressaten. Je nach Niveau und Inhalt des Briefes werden Alltagswörter verwendet (viele davon in der Liste beachtenswerter Wörter am Ende der Edition, z.B. κτηματίτζιον [ktēmatitzion], πιττάκιον [pittakion], ταξείδιον [taxeidion], χωραφίτζιον [chōraphitzion]). Nach der Korrektur von ἐναπλίτα (enaplita) zu ἐνάπλια (enaplia) Π169.22 ist das (bereits mit „?“ gekennzeichnete) Lemma ἐνάπλιτον (enapliton) im *LBG* zu streichen. Darüber hinaus sind aufgrund besserer Lesungen durch Papaioannou etwa 20 weitere Wörter aus dem *LBG* als ghost words zu tilgen (Prolegomena S. CXLIV). Dafür ist etwa δρουγγαρέα (droungarea) im *LBG* zu ergänzen. Im Verzeichnis der bemerkenswerten Wörter sollten einige Wortgrundformen anders angesetzt werden; so etwa εἱμαρταῖος (eimartaios, statt –αῖον) oder μέλανδρος (melandros, μελάνδρος). In dieser Liste werden diejenigen Wörter, die ausschließlich im Briefkorpus vorkommen, durch Unterstreichung hervorgehoben. Für den Sprachgebrauch des Psellos wäre es aufschlussreich gewesen, auch auf jene seltenen Wörter hinzuweisen, die im Gesamtwerk des Psellos mehrmals verwendet werden, z.B. ἐντυχία (entychia), εὐέδραστος (euedrastos), θηροφονία (thērophonia), καλοήθεια (kaloētheia), καταγεωμετρέω (katageōmetreō), κατακολπίζομαι (katakolpizomai), κλεπτέλεγχος (kleptelenchos), μαστιγονόμος (mastigonomos, siehe zu allen *LBG*).

Zum Text der Briefe: Michael Jeffreys erklärte, dass „Few of those who have spent years reading Psellos are confident of getting him right“. Die vorliegende Edition stellt einen entscheidenden Schritt zum besseren Verständnis des Autors dar. Stratis Papaioannou hat sich in den vielen Jahren der Beschäftigung mit Michael Psellos eine intime Kenntnis dieses so vielschichtigen Autors erworben. Der gut lesbare und verständlich gemachte Text von Psellos' Briefen in der vorliegenden Edition ist das Ergebnis dieses den Autor durchdringenden Verständnisses. Abgesehen von den bereits erwähnten Tippfehlern liegen die Briefe nunmehr in einer überaus sorgfältigen Edition vor, nicht zuletzt wegen des penibel herausgearbeiteten literarischen Hintergrunds sowie der Querverbindungen auch innerhalb von Psellos' Gesamtœuvre, wie sie im Apparatus fontium dokumentiert werden. Lediglich von der Korrektur παρ' ἐκείνων zu πᾶν ἐκείνων (par' ekeinōn zu pan ekeinōn; Π64.59) bin ich nicht überzeugt. Bei der Verbesserung von Optativ βούλοιο (bouloio) zu Konjunktiv βούλῃ (boulē, Π52.36 – gegen den handschriftlichen Befund) frage ich mich, ob dies notwendig ist angesichts von Psellos' deutlicher Vorliebe für den Gebrauch des Optativs (parallel zum Konjunktiv, siehe dazu den Index Graecitatis Psellique dicendi rationis in D. R. REINSCH, Michaelis Pselli Chronographia [Millennium-Studien 51]. Berlin – Boston 2014, 508–509). Die Form ἐλευθέρωμαι (eleutherōmai, Π66.34 ebenfalls in Gautiers Edition) ist zu ἠλευθέρωμαι (ēleutherōmai) zu verbessern (so auch in Hs P). Im Apparat zu Π66.56 ist die von Gautier falsch edierte Form zu ὑποπτεύθησαν (ypopteuthēsan) zu korrigieren.

Papaioannou weist mit Bedauern darauf hin, dass eine neuerliche Kollation der Handschriften, die die jüngsten Erkenntnisse zum byzantinischen Gebrauch der Enklitika berücksichtigt hätte, aus praktischen Gründen nicht möglich war (Prolegomena S. CLX). Der Editor hat, wie dies bis vor kurzem allgemein üblich war, die Akzentuierung im Zusammenhang mit Enklitika normalisiert. Wie zuletzt von Jacques Noret und Roderich Reinsch gezeigt wurde, erhält jedoch nach byzantinischem Usus etwa ein Wort mit Zirkumflex auf der vorletzten Silbe (entgegen der Schulgrammatik) für gewöhnlich keinen weiteren Akzent auf der Endsilbe, wenn ein Enklitikon folgt, also (die folgenden Beispiele wurden von mir anhand der Handschrift P, Par. Gr. 1182 [*Diktyon* 50786], eines der wichtigen Codices, überprüft): ἶσα μοι (isa moi, statt ἶσά μοι Π76.2), εἶτα με (eita me, Π173.39 εἶτά με), χρῆμα σοι (chrēma soi, Π173.64 χρῆμά σοι), ἐκεῖνοι σε (ekeinoi se, Π280.66), ἀποχρῶντα σοι (apochrōnta soi, Π318.4), τοῦτο φημὶ (τοῦτό φημι, touto phēmi, Π280.9), βραχεῖαν τινὰ (βραχεῖάν τινα, bracheian tina, Π280.13), ἀξιοῦσι με (ἀξιοῦσί με, axiousi me, Π462.3), μελιττουργεῖται μοι (melittourgeitai moi, Π118.37), μετριοφρονῆσαι σε (metriophronēsai se, Π275.4), ἀποφανοῦμαι σοι (apophanoumai soi, Π275.106), ἐνταῦθα τὲ (entautha te, Π275.106), σημεῖον τι (sēmeion ti, Π275.58). Dies ist nicht nur eine rein „formale" Äußerlichkeit. Zum einen ergeben sich durch die Normalisierung scheinbare Widersprüche zur Akzentuierungspraxis in Psellos' Chronographia, die von Roderich Reinsch unter Rücksichtnahme auf die byzantinischen/Psellos'schen Usancen herausgegeben wurde (siehe REINSCH, Michaelis Pselli Chronographia XXXIII). Zum anderen verfälscht die Normalisierung der Akzentuierung nach den Regeln der Schulgrammatik den Prosarhythmus, der wie Papaioannou selbst erklärt (Prolegomena S. CLVI), für die Gestaltung der Briefe wichtig ist. Insbesondere typisch für Psellos sind laut Papaioannou zwei aufeinander folgende Daktylen am Ende einer Phrase. Nicht nur weil dies dem handschriftlichen Befund entspricht sowie den daraus erfließenden Regeln, sondern auch um des Prosarhythmus willen sollte daher etwa ζῆσαί ποτε Π79.16 zu ζῆσαι ποτέ (zēsai pote, wie dies auch in der Hs P, f. 257v zu lesen ist) verbessert werden (und wohl auch τοῦτον προσκεῖσθαί σοι Π264.23 zu τοῦτον προσκεῖσθαι σοι [touton proskeisthai soi]).

Mark Lauxtermann erklärte: „Psellos' letters are, together with the Chronographia, his claim to immortality. Please read them." (JEFFREYS – LAUXTERMANN, The Letters of Psellos, Vorwort). Diese Briefe liegen jetzt einladend in der vorzüglichen Edition von Stratis Papaioannou vor. Lesen Sie sie! Sie sind ein literarischer Genuss und eröffnen ungeahnte Einblicke in die Welt der Byzantiner.

Martin Hinterberger
University of Cyprus
Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies
10, Kallipoleos Ave.& 1, Eressou str., 1678 Nicosia,
Cyprus
siebens@ucy.ac.cy

Catherine VANDERHEYDE, La Sculpture Byzantine du IXe au XVe siècle. Paris: Éditions Picard 2020. 366 pp. ISBN 978-2-7084-1050-3.

Despite the increased number of studies in recent years, Byzantine sculpture remains a relatively underrepresented topic within the field of medieval art history, especially when compared with coeval sculpture in the medieval West or related subjects of Byzantine art history, such as Byzantine painting. Given the frequent presence of sculpture in Byzantine churches in the form of column capitals, cornices, marble sanctuary barriers and other types of reliefs (even in small-scale provincial monuments), it is imperative to fill this gap in art historical scholarship. Catherine Vanderheyde's latest book "La Sculpture Byzantine" claims to be the first comprehensive survey of post-6th-century sculpture in Byzantium since the 2-part synthesis by André Grabar completed in 1976 (A. GRABAR, Sculptures byzantines du Moyen Age. II. XIe–XIVe siècles. Paris 1976; IDEM, Sculptures byzantines de Constantinople [IVe–Xe siècle]. Paris 1963). Thanks to the groundbreaking work of scholars such as Claudia Barsanti and Jean-Pierre Sodini (C. BARSANTI, La scultura mediobizantina fra tradizione e innovazione, in: Bisanzio nell'età dei Macedoni. Forme della produzione letteraria e artistica, VIII Giornata di Studi Bizantini [Milano, 15-16 marzo 2005], ed. F. Conca – G. Fiaccadori. Milan 2007, 5–49; J.-P. SODINI, La sculpture médio-byzantine: le marbre en ersatz et tel qu'en lui-même, in: Constantinople and its hinterland, ed. C. Mango – G. Dagron. Aldershot 1995, 289–311), great progress has been made since the publication of Grabar's books and it thus is obvious that C. Vanderheyde has succeeded in producing a much more advanced handbook than Grabar's. Indeed, Catherine Vanderheyde has dedicated years of research to the study and interpretation of Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture and is the right person to attempt a synthesis and presentation of multiple aspects of the field.

The book begins with a concise summary of the history and current state of scholarship on the subject, followed by an introductory section containing definitions concerning the chronology and the geographical framework. Thus, after outlining how previous and recently established views shaped modern approaches to Byzantine sculpture, the author demonstrates that there is to date no comprehensive monograph dealing with the sculpture of the entire medieval phase of Byzantine art, i.e. the centuries after the end of antiquity and the so-called Dark Ages (9th–15th centuries), which correspond with the Middle and Late Byzantine periods.

The first part ("Contexte Historique", pp. 21–30) is a discussion of the historical framework and of the social and cultural factors that defined developments in Byzantine sculpture throughout the centuries. In addition to its introductory character, this overview is essential to the analysis in the subsequent chapters, since it establishes a number of crucial issues relevant to sculpture, such as the attitude toward images after the end of iconoclasm and the flourishing of the visual language of ornament in general during the so-called Macedonian Renaissance.

The second part (pp. 31–90) is a narrative of the main stages of the development of Byzantine sculpture, which begins with the transition from the tradition of late antiquity, including transformations of function and context, and then proceeds with a description of the main Byzantine centuries. The author has conveniently chosen to articulate the narrative based on securely dated or datable monuments; thus, the sequence starts with the decoration of the Skripou church at Orchomenos (872/873 CE) and continues with the north church of the Lips monastery in Constantinople (907/908 CE), the churches of the monastery of Hosios Loukas (10th and 11th century), the Nea Moni on Chios (built during the reign of Constantine IX Monomachos), the monuments of the Mani by Niketas Marmaras (dated to the 1070s), and the Episkopi church on Santorini (dated with caution to the reign of Alexios I Komnenos). This approach has the advantage that it offers a reliable chronological overview of the evolution of sculpture in terms of its function, decoration, and techniques. Indeed, this outline serves as a useful methodological tool for establishing dating criteria, given the notorious difficulties in dating Byzantine sculpture. However, it is regrettable that important monuments from Anatolia are missing from this survey, for example the numerous templon fragments from various cities of Asia Minor, especially Phrygia, some of which are datable thanks to inscriptions and would facilitate a much-needed all-round approach to Middle Byzantine sculpture (C. BARSANTI, Scultura anatolica di epoca mediobizantina. *Million* 1 [1988] 281–283 and J.-P. SODINI, Une iconostase byzantine à Xanthos, in: Actes du colloque sur la Lycie antique. Istanbul 1982, 135–136): for example, the templon fragments from Selçikler/Sebaste would fit perfectly here. Fortunately, the Anatolian items are appropriately discussed in other parts of the book.

The 12th–13th centuries are treated with the help of other dated monuments and often with concrete connections with imperial or aristocratic patrons, such as Saint Panteleemon at Nerezi and the Kosmosoteira at Pherrai. The author rightly emphasizes the importance of the sculpture in the State of Epirus, although she opted to avoid any discussion of the recent publications of Lorenzo Riccardi (L. RICCARDI, La Parigoritissa di Arta. Un incrocio di tradizioni artistiche nel Despotato d'Epiro. Arte Medievale 10 [2020] 353–362), who, among other suggestions, has challenged the date of the figured sculpture of the Paregoretissa in Arta (he assigns it to the late 13th century, whereas C. Vanderheyde, like the author of this review, has followed Linda Safran in connecting them with the monument's first phase, i.e. in the 1230s— apparently this question remains open). An important contribution to the narrative is the inclusion of woodcarving, a phenomenon typical of the Late Byzantine centuries (and afterwards) and of works in stucco, the study of which has been recently intensified thanks to the research of Flavia Vanni (F. VANNI, Transferring Skills and Techniques across the Mediterranean: Some Preliminary Remarks on Stucco in Italy and Byzantium, in: Global Byzantium. Papers from the Fiftieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, ed. L. Brubaker – R. Darley – D. K. Reynolds. New York 2022, 332–353). The story ends with the so-called Palaiologan Renaissance and encompasses the output of areas in the Latin East. In general, the narrative throughout this chronological

overview is highly informative and paints a detailed picture of Byzantine sculpture over seven centuries with pertinent remarks contextualizing Byzantine sculpture within the wider framework of medieval sculpture. The inspired prose does justice to the author's approach and helps elevate the subject into a fascinating chapter of Byzantine art history.

The next section of the book, titled "Mise en œuvre" (pp. 91–166), deals with the mechanisms that created the works of art under discussion, namely the role of patrons, the modus operandi of sculptors, the materials and resources used (or reused), and the movement of workforce and marble. These chapters are particularly enlightening, especially thanks to the ways the evidence is connected with what is known about Late Roman/Early Byzantine practices, which were continued or transformed over the centuries and were indeed the basis of developments in Middle Byzantine times. On the other hand, there are fewer references to technical matters from the later centuries, save for the analysis of the champlevé technique which became dominant in the Palaiologan period. In any event, the author's highly original remarks concerning workshop organization, itinerant artists, and the use of tools are a valuable contribution to the discussion.

The final part of the book ("Décor aniconique et décor figuré", pp. 167–282) concentrates on matters of decoration and iconography and includes a thorough analysis of ornamental and figured sculpture. The author admirably tackles a wide range of subjects and themes without ignoring or underestimating any genre of Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture, thus succeeding in offering a panoramic view of the messages conveyed by sculpture and of its visual role within the buildings it adorned. The section on images, attitudes toward ancient sculptures, and the function of votive marble panels is one of the highlights of the work, whereby Catherine Vanderheyde convincingly demonstrates how the driving forces of the production of Byzantine sculpture were set in motion in the service of an art that was continually renewed and remained constantly relevant within the public sphere in Byzantium. This section also includes an in-depth analysis of some of the best-known albeit unsystematically studied specimens of Byzantine sculpture, namely the 11th-century marble icons of the Virgin.

Overall, the book is an important contribution to the study of Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture after late antiquity. By summarizing recent and current scholarship on the subject and formulating original concepts based on complex ideas, the author succeeds in producing a much-needed book on an important chapter of medieval art history. Of course, there is still much to be done in terms of contextualization and convincingly describing historical and social factors in relation to Byzantine sculpture (for example questions such as the fate of Anatolian architectural sculpture in the aftermath of the battle of Manzikert in 1071 CE remain open) and issues such as the interaction between Constantinople and the peripheral centres remain the subject of ongoing debate. Together with Philipp Niewöhner's bilingual handbook (P. NIEWÖHNER, Byzantine Ornaments in Stone. Architectural Sculpture and Liturgical Furnishings. Berlin – Boston 2021), which has contributed considerably to the conceptualization of Byzantine sculpture in relation to its

Early Christian background, Catherine Vanderheyde's book is an optimistic start for the field in the 2020s. Thanks to works like this it will be possible to advance the study of post-Justinianic sculpture and promote more innovative research.

Nicholas Melvani
Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz
Historisches Seminar - Osteuropäische Geschichte
Jakob-Welder-Weg 18, 55128 Mainz
nmelvani@uni-mainz.de

Rainer WARLAND, Allegorese in Byzanz. Die Weisheit Salomons und die Anfänge der biblisch-allegorischen Bildkunst in Konstantinopel. Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner 2021. 224 pp. ISBN 978-3-7954-3617-9.

With his monograph "Allegorese in Byzanz. Die Weisheit Salomons und die Anfänge der biblisch-allegorischen Bildkunst in Konstantinopel", R. Warland returns to one of the fundamental themes for researchers of early Byzantine art interested in understanding the semantic value of the figurative art of Byzantium. Allegoresis is a method of hermeneutics that deals with metaphorical, veiled or hidden meanings that transcend the literal sense of the word to emphasize the allegorical elucidation of the written word. Already known in Greek literature for the interpretation of the poetry of Homer and Hesiod, allegoresis was mainly applied in biblical exegesis, when, from the 1st century BC with Philo of Alexandria, this method allowed Greek metaphysics to be integrated with Christian thought. Warland applies this exegesis in reading and interpreting a collection of visual narratives about a group of objects made between the 6th and 7th centuries in Byzantium. The author's intent is to go beyond the visual description of the individual images to provide readers with a second, deeper reading that leads them to recognize the representations in their symbolic sense and thus reveal their meaning, which is only apparently hidden.

The book is structured in four chapters accompanied by numerous coloured illustrations that allow the reader to understand the narrative junction of the text and the details of the visual representations.

The first chapter (pp. 11–26) is preceded by a brief etymological note on the meaning of allegoresis and aims to clarify the key terms and concepts of allegorical hermeneutics by contextualizing their typological, chronological and geographical coordinates.

The second chapter (pp. 27–111) can be considered the central part of the monograph and is devoted to a new interpretative analysis of four early Byzantine works of art: one illumination from Codex GKS 6 2° preserved in the Royal Library of Copenhagen (pp. 27–31), the Throne of Maximian in Ravenna (pp. 31–65), the allegoresis of Christ in the Codex purpureus Rossanensis (pp. 65–91), and the silver cups with the life of David from Cyprus (pp. 93–111). Warland deals with a complex theme that has engaged generations of scholars who have ventured into the unsolved questions of

the arrangement and reading of the illustrated biblical cycles. With a lucid and structured argumentation, the author convincingly dwells on some voids in the organization of the images and on some inconsistencies and shortcomings in the visual narrative structure that at first sight cannot be explained. According to the author, these representative choices and details were deliberately planned by the artists and craftsmen in the production of their works in order to endow them with a hidden message. The illustrations of the biblical narratives therefore follow an intentional composition that apparently seems to move away from the naturalistic and realistic narrative style to challenge the intelligence of educated spectators, who can only decode the semantic content of the visual message if they interpret allegorically what they see. The creation of personalized images rich in juxtapositions and contrasts has the task of describing the underlying work of God in creation and in history, as well as the task of conveying his omnipotence and the emperor's closeness to God. The author contextualises the chosen works within the reign of Justinian I (AD 527–565), a particularly significant moment not only historically for the recovered unity with the western part of the empire (*renovatio imperii*), but also because in this period sacred architecture and visual arts were influenced by an imperial programmatic orientation, whose target was the manifestation of divine omnipotence and the biblical interpretation of the world.

The third chapter (pp. 113–152) contextualizes the works of art analysed with the aim of defining the concepts and principles that guided their production in the Constantinopolitan workshops. The author suggests that hidden allegoresis is a visual attempt to describe the reality of the cosmos on the one hand, and to paraphrase the mystery of God on the other. In this argument, particular attention is placed on the architectural symbolism of the Church of Hagia Sophia as an image of the cosmos that leads to the perception of divine wisdom and, through the light that penetrates the dome, to the abstraction of the presence of God (pp. 113–122). According to Warland, the architectural concepts of Justinian's church of the Holy Wisdom as well as the narrative ones of the ivory throne of Ravenna and the Rossano Gospels must be connected with the Book of Wisdom of Solomon, which was the basis for the conceptualizations of Justinian's workshops, in order to make the hidden sphere of God perceptible to the senses in the universality and transcendence of art. After having reflected on the theme of wisdom in terms of history, anchoring it to the reign and politics of Justinian I, and to the thinking of the Cappadocian fathers (pp. 122–124), the discussion moves on to visions of the world, of the cosmos and of science (pp. 124–129). The hidden allegoresis provides an explanation of the universe based on the harmony of the Pythagorean-Platonic principles with the cosmological and biblical narratives of God as a reality of the world order. The hermeneutics of the allegory of the early Byzantine period follows a process structured in three phases of recognition: rhetoric, connection (textual exegesis) and interpretation (visualization realisms). In the description of the verisms, the author dwells on the ways of representing reality including clothing, light, number, music and the altar, defining them as pictorial and symbolic *topoi* fundamental in terms of cultural history (pp. 129–146). A brief mention is made of animal allegoresis, which however, given its particularities, should be treated as a special case (pp. 146–148).

In the fourth chapter (pp. 153–208), Warland focuses in more detail on allegoresis by concretely correlating it to some objects produced between the 6th and 7th centuries. The works chosen belong to different artistic media ranging from artifacts and illuminations to wall mosaics and are grouped into three chronological and thematic groups. In the first group, chronologically closer to the reign of Justinian I, they are considered programmatic works (pp. 153–169). In the second (pp. 169–190), which goes up to the years of Emperor Justin II (AD 565–575), allegoresis moves towards biblical themes to move into the third group (at the time of Heraclius, AD 610–640) of cosmic and eschatological ones (pp. 190–202). Allegorical representations are investigated in manuscript illuminations (in the Vienna Dioscurides; the Cotton Genesis, the Rossano Gospel, the Vienna Genesis, the Codex Ejmiacin 2374 in Erevan and the Syriac Bible of Paris MS syr. 341), in artifacts (the ivory tablet of an angel in London, the lost gold medallion of Justinian and the astonished angels of a Sinai icon), in reliefs (two reliefs of Christ's childhood in Carthage and the ceiling relief of chapel Güllüdere 3 in Cappadocia) and in large-scale representations in churches (wall mosaics in the Basilica of San Vitale in Ravenna, in the church of Saint Catherine's Monastery in Sinai, in the Panagia Angeloktistos in Kiti/Cyprusa and in the Panagia Drosiani in Naxos). In these, the author shows the allegoresis in personifications, reliefs and mosaic schemes in the Byzantine context, focusing on the appearances as angel, Logos and Sophia. The chapter ends with an addendum on the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus in Rome and a mention of Middle Byzantine allegoresis (pp. 203–208).

In conclusion, Warland's publication should be praised for having tackled a complex, enigmatic and at the same time fascinating theme. Thanks to his lucid interpretation of the works of art and his deep knowledge of biblical sources, the author has provided a refined exegesis of the visual allegory of early Byzantine art. The pages rich in information, the numerous figures and the extensive and well-structured bibliography allow the reader to hermeneutically recognize the allegory hidden from the historical reality of the episcopate, the allegory of Christ, the liturgy, the imperial government and the interpretation of the work of God as the generating force of cosmic order as a whole. This monograph, delving into religious, human and visual culture studies, greatly enriches our knowledge of some of the more crucial centuries in the history of early Byzantine art. We applaud the authors's efforts, pursued with wisdom and intelligence, in such a difficult field.

Davide Bianchi
Institut für Klassische Archäologie
Universität Wien
Franz-Klein-Gasse 1, A-1190 Wien
davide.bianchi@univie.ac.at